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ABSTRACT

It is no longer arguable that one country’s internal political, social and economic stability are vital for another country’s economic and human security. There is regional spillover effect of one’s country instability and Kenya’s case against South Sudan’s instability due to Civil Wars isn’t exceptional. This study aimed at analyzing effects of South Sudan Civil Wars on Kenya’s economic security limiting the scope to cross border trade and influx of refugees into Kenya.

Chapter One gives a brief introduction of the topic as well as background to the research problem. It also specifies the statement of the research problem as well as listing objectives of the research. This is followed by hypotheses and justification of the research problem. Literature review is followed by theoretical framework and methodology of the research. The methodology entails the qualitative and quantitative approaches in order to gather comprehensive outcomes, thus a conclusive research.

Chapter Two gives historical relations between Kenya and South Sudan. Chapter Three presents findings from a sample of Kenyan exporters to South Sudan in Nairobi City County followed by Chapter Four that tables findings from Turkana County’s host community, refugees and security agencies.

The summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations are discussed in Chapter Five. The principal conclusion of the dissertation, in Chapter Five, is that South Sudan’s Civil Wars have affected Kenya’s economic and human security where free trade is affected leading to loses in Kenya firms and increases the presence of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camps. Further strategies and actions are indispensable, beginning with more secure trade routes including LAPPSET and Northern Corridors, bilateral trade agreements, Kenya’s further role in search of peace and security in South Sudan, empowerment of Turkana people to reduce their dependence on camp, enhance approaches that promote coexistence, and promote peace and security.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Introduction

Crises that take place around a regional bloc are likely to affect the economic security of the neighbouring states. The conflict may involve either intra-state conflict with economic spill-over effects or inter-state conflicts which mostly involves inter-ethnic or clan tension. In East African region, there has been occurrence of conflicts involving one nation or several nations. More specifically, Kenya was hit by Post-Election Violence (PEV) in 2007-2008 which had serious economic ramification especially on trade in goods and service, employment, proliferation of informal trade, insecurity that led to scale down of economic activities by Multi-National Corporations (MNCs) and internal or external displacement of persons.

Some of the countries that experienced some economic effect included land-locked countries like Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda, Burundi and Republic of South Sudan. Likewise, Sudan and her breakaway sister country, South Sudan, have experienced instability that led to secession of the latter through Comprehensive Peace Agreement signed in 2005. During the turmoil, Kenya equally suffered social and economic instability. Since December 2013, there is an on-going conflict between two political leaders namely President Salva Kiir and his former Deputy President Riek Machar. Kiir and Machar command the loyalties of their respective Dinka and Nuer tribes who are at the centre of the on-going armed power struggle. South Sudan boasts of 10.8million people and per capita income of USD 861, 50, according to the World Bank (WB). Almost 95% of government revenues are generation through crude oil exports; a sector that has been destabilized by
raging civil conflict\textsuperscript{1}. The study tested the relationship between regional instability and consequential economic and human security effects on the neighbouring countries and Kenya in particular.

1.2. Background to the Research Problem

Civil conflicts before and after secession of South Sudan have made the country to stagnate in economic and social development. The country is rated as one of the world’s poorest country with small existing infrastructure\textsuperscript{2}. However, South Sudan boasts of a vast coverage of forested land which produces hard wood and forest exports, especially teak trees which has also been used to fund militia groups in South Sudan. South Sudan has also a high potential for other mineral resources that have high demand in international markets like petroleum and gold\textsuperscript{3}. South Sudan is rich in oil and is regularly denied access to export oil via Sudan’s Red Sea State hence contemplating bilateral agreement between South Sudan and Kenya to export oil via Kenya’s Port of Lamu. If Sudan and South Sudan standoff continues, the alternative pipeline to the Kenyan coast will improve Kenya’s economic performance through the Lamu Port-South-Sudan-Ethiopia (LAPPSET) corridor which incorporates Highway Components of Lamu Port, Crude Oil pipeline, highway, railway, airport, resort cities, and associated infrastructure (Power, water, communications)\textsuperscript{4}.

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{3}] Wikipedia. (2013, May 4). \textit{Economy of South Sudan}. Retrieved from Wikipedia website \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_South_Sudan} (last accessed 20th September 2014)
\item[\textsuperscript{4}] Export Promotion Council (2012). Consultancy Services for Market Research in the Republic of South Sudan (Market Survey, Nairobi, Nairobi City County: Makini Consultancy Services, pg 18
\end{itemize}
South Sudan has high potential for farming where 30 million hectares of land are arable and only 5% is under cultivation. Despite that, South Sudan relies on food imports from neighboring countries, such as Uganda, Kenya and Sudan. It also heavily depends on imports from neighboring countries like vegetable fats, crude, refined or fractionated fats, lime cement and construction materials, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, medicines, iron products and furniture which are mainly sourced from Kenya. South Sudan has vast porous borders which she shares with six neighboring countries. Consequently, the porous Kenya-South Sudan border makes Kenya very susceptible to terrorist cells in Sudan and Arab Countries which target Western economic interests in Kenya.

As far as influx of refugees is concerned, there are also tensions with local communities surrounding the camps, in particular over natural resources. For instance, disputes between the local Turkana community in Kakuma and South Sudanese refugees have led to several reported killings over the last decade. Many men leave the camps and move to Nairobi in search of better economic opportunities because Kenya labour laws do not allow refugees working in the camps to earn salaries; instead, they are only permitted to receive ‘incentives’ from United Nations (UN) agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). The state in camps makes their lives more miserable as opposed to what they could earn in urban areas like Nairobi or in Juba if South Sudan remained peaceful. Further, the presence of refugees will in some way be affecting the lives of peoples living in that area. This calls for host communities to adapt to the economic changes and challenges brought on by the camps.

---


establishment that might have different impacts towards their livelihoods\textsuperscript{7}. The impacts of refugee camps on host communities can be both negative and positive, creating both winners and losers of the given scenario\textsuperscript{8}. Understanding and knowledge of these economic relationships between the host community and the refugees is of great importance for ensuring a sustainable and peaceful coexistence between them which can boost economic security of a country.

It is against this background of geopolitical importance that South Sudan’s instability can result to economic security threats to the region and Kenya in particular. Her population of 11,090,104\textsuperscript{9} people serves as a vast market to Kenya’s export products and services. Sudan’s vast arable but uncultivated land has high potential for Kenyans interested to farm and increase food security for South Sudanese people. Instability in South Sudan can cause economic harm to Kenya in her renewed quest to tap from South Sudan ‘virgin economic frontier’ with massive potential that can serve Kenya’s economic security. Kenya has engaged in economic diplomacy to build a strong South Sudan state that act as a buffer zone against terrorism, job creation for Kenyan population, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) for Kenya’s MNCs, export market for Kenya’s product, joint development plans like LAPSSET that will see South Sudan’s rich natural resources exported through Kenya and farming in South Sudan’s vast arable land. Further, the research aimed at looking at how refugees affect the economic and security of the host community in Turkana’s Kakuma area and explore best solutions to mitigate negative effects.


\textsuperscript{9} \textit{The World Factbook} (2013–14 edition)
1.3. Statement of the Research Problem

There is shortage of literature addressing the effects of instability in one country on economic and human security of another state especially as regards with Kenyan-South Sudan case given that the latter achieved her independence three years ago i.e. 2011 and renown scholars on political economy have not developed a lot of literature on the subject. Moreover, Chambers\(^\text{10}\) states that there is lack of precise information on the effects of hosting refugees to the host communities including the economic implication and security matters. Due to competing interests between the host community and the refugees, there is high likelihood of security lapses, conflict over natural economic resources and Common Property Resources (CPRs), change in economic values due to change in supply and demand among other issues.

The study examined economic and protective security especially personal security of the host communities in Kenya in relations with South Sudan’s political, social and economic stability from 2003, two years before the transitional period when Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed, to 2013 when the Machar-Kiir rivalry started. Further, it endeavored to generate literature on the question of trade development between Kenya and South Sudan during the South Sudan unfortunate period of political upheaval. This begs the question: Is one country’s political, social and economic instability a threat to economic and human security of communities in another state?

1.4. Objectives of the Research

The main objective is to demonstrate that South Sudan instability is a threat to Kenya’s economic and human security.

Specific objectives are as follows:

\(^{10}\) Chambers, *op. cit.*, p.245-263
i. To analyze how South Sudan’s instability has affected South Sudan-Kenya’s trade.

ii. To find out the security implication of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp.

1.5. Hypotheses

i. The political and social turmoil in South Sudan affects negatively Kenyans’ trade with South Sudan.

ii. The increasing numbers of South Sudan refugee in Kenya strains CPRs in Kakuma Refugees Camp.

iii. The influx of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp is increasing insecurity in Turkana County.

1.6. Justification of the Research Problem

Due to globalization and global economic inter-dependence, the instability in one nation can cause direct negative effects in another state’s economic, political and social standing. Instability creates a stumbling block against other states ideal or realistic economic interest. Instructively, South Sudan’s instability has prevented Kenyans from pursuit of their economic interest through Kenya’s renewed economic diplomacy and this has consequently caused economic insecurity for the Kenyans trading in goods and services. This study is important in the sense that it provides a basis for strengthening mechanisms that can address regional instability stemming from inter-state or intra-state conflicts.

The era between 2003 and end of year 2013, immediately after enforcement of CPA, presented Kenya with a complex situation in which the country’s economic interests were threatened in more than one way. First, the final conflictual stages before signing of CPA presented with cross-border crimes especially between Turkanas and Sudan Sudanese
refugees, the collapse of larger Sudan’s market due to secession and assessing afresh economic diplomacy for Sudan and South Sudan Nations before and after secession, dependence burden created by high numbers of refugees streaming into Kenya from South Sudan and porous borders that threatened regional security and Western interests hence creating low foreign investor’s confidence. Kenya being a major trade partner with South Sudan hasn’t been able to exploit optimally the export market in South Sudan as a result of instability. It was open to Kenya to intervene in the affairs of South Sudan, for purposes of securing peace and creating room for pursuit of her Grand National economic interests.

Despite Kenya’s effort, sustainable stability hasn’t been achieved and this study is integral in testing effects of South Sudan’s instability on Kenya’s cross-border trade and relationship between the Kenyans in Turkana County and South Sudanese refugees.

1.7. Literature Review

The literature review provides literature on the research topic in addition to contextual information on the locations of the research.

1.7.1. Economic Diplomacy: How it Informs Stability of a Region

Building on the definition of Baine and Woolcock¹¹, one can define the new economic diplomacy as couple of undertakings involving methods and processes used in making decisions in international set-up. This is commonly associated in decision making for international activities like trade in goods and services which are mainly pursued by state and non-state actors in the realist world. Economic diplomacy entails two components.

First, Baine says it is the use of political and diplomatic relationships especially bilaterally to influence international trade and investment, and to reduce risks of cross border transactions (including property rights) like the case of Kenya and South Sudan.

Secondly, Baine and Woolcock say there is use of economic assets through cross border linkages so as to increase the cost of engaging in intra-state and inter-state wars. This also enhances economies of scale and encourages comparative advantage between states with a view of enhancing achievement of mutual interests and stable political and economic relationships. This consequently promotes stability within a region as well as economic and human security of given states. For instance, Kenya and South Sudan together with a host of other regional countries have initiated LAPSSET corridor project.

Many Neoclassical Economic theories have not given weight to the question of public policy within the bilateral economic agreement framework. Bhagwati\textsuperscript{12} has complained about this gap in public policy and wonders “How can we possibly explain what happens unless we bring in the political equations into our modeling at the same time”. The lack of political component may be informed by need to specialization of economic engagements as informed by David Ricardo’s Comparative Advantage Theory coupled with need to avoid costly welfare issues introduced by politics. Undeniably, some books in international economics do not give consideration to the role that politics play in international economics. Instructively, in his important paper on Principles of Political Economy and Taxation (1817), Ricardo illustrates the Theory of Comparative Advantage basing it on relative advantages accrued due to accumulation of certain economic resources as opposed to another state and exemplified his argument with international trade between Portugal’s wine and England’s cloth. Actually, this trade didn’t come about due to liberalized trade but out of economic diplomacy enshrined

in Methuen Treaty, a military and commercial treaty between Portugal and England. In the treaty, England’s woolen cloths enjoyed zero tariffs in Portugal and Portugal’s wine was levied less two thirds of customs charged France’s wine hence giving Portugal a competitive edge. This clearly demonstrates that economic diplomacy is integral in promoting economic security of a country and its stability in a given region.

Conversely, the political implication in promoting economic diplomacy in a given region and consequently economic security of given states has been noted by Mill\textsuperscript{13}. He noted that trade encourages the business players (state and non-state) to promote regional peace and security in a given international trade set-up. Also, Lenin\textsuperscript{14} underscored that inter-state trade reduces incidences of war and consequently reduce the likelihood of conflict in a region. This can be exemplified with Kenya-Uganda verbal conflict over geopolitically important Migingo Island which doesn’t degenerate to a full blown conflict because of trade ties between the two countries.

Studies by Rose\textsuperscript{15} indicate that an increase in conflictual behavior significantly reduces trade flows between two countries. She further states that on the contrary, enhanced cooperative behavior increases bilateral trade flows which leads to reduced conflict. Rose adds that bilateral economic relations are enhanced further by establishment of diplomatic ties between states. Indicatively, Maurel and Afman\textsuperscript{16} notes that there is high correlation between trade diversions by means of mutual trade ties which increases stability within a region because of economic inter-connectedness.

\textsuperscript{14} Lenin, V.I. (1920) Report on the concessions delivered to the R.C.P. (B) Group at the 8\textsuperscript{th} Congress of Soviets, December 21, 1920. Moscow: VIX Press, pg 7
\textsuperscript{15} Rose, A. (2007). The Foreign Service and Foreign Trade: Embassies as Export Promotion Economy, Volume 30, Number 1, January 2007, pp. 22-38
1.7.2. Economic and Security Implication of Hosting Refugees

According to Chambers\textsuperscript{17}, hosting refugees from other countries either in urban or rural set-up comes with many economic, social and political implications to the host country. However, there is lack of precise information on the effects of hosting refugees to the host communities according to various scholars in this field like Chambers and Maystadt and Verwimp\textsuperscript{18}. According to Chambers, it is simply known that majority of refugees fall under low economic status in their country of origin and they mainly settle in rural areas especially near the border to their country and in most of these rural areas, the host communities struggle to support themselves economically. This implies that influx of refugees will lead to worsening of standard of living for the host communities on available resources which at times leads to conflicts between the host and the refugees\textsuperscript{19}. How it will impact nonetheless depends on several factors and approaches where both positive and negative outcomes are possibilities according to Maystadt and Verwimp\textsuperscript{20}. Indeed, most literature has also noted that host states have been subdued by international actors and regimes like United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to observe best humanitarian standards for the refugees. This has in some cases led to better non-actors’ economic and humanitarian provisions for the refugees than the host communities.

Nonetheless, according to Chambers, the impact of refugee assistance through humanitarian aids and other economic assistance may also help improve the livelihoods of the host community. He however adds that in trying to support both the host community and refugees, this could lead to overexploitation and depletion of scarce resources. Hosting of refugees

\textsuperscript{17} Chambers, op. cit., p.245-263
\textsuperscript{19} Chambers, op. cit., p.245-263
\textsuperscript{20} Maystadt & Verwimp, op. cit., p. 2
brings mixed fortunes to the host state. Chambers\textsuperscript{21} presents five dimensions of analysis of the cost-benefit relationship between the refugees and the host communities which are reliant upon food/land, labor/wages, services, Common Property Resources (CPRs) and economic development. In early stages of refugee influx it is likely that before imported food aid assistance is fully implemented that depletion of local food supplies will drive up food prices. The outcome for the ones selling food such as surplus farmers would likely be positive, while negative for the ones who are depending on buying food supplies such as subsistence farmers and landless labors. Refugees stretch food security situation for the host communities as can be observed by Theories of Supply and Demand. Influx of refugees increases demand for food in the face of constant and constrained supply\textsuperscript{22}. Famine Early Network Systems also says that this ends up pushing prices of goods and services higher hence decreasing the purchasing power and standard of living of the host communities. However, the host communities may be cushioned against the harsh effects of higher demand where they can benefit from relief supplies through trade.

Even if relief food is meant for refugees, it at times ends up in free markets or barter trade as Whitaker states. Further, Whitaker\textsuperscript{23} adds that about 75\% of relief foods distributed in Tanzania between 1992 and 1993 ended up in the market but World Food Program (WFP) refutes that and states that even if the relief food ends in market, the markets are controlled by host communities who in return get food in better prices. On issue of labor, influx of refugees equally brings mixed fortunes where high supply of laborers in labor-intensive economies reduces wages on one hand but on the other hand increases food production for economic

\textsuperscript{21} Chambers, op. cit., pg. 246-249
security. The worst case scenario comes in when land, as a factor of production, is scarce which could lead to hurting host communities and increase competition between the two groups. Jacobsen\textsuperscript{24} agrees with Chambers that scarcity of land and natural resources increases competition over resources as was the case in refugee camps in East Africa and Horn of Africa.

On accessibility of social service, initially, refugees benefit more and access education and health facilities than the local communities as argued by Chambers\textsuperscript{25}. Competition for CPRs also creates conflict between the refuges and the host communities. It includes such resources as grazing land, trees, firewood, food and water. Host community reacts when they lose on CPRs and become hostile to refugee population. According to Jacobsen\textsuperscript{26}, this has been experienced in refugee camps in the Sudan-Uganda-Kenya border region.

Literature assumes that problems facing refugees are one of the major issues facing international refugee regimes. Concrete results ought to be sought as in the refugee case in Kenya’s Kakuma Refugees Camp in Turkana County which host high numbers of South Sudanese refugees due to instability in their country\textsuperscript{27}. Therefore is it vital to address the economic security issues of the host communities as well as promote co-existence due to shared interests between the host state and the state where refugees originates.

Literature on economic diplomacy to increase state’s economic security through realist means and literature on economic effects of refugees on host communities has received limited

\textsuperscript{25} Chambers, \textit{op. cit.}, p.252-253
\textsuperscript{26} Jacobsen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11
attention. Maystadt and Verwimp\textsuperscript{28} have equally noted that knowledge and literature hasn’t been sought enough since Chambers’ analysis of impact of refugees on host nations in 1986.

This research contributed to fill a gap in knowledge on how instability in South Sudan has had economic and human security ramifications in Kenya and impact of Kenya’s consequential economic diplomacy on her economic security and performance. It equally aims at responding on economic effects over Kenya’s hosting one of largest refugee camp in the world.

1.8. Theoretical Framework

The two objectives in the research to be addressed is how South Sudan’s instability has affected South Sudan-Kenya’s trade and finding out the security implication of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp. As explained, Kenya’s economic relations with South Sudan is one where both countries, in one hand, aim at sustaining realist’s interest for their economic security and on the other hand, upholding liberalists’ quest to promote local and regional peace, security and stability.

The prolonged debate between realists and liberals on the causes of war and the consequential economic effects has centralised on explaining different causal variables\textsuperscript{29}. Realists underscore factors as relative power, whereas liberals concentrate on economic collective security regimes\textsuperscript{30}.

Liberalists argue that economic interconnectedness mitigates possibility of conflict between two states or within a state and that this promotes international trade and increase cost of intra-state and inter-state wars hence enhancing economic security of the states. Conversely,

\textsuperscript{28} Maystadt & Verwimp, op. cit., p. 2
\textsuperscript{29} https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/copeland.htm (last accessed 1st September 2014)
realists criticises the liberal arguments saying that in an anarchic state system, states will push their citizenry to be more concerned about protecting their national economic interest which may increase competition and leading to war with each other. They equally argue that in an intra-state set-up, different competing groups like clans, tribes, races and gender will compete against each other to maximise benefits from trade or even from scarce resources. Accordingly, economic interconnectedness, either under Ricardian Comparative Advantage Theory, or Adam Smith’s Absolute Advantage Theory or other theories of free trade set-up, means dependence and relative vulnerability, makes states to be concerned about their economic wellness and security.

1.8.1. The Liberal and Realist Arguments on Instability and Economic Interconnectedness

According to Dale\(^{31}\), the primary liberalists’ position is forthright as they states that international trade brings immense gains from trade to state especially if a state is exporting more than importing as is the case for Kenya trading with South Sudan. A state that is not independent should hence avert either intra-state or inter-state war, since mutual and free flowing trade allows it to integrate further in regional ties and without incidence of increasing cost of doing business. The argument was propounded first in 1850s by Richard Cobden, who noted that international trade ties makes states to be cautious about their internal peace and security and promotes the same in other state so as not to lose its share of market in unstable state, which was otherwise a trading partner previously\(^{32}\). Liberalists argue that even though war was economically beneficial during Mercantilist era which encouraged the many intra-European wars of the period and arguably fueled European expansion and imperialism – both in Europe and throughout the rest of the world – until the 19th century or early 20th century,


modern world has come up with mechanisms that hinders realist states to create ‘own wealth from other states’ through use of force; indeed, by severing trade links through war, it becomes simply ‘commercially suicidal.”\textsuperscript{33}

In 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} Centuries during the Industrial Revolution and before the 1\textsuperscript{st} World War, Angell argument in his thesis could lose ground because states jostled in search of raw materials and cheap labor that led to Berlin Conference which divided Africa into colonies, albeit the conference succeeded a period of successive wars. But coming to period between 1930s and 1940s during the Great Depression, Angell argued that the debacle simply confirmed the unprofitability of modern inter-state or intra-state wars\textsuperscript{34}. Angell encourages leaders to see how unprofitable inter-state or inter-state war is compared to the merits of trade ties which increase economic security of states.

Fifty years after Angell’s arguments, Richard Rosecrance re-affirmed the importance of trading states being pre-occupied with promotion of wealth creation through partnerships instead of extra territorial conquest. Globalization has made states emphasize on improvement of business environment internally and internationally after realizing that wars are not only costly but cut links for mutually beneficial international trade environment. With this strategic mutual economic interest in mind of nations, it is common knowledge then that instability in one country leads to economic insecurity in the other countries. A highly interdependent economic system is a disincentive to war either within state or between states and encourages peaceful co-existence for higher economic security. It makes states appreciate


\textsuperscript{34} \url{https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/copeland.htm} (last accessed 2nd September 2014)
high probability of doing better through micro-economic development and growth integrated macro-economically with worldwide market for their goods and services\textsuperscript{35}.

The Liberalist Theory faces criticism from proponents of realism including Niccolo Machiavelli, Hans Morgenthau, and E. H. Carr. For instance, in his book \textit{The Prince} (1513), Machiavelli advised about how to deal with conflicts among neighboring states and how to defend one’s homeland with a single motive to protect economic interest, boundaries, and its population against direct or indirect intrusion. Machiavelli’s name has become synonymous with nasty and brutal politics. They also suggest that as opposed to liberalist views, mutual interdependence creates room for tension due to competition for market with a view to create a surplus balance of payment or balance of trade. They further argue that intra-state or inter-state conflict can occur over intention to control natural resources which makes input for the export goods. Sudan conflict that led to secession of South Sudan from main Sudan was partly contributed by material desire to dominate oil-rich Abyei region and other oil fields. Realist states fear that other states can use as defense threats of cutting off imported goods during a standoff. These goods may include vital inputs to economy like oil and raw materials of which if they aren’t availed, it can collapse the economy and cause serious economic ripple effects.

The other objective to address is how the refugee camp affects the host Kenya community and in particular their household viability in rural and urban areas in the face of scarce resources.

Chambers present theories on how host countries are affected by refugees economically\textsuperscript{36}. He argues that in the face of scarce economic resources in a country, the host country and


\textsuperscript{36} Chambers, \emph{op. cit.}, p.234-236
communities are likely to feel hurt especially in loss of CPR. The Kakuma and Daadab refugee camp in Kenya, hosted by Turkana and Kenyan-Somali communities respectively in Turkana and Garissa Counties fits description of an area where CPRs are limited.

Chambers\textsuperscript{37} does also present a theory on how host communities may benefit from the refugee presence through development of social services such as schools and health services also becoming available for the hosting part. Alix-Garcia and Saah\textsuperscript{38} confirms Chambers views that increasing competition for resources in addition to population growth and migration may negatively impact the host community and their household viability. They do also present a theory that new market opportunities for locals to sell, buy and trade merchandises with refugees may have a positive impact for the host community. Maystad and Verwimps\textsuperscript{39} empirical research from hosting communities in Tanzania supports this theory as they argue that a significant amount of food rations distributed to refugees are often sold or exchanged at new markets between refugees and local hosts.

The theories presented here on both how host communities can be hurt in terms of losing vital resources and benefit from hosting refugees through gaining more access to social services and creation of new market opportunities are central to the research. The balance between these possible impacts is nevertheless complex, dynamic and to some extent unexplored according to literature. Therefore makes these theories presented an interesting framework for analyzing the findings from Turkana County. This is in relation to research question number two.

\textsuperscript{37} Chambers, \textit{op. cit.}, p.234-236
\textsuperscript{39} Maystadt & Verwimp, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 9
1.9. Methodology of the Research

1.9.1. Methodology Discussion

The most common distinction of methodology in social research is between applying a quantitative or qualitative approach according to Bryman. This does not necessarily mean that researcher needs to strictly follow only one approach. A mixed method approach including both quantitative and qualitative strategies is also an option for researchers. Nonetheless, there are some clear distinctions between the two which makes them natural to divide; the most obvious is that quantitative researchers employ measurements while qualitative researchers do not.

1.9.2. Choice of Methodology

To explore how some sectors of Kenya economy have been affected by South Sudan instability either through severance of trade in goods and services ties or impact of hosting refugees in the country, a qualitative method approach was intended. Moreover, quantitative approach supplemented qualitative approach to generate statistical data on trade and services. This is in line with research objectives set. Qualitative research is often conducive to the exploration of people’s lives and history and was therefore the chosen method. A qualitative approach was also considered favorable for exploring effects of South Sudan conflict on Kenya’s economic security in trade in goods and services with her as well as hosting South Sudan refugees rural areas of Turkana County. As a framework, a case study design was

---

adopted. This design is appropriate when researchers are concerned with in-depth elucidation of a situation\(^{42}\).

### 1.9.3. Qualitative Research

Silverman characterize the use of qualitative research with intention to explore people’s lives and history\(^{43}\). Qualitative research distinct itself from quantitative in the sense that it usually emphasize words rather than quantifications when collecting and analyzing data\(^{44}\). Bryman identifies three specific features that characterize qualitative research strategies\(^{45}\). An inductive approach is common where theory is generated out of research rather than the other way around which is more usual in quantitative research. An interpretive epistemology is more common within qualitative strategies. Understanding the social world through interpretations from participants instead of through scientific models characterize qualitative strategies.

Bryman lists four main preoccupations of qualitative researchers\(^{46}\). Seeing through the eyes of the people being studied, is described by Bryman as common feature by qualitative researchers aiming at viewing the social worlds through the perspectives of the people they are studying. Qualitative researchers are also more concerned with providing descriptions and emphasis on the context of what they are researching. Further on, Bryman claims that emphasis on process is central where qualitative research “view social life in term of processes”. Finally, qualitative research as opposed to quantitative tends to be more flexible and less concerned with structure. Obviously structure is a part of qualitative research, but

\(^{42}\) Bryman, op. cit., p.21  
\(^{43}\) Silverman, op. cit., pg 25  
\(^{44}\) Bryman, op. cit., pg 366  
\(^{45}\) Ibid., pg 366  
\(^{46}\) Bryman, op. cit., pg 384-389
flexibility in relation to the phenomenon being researched is an important preoccupation for qualitative researchers.

1.9.4. Research Strategy

Bryman lists five different types of research designs when conducting social research depending on the approach and strategy the researcher chose. These designs are the following: experimental design, cross-sectional or survey design, longitudinal design, comparative design and case study.

I chose the case study design in my research as I found it the most suitable approach for this particular research project. Bryman describes the nature of a case study as a design that entails detailed and intensive analysis of a single case. Further, the case study is often associated with a study of a particular location or community. In my research, I chose Turkana and Nairobi City Counties as my “case” which is representative of Kenya in general. The aim is to explore and provide detailed analysis of how the goods and services industries have been impacted by instability in South Sudan and equally explore the impact of refugees in Turkana County.

I have used a qualitative approach as a research design. In term of the relationship between theory and research, I have used a framework of theories. New theories can also be deduced from the collected data.

My choice of using a qualitative methodology includes the use of semi-structured interview and questionnaires as the main research methods in addition to a literature review. The questions presented in the interviews are mostly open-ended with the purpose of respondents to reply in which matter they choose. In-depth interviews have the strength that it can reveal

---

47 Bryman, op. cit., pg 35
48 Bryman, op. cit., pg 52-53
issues that may only be found by asking questions. It also gives the participants the opportunity to elaborate on questions which again can provide further interesting and valuable information\(^{49}\).

Structured questionnaires presentations were also valuable part of this research. The questionnaires were administered to respondents in the selected companies trading with South Sudan from Kenya. When developing the questionnaire items, the closed and open-ended formats of the item were used. The formats were used in all categories of the questionnaires even if the open-ended question offers the respondents with the chance to express their feeling and also give the researcher an opportunity to ask for clarity in case or she does not understand the response well. The researcher then gets the chance to get deeper feeling of the respondents by asking him or her questions to qualify his or her answer. The open-ended questions also give more information that the researcher had not forethought while constructing the questionnaire. The open-ended questions are open to any form of answers from the respondents. The researcher should be clear and precise with his questions and make them short. The purpose of the research should be clear in the questions and make sure that the questions are relevant to make the analysis easy and simple\(^{50}\).

1.9.5. Sampling

Bryman \& Bell defines a sample design as a definite plan for obtaining a sample from the sampling frame\(^{51}\). It refers to the technique or the procedure the researcher would adopt in selecting some sampling unit from which inferences about the population is drawn. Sampling design was determined before data is collected.

\(^{49}\) Bryman, op. cit., pg 466


The sampling procedure involved the use of purposive and random sampling techniques in which the researcher chose respondents from a target population. It was important to keep in mind that as the research goes on include misinformation by the respondents who have an idea of what the research hypothesis is all about and they might manipulate their responses. This means that the collection of the information has to be maintained at an impersonal level to prevent such from happening. The respondents should agree to give the information voluntarily and the researcher has to make sure that they do not give false information due to pressure from their superiors. The identity of the respondents and their safety should be a guarantee because some of them may fear losing their jobs if they give a negative impression of the organization.

The instrument used was rated in terms of how effectively it sampled significant aspects of the purpose of the study. The content validity of the instrument was determined by seeking opinion on the content. First, the researcher discussed the items in the instrument with the supervisors, colleagues and other lecturers in the department. The advice given helped the researcher to determine the validity of the research instruments. The advice given during the consultation with the other partners in the research included suggestions, clarifications and other inputs. These suggestions were used in making necessary changes to the collection instrument before taking it out to the field.

The study of Exporting Manufacturers, mostly from Nairobi City County, was used mainly to test objective number one and hypothesis one and Turkana’s Kakuma Refugee Camp was used to test objective number two and hypothesis number two and three. Due to the location of Kakuma Refugee Camp in Turkana County, it was expected that contextual information on the location would pose a challenge which partly but limitedly could hinder ease of sampling. In the contrary, Nairobi City County where industries trading between Kenya and South
Sudan are located is well mapped out and afforded ease of sampling but industries preferred classifying information in fear of business intelligence and possible harm to their operational plans. This research made estimation on the population from where representative samples were drawn. This is because there is ever an influx of refugees entering the camp due to hostilities in their countries of origin especially now that there is ongoing conflict in South Sudan which is driving hundreds of South Sudanese to Kakuma Refugee camp. Indeed, the refugee administrators in Kakuma are planning a new Section IV due to new refugees coming in. This influx has made refugees in Kakuma to be more than the host community. So a larger sample was drawn from refugees than from the host community. Secondly, this research also targeted officers from government security agencies like Kenya Administration Police, Kenya Police, and National Coordination Department and Criminal Investigation Department.

A rough map of the refugees’ camp and the surrounding villages was developed which helped identify the main targets in the host community. Some key characteristics within the samples for the refugees and host community were emphasized like age, gender, nationality, location and time lived in Kakuma. This information was sought because the older people can easily provide serial information over a long period of time and the younger generation can provide information on topical issues. The closeness or distance of the host community from the refugees’ camp was also considered to test the magnitude of security and economic implication between the host and the refugees in Kakuma.

Equally, external actors were included like government security agencies since their insightful information is valuable. These actors had better information that spans more than ten years concerning the security and economic situation in Kakuma.
Kakuma is divided into three sections and different refugees settle in different places in the camp. Another Section IV is coming up due to new influx because of new fighting in South Sudan. However, this research looked for representative sample of South Sudanese refugees. Further, refugees also settle in Kakuma either by where their tribes are concentrated or on new grounds altogether.

The research used purposive and random sampling methods. The choice of purposive sampling has been informed by Bryman\textsuperscript{52} who states that purposive sampling includes sampling participants in a strategic way so that the samples can remain very relevant to the research questions. For instance, the research drew its main sample from the population in Kakuma Camp and immediate neighboring villages so as to draw better and most relevant sample. Selection of households around the camp was done randomly. This involved selecting households randomly for interviews. Further, the research faced language barriers from Turkana and refugees in the camp. As a result, the research used a Turkana research assistant familiar with the ground to select purposively households where individuals understand either Swahili or English. Due to hosting refugees for many years, Kakuma people, ranging from refugees to host community, have largely adopted Swahili as their language. The selection of representation from external actors i.e. government security agencies and agents, was done using purposive sampling method. All government security agencies expect Kenya Defense Forces have a large footprint in Kakuma refugee camp and two representatives from each agency were picked for interview.

The following table shows the breakdown on how interviews were conducted.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Category & Count \\
\hline
Overall & 50 \\
Refugees & 30 \\
Host Community & 20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{52} Bryman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 415
Table 1: Breakdown on Interviews Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host Community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kakuma Refugees Camp</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kakuma Refugees Camp</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Actors (Security Agencies)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kenya Police</td>
<td>2 respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration Police</td>
<td>2 respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.S.U.</td>
<td>2 respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Administration</td>
<td>2 respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.I.D.</td>
<td>2 respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyan Exporters</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Interviews conducted and Questionnaires presented*

Further, as the Table 1 row 4 shows above, the research procured a list of 54 Kenyan exporters to South Sudan located in Nairobi County and a sample of 14 respondents were picked where the strata were allocated samples according to their percentage representation in the population. The companies were stratified according to the type of goods they manufacture with an aim of drawing a 30% sample i.e. 14 respondents from the population. The manufacturers were issued with questionnaires to respond to. In total, the research conducted survey from a pool of 94 respondents.

1.9.6. Data Collection and Instruments

This study used both primary and secondary data collection tools. On one hand, primary data gives researcher an opportunity to get first-hand information regarding a phenomenon\(^{53}\). Questionnaires and interview schedules were the main tools for data collection. The primary data was obtained from the field using questionnaires and structured interview schedules. They were developed in a manner to capture all the key components of the research and

clearly align them with the objectives of the study. The secondary data comprised comprehensive literature review from the various sources including books, referred print and electronic journals, strategic trade reports between Kenya and South Sudan, and reviews from relevant industry-related newspapers and magazines. The primary and secondary data were treated as complementary.

Data collection was conducted from 30th June 2014 to 31st July 2014. I started with collection of secondary data which informed Chapter Two of the research on historical relations between Kenya and South Sudan. The research also collected secondary data from sectors trading in goods between Kenya and South Sudan which informed Chapter Three of this research. The researcher travelled to Kakuma Refugee Camp to collect data through interviews from the host community, refugees and external actors. Hence, one questionnaire and three interview guide were developed.

1.9.7. Data Analysis

Descriptive statics were employed in data analysis. With content analysis, the researcher reduced a wide variety of items of information to a more limited set of attributes composing a variable. Existing and collected statistical data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 17, which offers extensive data handling capabilities and numerous statistical analysis procedures that analyzes small to very large data statistics. The data was used to draw conclusions about implications of South Sudan’s instability to Kenya’s economic and human security. The analyzed findings are presented in form of frequency tables pie charts and bar charts since they are user friendly and gives a better graphical representation of the respondents’ opinions on effect of South Sudan’s instability to Kenya’s economic and human security.

---

54 Bryman & Bell, op. cit., p.73
1.9.8. Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The information collected was analyzed, synthesized, collated and the resultant data was categorized in accordance with the objectives of the study. The study guarantees total confidentiality of the data obtained.

1.9.9. Scope and Limitations of the Research

According to Bryman, it is of great importance to be aware and acknowledge limitations to address in the stages before the start of the research as such limitations may jeopardize the research\textsuperscript{55}. Most of my challenges concerning the research were experienced in the planning stages of the fieldwork. The limited contextualized literature on Kenya-South Sudan trade relations and economic impact of South Sudanese refugees’ presence in Turkana County brought challenges in familiarizing and planning. Moreover, Bryman has also argued ethically that informants may dislike possible invasions of privacy\textsuperscript{56}. Accordingly, some companies trading between South Sudan and Kenya were hesitant to reveal financial information which is classified as confidential against possible business intelligence and espionage. Additionally, given that the study aimed at studying the impact of South Sudan’s instability on Kenya’s trade flow, it was hard to get concrete secondary data because South Sudan is just a new state whose trade statistics was previously lumped together with main Sudan. Else, there are some respondents that provided information in hope of their personal difficulties to be addressed.

The methods and strategies I have chosen for my study also had some limitations and possible challenges. However, to totally safeguard research against possible biases and influences by respondents is very difficult. Some measures can be done to limit those\textsuperscript{55}\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., p.75.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p. 123-124.
possibilities such as avoid leading questions and pre-test interview guides\textsuperscript{57}. Financial constraints, lack of sponsorship, human capacities, and time constraints were other common challenges that faced this research.

1.10. Chapter Outline

This dissertation contains five chapters. Instructively, Chapter Two looks into Historical Relations between Kenya and South Sudan followed by Chapter Three which presents findings over the Impact of Instability on Trade between Kenya and South-Sudan.

Chapter Four presents findings from Kakuma Refugees Camp where three different samples were drawn from Host Community, South Sudan Refugees and Security Agencies. Finally, Chapter Five gives summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

\textsuperscript{57} Silverman, op. cit., pg 83
CHAPTER TWO

2. Historical Relations between Kenya and South Sudan

2.1. Introduction

Kenya and South Sudan have enjoyed trade relations which were spurred by start of negotiations for peace settlement between the South and North. Kenya supported pacific settlement of dispute in accordance with UN Charter Article 33 on Pacific Settlement of Dispute which states “The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice”\textsuperscript{58}.

It is important to note that trade between Kenyan and South Sudan isn’t only hurt by civil instability in South Sudan but there could be other factors like government restrictions (tariff and non-tariff barriers), lack of competitiveness of Kenya products in face of stiff competition from Uganda and Ethiopia, transport infrastructure among others.

\textsuperscript{58} United Nations Charter
### 2.2. Trade Relations Between Kenya and South Sudan

Table 2: Export/Import Statistics (2003-2012)\(^5^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXPORTS IN KSHS (SOUTH SUDAN)</th>
<th>ANNUAL % EXPORT CHANGE</th>
<th>IMPORTS IN KSHS (SOUTH SUDAN)</th>
<th>ANNUAL % IMPORT CHANGE</th>
<th>BALANCE OF TRADE (KENYA-SOUTH SUDAN)</th>
<th>BALANCE OF TRADE (KENYA-SOUTH SUDAN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,782,156,340</td>
<td></td>
<td>950,055,863</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,139,353,021</td>
<td>832,100,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,356,441,518</td>
<td>-23.89%</td>
<td>145,404,943</td>
<td>-84.70%</td>
<td>1,658,211,020</td>
<td>1,211,036,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,305,826,310</td>
<td>143.71%</td>
<td>410,751,197</td>
<td>182.49%</td>
<td>3,964,079,661</td>
<td>2,895,075,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,436,343,050</td>
<td>-56.55%</td>
<td>140,369,710</td>
<td>-65.83%</td>
<td>1,774,510,629</td>
<td>1,295,973,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,999,930,381</td>
<td>248.10%</td>
<td>159,753,356</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>6,627,409,151</td>
<td>4,840,177,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,403,219,835</td>
<td>48.07%</td>
<td>62,869,618</td>
<td>-60.65%</td>
<td>10,050,769,620</td>
<td>7,340,350,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,467,671,786</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
<td>8,236,065</td>
<td>-86.90%</td>
<td>11,583,076,699</td>
<td>8,459,435,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10,305,874,661</td>
<td>21.71%</td>
<td>119,028,021</td>
<td>1345.20%</td>
<td>13,948,332,943</td>
<td>10,186,846,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9,321,015,719</td>
<td>-9.56%</td>
<td>8,499,638</td>
<td>-92.86%</td>
<td>12,751,156,409</td>
<td>9,312,516,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13,750,473,920</td>
<td>47.52%</td>
<td>122,469,419</td>
<td>1340.88%</td>
<td>18,660,136,040</td>
<td>13,628,004,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16,179,423,646</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
<td>598,026,117</td>
<td>388.31%</td>
<td>21,334,818,136</td>
<td>15,581,397,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,844,484,987</td>
<td>-70.06%</td>
<td>697,757,077</td>
<td>16.68%</td>
<td>5,677,904,415</td>
<td>4,146,727,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83,152,862,153</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,423,221,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>109,169,757,744</td>
<td>79,729,641,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5^9\) Export Promotion Council, Intranet 2013
The sustainable peace process in Sudan that led to signing of CPA was initiated and overseen by Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and Kenya was key mediator to the process. Through IGAD, the Kenyan government supported signing of the Machakos Protocol (or Chapter I), signed in Machakos, Kenya on 20\(^{th}\) July 2002\(^6\) which covered various pacts on various principles of state, government and governance.

The statistical Table 2 above shows that due to signing of this agreement, the trade between Kenya and South Sudan improved. Kenyan exports changed from Kshs1.35 billion (2002) to KShs3.31 billion (2003) which was about 143.71% increment. Kenya imports increased relatively from KShs 145million to KShs 411million accounting to about 182.49% growth. Peace talks between the southern rebels and the government made substantial progress in

2003 and early 2004\(^61\), although skirmishes in parts of South Sudan continued especially Aweil, Abyei, Bentiu and Marakal along Sudan-South Sudan Border-line. This led to decline in trade between Kenya and South Sudan due to lost hope after the start of negotiation for CPA. Indicatively, trade between Kenya and South Sudan declined. Kenya’s exports slid from KShs3.3 Billion to KShs 1.4 billion accounting to 56.55% loss in export trade. On the other hand, imports from South Sudan equally fell from KShs411 million to KShs 140 million accounting for 65.83% loss in import trade from South Sudan. During the heavy turmoil in South Sudan in 2003 and 2004, The Agreement on Security Arrangements (CPA Chapter VI) was signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 25 September 2003.\(^62\)

The hostilities de-escalated in year 2004. However, due to the turmoil experienced in year 2003, trade remained low in 2004 where Kenya exported goods worth Kshs 1.4 billion and imported goods worth KShs 140 million.

In the year 2004, several protocols were signed which led to future hope for de-escalation of conflict between Sudan and South Sudan. These protocols included The Agreement on Wealth Sharing (CPA Chapter III) signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 7 January 2004\(^63\), The Protocol on Power Sharing (CPA Chapter II) signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 26 May 2004\(^64\), The Protocol on the Resolution of the Conflict in Abyei Area (CPA Chapter IV) signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 26 May 2004\(^65\), The Protocol on the Resolution of the Conflict in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States (CPA Chapter V) signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 26 May 2004\(^66\), The Permanent Ceasefire and Security Arrangements Implementation Modalities and Appendices (CPA Annexure I) signed in Naivasha, Kenya on 30\(^{th}\) October


\(^{63}\) Ibid., pg 1

\(^{64}\) Ibid., pg 1

\(^{65}\) Ibid., pg 1

\(^{66}\) Ibid., pg 1
Due to the above-stated protocols, agreements and annexures to CPA signed in 2004, trade between Kenya and South Sudan boomed. Kenya’s exports rose by 248.10% from KShs 1.4 billion to KShs 5 billion. Similarly, Kenya’s imports from South Sudan rose by 13.81% from KShs 140 million to KShs 160 million.

The negotiation process was completed in end of year 2004. The final, comprehensive agreement was signed on 9th January 2005 and heralded a start of the implementation stage. This brought a new dawn to Kenya’s and South Sudan’s traders which led to further increase in trade. Kenya exported goods worth about KShs 7.4 billion (2005) from Kshs 4.9 billion (2004) accounting to 48.07% growth. Imports declined from Kshs 160 million to KShs 63 million accounting to import trade loss of 60.65%. This decrease in imports was as a result of administrative changes as the South Sudan government was preparing to take over transitional state trade operations. However, the decrease in imports from South Sudan favored Kenya’s Balance of Trade which widened from Kshs 4.8 billion to KShs 7.3 billion, accounting to 51.65% increase in trade in favor of Kenya.

The peace dividends accrued from signing of peace agreement between South Sudan and Sudan continued to be reaped where Kenya’s exports grew by 14.38% from KShs 7.4 billion (2006) to KShs 8.4 billion (2007). The imports from South Sudan shrunk further from KShs 62 million to KShs 8.2 million accounting to 86.9% loss in import business. This further widened trade gap between Kenya and South Sudan where Kenya’s surplus balance of trade stood at KShs 8.5 billion. According to Dale, surplus international trade brings immense

---

67 Ibid., pg 1  
68 Ibid., pg 1  
69 Dale, op. cit., p.2
gains to state as exemplified in this case between Kenya and South Sudan. This decline in South Sudan’s exports to world market and Kenya in particular was caused by transition from main Sudan to an infant autonomous South Sudan State; a state that was struggling to establish her institutions that would spur growth.

During the time, there was need for development of private sector which could in turn be responsible for sustained improvement in the provision of infrastructure services. There was need to come up with a bimodal private sector comprising a large number of small or even very small businesses on one hand, and a limited number of rather medium firms on the other whose main objective is job creation and support Export-led Economic Growth model.

According to report prepared by the African Development Bank (ADB)\textsuperscript{70}, most of the formal businesses in the country are small and medium-sized enterprises as of 2008. There are about 50 larger firms involved mainly with banking, telecommunications and manufacturing of beverages. Medium-sized firms number about 500 and are mainly in construction, hotel and restaurant services and trade-related services. Small firms number about 8,000 and are involved with services similar to that of the medium-sized ones. In addition to these registered businesses, the report states that there are more than 10,000 micro-firms (typically individual entrepreneurs) involved in petty trade. Almost all of the larger companies are foreign-owned including Kenyan firms, as many South Sudanese still lack the capital to start larger businesses.

Due to the prevailing peace and security between 2007 and 2008 and rather smooth implementation of CPA, the Kenya’s exports improved from KShs 8.5 billion (2007) to KShs 10.3 billion (2008) representing 21.71% increase in export trade. Likewise, due to improving

\textsuperscript{70} DCDDM. (2011), \textit{A Study on South Sudan’s Competitiveness and an Assessment of the Country’s Cross Border Trade with its Neighbouring Countries}. Nairobi: African Development Bank. p. 3
environment for establishment of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and liberalization of South Sudan market coupled with peace brought about by implementation of CPA, South Sudan’s exports to Kenya improved drastically by 1345.20% (2008).

However, according to report prepared by the ADB\textsuperscript{71}, this growth in 2007 and 2008 in trade ties between Kenya and South Sudan could have been better were it not that South Sudan had threatened to pull out of CPA. Instructively, in October 2007, the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) pulled out of the Government formed between South and North, while laying accusations to Government of National Unity (GoNU)’s partner members led by The President of Sudan, Omar al-Bashir, of breaching terms and conditions set in the CPA. More specifically, the SPLM stated that the Khartoum-based government, largely under the control of the National Congress Party led by Bashir, has refused to demilitarize southern filedrs rich with oil which was occupied by about 14,500 troops and that the North-led government had refused to observe the Abyei Protocol. The SPLM stated categorically that it was not going into war again with the North. However, some students of Sudan conflict had noted that there was gradual fragmentation of North and South, because the international actors had put their focus on Darfur region that had been worst hit by conflict by then.\textsuperscript{72}

The SPLM indicated plan to re-join the GoNU in December 2007, following an agreement that headquarter for the GoNU will be rotating from North-South-North (Juba and Khartoum) every three months. Finally, the Northern Sudanese troops finally left Southern Sudan in January 2008.

Equally, Sudan’s terms of trade figures have shown a cyclical trend, owing to sharp variations in oil prices and ranging war between South and North in the period 2000-2011.

\textsuperscript{71} DCDM, op. cit., p.4

This led to a decline of South Sudan’s overall trade by 47.3% in 2008 and moved up to 7.7% in 2009.\textsuperscript{73} The South Sudan region was caught by the election fever in 2009. The year 2008 had equally witnessed a build-up toward elections initially scheduled for January 2009 with implications for democratic transformation in the Sudan. However, elections could not be held in 2009 because of logistical problem following the non-implementation of apparatus to make elections work like census issues, growing crisis in Darfur, rainy season etc.\textsuperscript{74} This is actually not a problem of the National Congress Party (NCP) alone, as obvious from the guiding principles of the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/ Army (SPLM/A) which was characterized by partial or being indifferent to the CPA implementation coupled with a shift in the general idea of unity to which the NCP-led government was not disposed either.

Thus, 2009 could not see the election to fulfillment, however the Assessment and Evaluation Commission (AEC) as at this time conducted the Mid-Term Assessment and Evaluation report and advocated for more international engagement to rid the CPA of its deficiencies and challenges.

Due to this election stand-off between SPLM/A and NCP, there was sharp decline in traders’ confidence that led to decline in Kenya’s export from Kshs 10.3 billion (2008) to KShs 9.3 billion representing 9.56% loss in export trade. Correspondingly, South Sudan’s export fell sharply from KShs 119 million (2008) to KShs 8.5 Million (2009) representing 92.86% loss in trade.

\textsuperscript{73} Global Financial Crisis Discussion. (2010, February 3). \textit{Sudan Phase 2} Retrieved from Overseas Development Institute, London, \url{www.odi.org.uk}, pg 3

2.2.1. Sudan’s Elections and Referendum

Following the divergent visions of the NCP and SPLM/A as well as the authoritarian attitudes of these domineering belligerents, the expected transformational elections was conducted in April 2010 with overwhelming victory for NCP in the North affirming President Omar Al-Bashir as the president and same for Salva Kiir of the SPLM/A in the South. Undeniably, NCP won in the North. The election, with all its irregularities, was not disputed by the SPLM/A. Their position was informed by the fact that South Sudan/SPLM/A didn’t want the referendum, for secession scheduled for 2011, to be rescheduled and elongate the time that NCP would wield control over Southerners. These ideas were later manifested in the South’s vehemence to get the referendum through as scheduled for January 2011 with all the necessary noise-making and threat of renewal of hostilities and violence should referendum be denied or delayed.

The conduct of the South Sudan referendum came as scheduled in spite of the initial gloom that surrounded the conduct of referendum. As scheduled, it was implemented and declared as having about 98.83% in favor of secession against the unity option. The result of the referendum remained unchallenged having met more than the 60% criteria of the Government of Sudan (GoS).

However, several issues remained unresolved as pockets of violent clashes and insurgencies were largely on the prowl in South Sudan. There was also need for demobilization and enhancing security at the newest border between South and North. Boundary demarcation, especially Abyei Region, between the North and South hadn’t been resolved in time of referendum and remains to date a contested issue over the oil-rich fields in the region.

The successful elections conducted in 2010 and subsequent referendum restored confidence in cross-border trade between South Sudan and Kenya henceforth. In 2010, Kenyans exported
goods worth KShs 13.7 billion as they imported goods worth Kshs 122 million representing 47.52% export trade growth for Kenya and 1340.88% export trade for South Sudan. This trend continued to improve where in 2011, Kenya’s exports to South Sudan rose by 17.66% as compared to year 2010. Similarly, South Sudan managed to increase her exports to Kenya by 388.31% between 2010 and 2011.

2.3. South Sudanese Refugees and Security:

Kenya has seen a huge influx of refugees over the recent years owing to the political instability experienced in her neighboring states more especially in South Sudan and Somalia. The Sudan First and Second Civil Wars and recent South Sudan Crisis between President Salva Kiir and his former Deputy President Riek Machar has made Kenya host many refugees in Refugee Concentration Camps as well as in urban areas. These refugees, who were traditionally perceived and presented as humanitarian issues, are now increasingly viewed as security threats. Kenya previously had an open door policy for refugees where they could operate freely within the country until threat analysis was conducted by Refugee Department and Security agencies. Some of the threats included harboring terrorism, section of militant groups strategizing on attacking their country of origin, resource-based conflicts between the host communities and refugees and increase in crime by hardened criminals. For instance, due to Kenya’s will to fulfill her obligations in international humanitarian laws, it has equally hosted a high number of Somalis refugees among which some Al-Shabaab and Hizbul Islams enter into and exit Kenya with great ease. A 2008 United Nations Monitoring Group on Somalia report noted that “members of Shabaab and Hizbul Islam travel with relative freedom to and from Kenya, where they raise funds, engage in recruitment, and obtain treatment for wounded fighters.” This has been facilitated by the open door policy that

75 http://www.ocms.ac.uk/transformation/results_issue.php?pageNum_rs_trans=0&totalRows_rs_trans=6&mm_iss=26&mm_qua=1 (last accessed 25th July 2014)
Kenya has adopted and is working against Kenya’s national interest, human security and economic development. The question that arises hence in many circles is; does this influx pose a threat to the country’s human security?

2.3.1. History of South Sudan’s Refugees in Kenya

Kenya is quite rich with refugees’ history which is recorded as early as 1963. Kenya has hosted refugees from most of neighboring countries except Tanzania which hasn’t experienced civil wars, political turbulence. They include Sudan, Ethiopia, DRC, Burundi, Somalia, Rwanda and Central African Republic. By August 2012, Kenya was hosting about 630,000 refugees where about 55,000 refugees and asylum-seekers are concentrated in Nairobi.76

Kenya is a signatory to the 1951 UN Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, as well as the 1969 OAU Refugee Convention.77 She has equally ratified or domesticated some other treaties and protocols on refugees and their rights. On the domestic front, however, Kenya lacked any national refugee legislation until 2007, when the Refugee Act came into force. Notwithstanding the relatively recent introduction of national refugee legislation, Kenya in general and Turkana in particular have a long history of hosting refugees from neighboring and nearby countries.

Until the end of the 1980s, when Kenya began receiving thousands of refugees especially from South Sudan and Somalia, refugees and asylum seekers were able to reside in any place of their choice. In the early 1990s, following massive refugee arrivals from Ethiopia, Somalia and Sudan, refugee camps were set up in the border areas of Kenya. Refugees from Sudan


were largely accommodated primarily at Kakuma Refugee Camp. Kenya and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) believed that camp location would protect Kenya from adverse effects, like insecurity, for hosting a people from war-torn countries and organizing the provision of food, shelter and other forms of assistance to the new arrivals.

In Kakuma Refugee Camp, the UNHCR, other U.N specialized agencies like United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and other IGOs or NGOs have taken up role and responsibility of giving humanitarian support. The government of Kenya is charged with the maintenance of law and order while facilitating some administrative issues to refugee in the camp.

2.3.2. Kenya’s Policy On South Sudan’s Refugees

The Refugee Act was enacted in 2006, to implement the 1951 United Nations Convention Related to the Status of Refugees, the 1967 Protocol and the 1969 OAU Convention. The Refugee Act also established a Department for Refugee Affairs (DRA) which has responsibility for the administration, coordination and management of issues related to refugees.

Despite the high influx of refugees in the country from South Sudan, Kenya has largely pursued an open door policy by allowing a free flow of refugees in the country. This is a policy that is characterized by the liberal admission of refugees who are then awarded full socio-economic rights and are only repatriated to their countries when conditions are conducive. Thus, many migrants are accorded refugee status without the scrutiny that they would undergo under the UN Convention and Protocol and other international instruments that govern refugees78.

Kenya has faced multiple threats due to hosting of refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp including harboring terrorists, section of militant groups who strategize on attacking their country of origin, resource-based conflicts among other issues. This encouraged Kenya to

---

shift from open door policy to where refugees' freedom of movement and engagement in self-reliance activities is restricted. These challenges presented by the South Sudan Refugees could form a strong basis for Kenya to advocate change in the existing international refugee regime so as to have refugees protected in 'safe zones' in their own countries.

However, as it stands today, Kenya can do little as the principle under international law protects refugees from being expelled from the country in which they have sought refuge.\textsuperscript{79} This principle, closely examined exposes the receiving state to insecurity and as earlier noted, the refugees, who were received on humanitarian background and allowed much freedom of movement and association, are currently perceived as a security threat and measures should be put in place to ensure human security and national security has not been compromised. In other words, states are advocating that the security of the host community and refugee should be mutual and inclusive\textsuperscript{80}.

\textsuperscript{79} Article 33 of the UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1957, as modified by the Protocol of 31st January 1967
\textsuperscript{80} Heleta, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 4
CHAPTER THREE

3.1. Impact of South Sudan’s Instability on Kenya’s Trade

This chapter presents findings in regards to research objective number one which endeavours, “To analyze how South Sudan’s instability has affected South Sudan-Kenya’s trade.” The perspectives by the Exporters through primary data collection and partly secondary data are hereby presented.

3.1.1. Findings From Kenyan Exporters

The research drew 30% sample from a population of 54 Kenyan exporters to South Sudan located in Nairobi County. The companies were stratified according to exportable goods they deal with. I have in total issued 14 closed and open-ended questionnaires to exporters in Nairobi City County. The questionnaire carried 16 questions. The questions probed on threat of civil war to trade between Kenya and South Sudan, Kenya’s efforts to counter effects of civil war on trade, and position of Kenya’s economic ties with South Sudan. Each respondent took an average of 3 days to hand in the questionnaire.

It was extremely challenging to convince respondents to provide financial data of their companies fearing that their competitors could use them to their disadvantage through business intelligence. The following stratified respondents were identified and issued with questionnaires as tabulated below:
Table 3: Stratified Export Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPORT SECTOR</th>
<th>POPULATION SIZE</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat rolled products of iron or non-alloy steel, clad, plated or coated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Exporters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Exporters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packed Cereals, Vegetable Fats</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soaps and Detergents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey data*

From flat rolled products of iron or non-alloy steel, clad, plated or coated strata, 3 out of 12 companies were randomly picked namely Katchy Distributors, Adephi Agencies Ltd and Marid International. From the second strata of Tea Exporters, 3 samples were picked namely Jekez Enterprises, Syms Beverages, Betka Growers Ltd.

The third strata of Coffee Exporters picked randomly 2 respondents from a population of 8 exporters namely Rejitek Coffee Co. Ltd and Coffee Exporters K. Ltd whereas the fourth strata of Packed Cereals and Vegetable Fats picked four respondents namely Mace Foods Kenya Ltd Palm Products Working Group, Kenya Food Processors Ltd. and TruFoods Ltd.

The final and fifth strata of Soaps and Detergents picked 2 respondents from a population size of 8 exporters namely Elephants Soaps Industries Ltd and Camelia Soap Industries. All the 14 companies are based in various parts of Nairobi City County with a higher concentration in Industrial Area.

More than half of the respondents have carried out trade between Kenya and Sudan (up to 2011) and South Sudan (up to date) for more than 10 years and have all along operated from Nairobi City County. The other 6 respondents moved into the various export sectors after the
secession of South Sudan from main Sudan in 2011. Out of the 14 respondents, 9 are males and 5 are female. 8 respondents hold a Bachelor’s Degree, 2 hold Higher Diploma and 4 hold Diploma in specialised fields. A variety of key characteristics amongst the respondents such as age, level of education, occupation, and years in trade have been included.

The findings from the Kenyan Exporters have been put into 3 categories namely: The Impact of Civil war on Kenya-South Sudan Trade, Kenya’s Effort to mitigate effects of Civil War on Cross-Border Trade between Kenya and South Sudan and Present Challenges to Kenya’s Current Economic Ties with South Sudan.

3.1.1.1. The Impact of Civil War on Kenya-South Sudan Trade

Liberalists note that war was economically beneficial during Mercantilist era due to realist objective of expansion and imperialism but further note that modernization now makes it impossible to "enrich" oneself through force and that, by destroying trading bonds, war is "commercially suicidal."81 Indicatively, as the above statement goes, all the respondents (14) said that they have been affected negatively during the escalation of Civil War in South Sudan since 2003. The respondent from Elephant Soaps and Industries noted that they lost an average of KShs250,000 i.e. 20% of their total revenues in 2004 during the escalation of war around Juba in South Sudan where they supply most of their products. Further, the respondent noted that after December 2013 intra-state conflict pitting Dinka tribe against Nuer tribe, they reduced operations in South Sudan due to animosity shown towards foreign traders which resulted to an average monthly loss of about KShs 450,000 in the face of running fixed cost. Accordingly, as noted earlier, Rose82 indicated that an increase in conflictual behavior significantly reduces trade flows between two countries. Another respondent in Soaps and Detergents sector noted that in the eventuality of civil war in South

82 Rose, op. cit., p. 22-38
Sudan, they take longer to deliver their goods to South Sudan hence affects the economies of scale like low utilization of industrial manufacturing capacity, underutilization of haulage vehicles’ capacity, payment for more security along the road to and within South Sudan and redundant personnel in the industries due to lower productions.

All the four respondents from Packed Cereals and Vegetable Fats Sector namely Mace Foods Kenya Ltd, Palm Products Working Group, Kenya Food Processors Ltd. and TruFoods Ltd said that they have constantly made loses from December 2013 to date due to conflict within South Sudan. Mace Foods Kenya Ltd.’s respondent noted that they are currently supplying 55% less to South Sudan as opposed to the period between 2011 after the referendum and October 2013. Palm Products Working Group’s respondent noted that the cost of doing business in South Sudan has increased although it was also high even before the 2013 civil war started. He noted that they have to use longer route through Uganda to access Juba, Rumbek and Yei where consuming population is high. In Juba there are about 372,410 residents whereas in Rumbek and Yei, there is about 32,100 and 201,000 population size respectively. He noted that according to UNHCR report, about 2 million people have perished in Rumbek region only during the Sudanese Civil War hence reducing the market and making the area more volatile for doing business.

In the tea export business, all the three respondents noted equally the loss of trade in goods between South Sudan and Kenya in case of eruption of Civil War. Respondent from Jekez Enterprises noted that since the secession of South Sudan from main Sudan in 2011, the tea business in Sudan reduced due to inaccessibility of the market by road due to insecurity as well as diplomatic row and consequential severance of economic relationship between Kenya and Sudan due to former’s support of secession. Equally, the respondent noted that South Sudan remained volatile hence becoming more costly to do business and noted that business situation aggravated after Kiir-Machar led civil wars in South Sudan over political power.
He noted average monthly loses to a tune of about KShs 400,000 due to low production, longer delivery timelines, shrunk market, volatile security and higher corruption incidence. Syms Beverages and Betka Growers Ltd shared same information as Jekez Enterprises where the respondents noted an average monthly loss of about Kshs 100,000 and KShs 170,000 respectively; similarly due to reduced business and consequential loss in profits. The respondent noted that he started exporting to South Sudan in 2011 after the secession and the business picked up very well until December 2013 where new Civil War erupted.

All the three respondents from Flat Rolled Products of Iron namely Katchy Distributors, Adephi Agencies Ltd and Marid International differed with other sectors and responded that the construction industry has expanded in South Sudan and despite the Civil Wars from 2003 to date, they have experienced growth in their products. Respondent from Katchy Distributors reported that they have survived in South Sudan market due to diversification of the market and warehousing of their products in Juba through bulk transporting. While refusing to give actual figures on profit growth, she noted that there has been an average annual profit growth of 25% since they started operations in South Sudan in 2002. Another respondent from Adephi Agencies Ltd reported that it was only in 2010 that they reduced their profits due to issues external to Civil Wars in South Sudan. Instructively, she noted that unionized workers’ strike, higher prices for oil, tax imposed on scrap metals by government were responsible in profit reductions.

The two respondents from Coffee Sector namely Rejitek Coffee Co. Ltd and Coffee Exporters K. Ltd noted that there is high correlation between trade flow and war between Kenya and South Sudan. They noted that they have experienced reduced profitability since December 2013 to date due to intra-state war in South Sudan pitting Dinka’s against Nuers. However, the respondents were hesitant to give actual figures that would reflect loss of business in South Sudan.
### Table 4: Respondents’ view on Impact of Instability on Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prices of Goods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of South Sudan Market</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Transport</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Input (Raw Materials)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of Export Goods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness of Fast Moving Consumer Goods (FCMG)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption incidence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data*

### Graph 2: Effects of South Sudan’s Instability on Kenya’s Export Trade

As the above Graph 2 shows, 10 (71.43% of respondents) out of 14 respondents responded that generally South Sudan Civil War has affected price of export goods, availability of
market in South Sudan, cost of transport, cost of input (raw materials), employment, security of export goods, freshness of Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG), and corruption incidence. However, 4 of the respondents noted that there has been no effect on price of export goods, availability of market in South Sudan, cost of transport, cost of input (Raw Materials), employment, security of export goods, freshness of Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG), and corruption incidence due to civil war.

While using a five-point scale, 10 (71.42%) respondents reported that they strongly agree that the prices of Kenyan goods are affected by civil war in South Sudan. The other 4 respondents agreed, remained neutral, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the view that South Sudan Civil War affect the prices of Kenya Goods. Concerning South Sudan’s market accessibility by Kenyan goods, 11 (78.57%) respondents strongly agreed that there is high correlation between instability in South Sudan and accessibility of her market by Kenyan products. 3 (21.43%) of the respondents agreed that there is correlation between instability in South Sudan and accessibility of her market by Kenyan products.

As far as Transport Cost is concerned, 9 (64.29%) respondents out of 14 felt that the cost of transport increases wherever there is instability in South Sudan. Two sets of 2 respondents reported that they agreed and remained neutral respectively on the question of cost of transport. One respondent disagreed that instability increases cost of transport.

8 (57.14%) respondents strongly disagreed that instability in South Sudan affects cost of input in production probably because most of the inputs for the five sampled sectors are sourced locally. Three sets of each 2 respondents either responded neutrally or disagreed or strongly disagreed respectively with the view that instability affects cost of input for exportable goods to South Sudan.

Asked about their view on relationship between instability and employment for Kenyan in supply chain, 9 (64.26%) respondents indicated that they strongly agree with the fact that
South Sudan instability affects employment of Kenyans in Kenya as well as in South Sudan. 3 respondents just agreed that instability in South Sudan affect employment of Kenyans in export goods industries. Only 2 of the respondents disagreed with the notion and they were drawn from flat rolled products and iron sector.

8 respondents answered that they have noted high insecurity along Kenya-Uganda-South Sudan route due to instability in South Sudan. Four and two respondents agreed and disagreed respectively that security of export goods is compromised by civil war.

Conversely, concerning FCMG, 6 respondents strongly disagreed that the freshness of the FCMG is compromised by instability in South Sudan probably alluding to the fact that most of FCMG are likely to be exported by air instead or road or rail so as to reach customer fast. However, 4 respondents strongly agreed that there is possibility that the freshness of FCMG is compromised whereas 3 and 1 respondents agreed or remained neutral respectively on this question.

It was quite astonishing that 10 respondents noted that corruption incidence has increased in trade in exportable goods along Kenya-Uganda-South Sudan route. This may happen due to poor legal regimes governing trade and business and underdeveloped institutional capacity and infrastructure as well as overlapping government structures, competences and authorities which are further complicated by instability due to civil war. Only two sets of 2 respondents either agreed or disagreed respectively with that question.
Table 5: Analyzed Number of Respondents on Emergence of Black, Grey Markets and Counterfeits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of grey market</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of black market</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of counterfeit goods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

Graph 3: Views on Emergence of Black, Grey Markets and Counterfeits

Asked how the civil war has caused emergence of grey market, black market and counterfeit goods, the respondents gave varied answers as the above Graph 3 shows. 8 respondents indicated that there is emergence of grey market whereas 4 and 2 respondents either
disagreed or strongly disagreed respectively that instability in South Sudan has created room for emergence of grey market.

On one hand, 9 respondents said that there is emergence of black market in South Sudan which brings unfair competition to Kenyan products channelled the right ways. On the other hand, 2 and 3 respondents agreed or disagreed respectively with this question. 6 respondents indicated that there is an increase in counterfeit Kenyan products from Kenya due to porosity of business in South Sudan which is presided over by lack of proper legal mechanisms and availability of cheap market coupled with low cash liquidity. 4 respondents remained neutral whereas two sets of two respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that there is emergence of counterfeits due to instability.

3.1.1.2. Kenya’s Effort to mitigate effects of Civil War on Cross-Border Trade between Kenya and South Sudan

Bhagwati\textsuperscript{83} , a neoclassical economist, has long supported political component in development of public policy in international engagement and has severally complained about this gap in public policy. Correspondingly, 10 out of 14 respondents felt that Kenyan government hasn’t done enough politically to safeguard economic interest of Kenyan business people in South Sudan. Only 4 recommended that the government has engaged economic diplomacy. One respondent from Kenya Food Processor Ltd. said that once LAPPSET Project is complete after being spearheaded by the government, it will increase the cost of any possible war and reduce cost of doing business by cutting road distance from Nairobi to Juba by quarter. This supports argument propounded by Cobden\textsuperscript{84} that international trade ties makes states to be cautious about their internal peace and security and promotes the same in other state so as not to lose its share of market in unstable state, which was otherwise a trading partner previously.

\textsuperscript{83} Bhagwati, op. cit., p.16
\textsuperscript{84} Cobden, op. cit., p. 225.
Equally, Maurel and Afman\textsuperscript{85} note that economic interconnectedness increase stability in a given region and promote trade diversion. Another respondent from Rejitek Coffee Co. Ltd responded that the government of Kenya has been providing business information and intelligence and carrying out market survey on South Sudan through its agencies like Export Promotion Council (EPC), Horticultural Crops Development Authority among others.

Another respondent from Adelphis Agencies Ltd who is in iron industry said that through negotiations for warehousing in Uganda and reduced road levies in Uganda because of East African Community’s Protocol on Economic Integration, the cost of doing business has reduced and mitigated the effect that instability in South Sudan could have on trade. Elephants Soaps Industries Ltd.’s respondent said that the CPA was spearheaded by the Government of Kenya under the auspice of IGAD and consequential peace out of the whole process has created new markets for Kenyan products. This supports arguments by Rose\textsuperscript{86} that cooperative behavior increases bilateral trade flows and this can lead to reduced conflicts.

**Table 6: Respondents’ Views of Trade Support Given by Various Kenya Government Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated tariffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business intelligence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapping of Export Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative means of transport</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-counterfeit measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti- Grey Market measures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti- Black Market measures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data*

\textsuperscript{85} Maurel & Afman, \textit{op. cit.}, p.2

\textsuperscript{86} Rose, \textit{op. cit.}, p.17
7 respondents said that the government of Kenya is doing enough to protect trade interest in South Sudan in several ways. As the above Graph 4 shows, 3 respondents said that use of Warehousing has mitigated effects of South Sudan Civil War. One respondent and three respondents respectively remained neutral and expressed that there is low extent usage of the warehouse for Kenya’s export products. Five respondents indicated that the government of Kenya hasn’t negotiated favorable tariffs and non-tariffs that would increase competitiveness of Kenyan products in South Sudan and compensate where the cost of business is increased by civil strife. Five respondents also indicated that the government hasn’t considered scrapping export duty for goods destined to South Sudan to encourage traders to export to that market despite the civil wars.
However, six respondents indicated that the government has very greatly used business intelligence and information and data dissemination to traders to help them make informative decisions.

Despite the LAPPSET Project and Northern Corridor Projects, two respondents felt that the government is not doing enough to address road, air and rail transport problems to South Sudan. According to Baine and Woolcock\textsuperscript{87}, this is part of new economic diplomacy by Kenya’s state and non-state actors to tap from resources in the region. Similarly, Mill\textsuperscript{88} noted that government’s political implication in promoting economic diplomacy in a given region and consequently economic security of given states is integral. He noted that trade is discouraging war in minds of economic partners in a given international trade set-up. Two respondents indicated that the government has failed to secure shorter and secure roads to South Sudan.

Six respondents indicated that the government has failed to implement counterfeit measures for similar products originating from Kenya to South Sudan which introduces unfair competition hence edging out some of Kenyan traders. Similarly, four respondents indicated that the government hasn’t implemented anti-grey market measures for goods going to South Sudan and this has consequently affected trade for some business people who are affected by effects of Civil Wars. Nonetheless, four respondents indicated that the government is implementing anti-black market initiatives at great extent.

Six respondents indicated that they have been attacked while transporting their goods to South Sudan alluding to the fact that South Sudan and Kenya authorities haven’t come with modalities on how to protect traders from constant attacks by bandits. Out of the six, four respondents indicated that it is somewhat very common to be attacked especially from Uganda-South Sudan border to other towns like Juba, Rumbek etc. Eight respondents

\textsuperscript{87} Baine & Woolcock, \textit{op. cit.}, p.3
\textsuperscript{88} Mill, \textit{op. cit.}, p.48
however indicated that they have never been attacked while trading their goods to South Sudan. This supports Lenin\textsuperscript{89} argument that inter-state trade discourages war and consequently reduces the likelihood of conflict in a region.

3.1.1.3. Present Challenges to Kenya’s Current Economic Ties with South Sudan

Eight respondents viewed that Kenya is currently enjoying an average relationship with South Sudan in the face of Civil War in South Sudan. Two sets of each three respondents noted that the current economic ties are below average and extremely poor respectively.

Due to the various unfavourable scaling of the relationship by the respondents, they further indicated various challenges that are present in the current Kenya-South Sudan trade ties as presented in the Graph 5 below.

Table 7: Respondents’ View on Negative Effects of South Sudan Instability on Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost of living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Rustling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low International Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling of cross-border projects e.g. Lappset</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade in illicit arms</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other_____________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

\textsuperscript{89} Lenin, \textit{op. cit.}, p.7
Nine respondents out of fourteen indicated that there is low relationship between the current high unemployment in Kenya and South Sudan civil wars. However, 4 respondents indicated that Kenya’s unemployment has greatly been accelerated by South Sudan Civil Wars. Same number of respondents (9) equally indicated that South Sudan Civil Wars haven’t had any impact on Kenya’s high cost of living.

Conversely, ten respondents viewed that the cattle-rustling affecting some parts of Kenya like Turkana County have been aggravated by the constant Civil Wars in South Sudan. Only three respondents distanced cattle-rustling in some part of the country from the Civil Wars. Six respondents equally indicated that civil wars have had low effect on international tourism within Kenya.
7 respondents viewed that the Civil War has greatly affected implementation of cross-border projects like LAPPSET due to diversion of South Sudan’s attention to Civil Wars. Two respondents indicated that at a great extent, such projects have been hurt. Two respondents remained neutral and three said that the projects aren’t hurt much by the strife. This supports prolonged debate between realists and liberals on the causes of war and the consequential economic effects according to Mearsheimer.\textsuperscript{90} Realists underscore factors as relative power as the cause of these Civil Wars whereas liberals concentrate on economic collective security regimes to defeat such wars so as to achieve economic goals as a region. Indeed, both theorists stress on economic interdependence as one of the most important factor that can help states defeat economic effects of civil war or inter-state wars though their approaches are different.

Eight respondents indicated that to a very great extent, there is influx of illegal workers in labour market despite low skills exhibited by South Sudan labour force. Equally, almost 75% of the respondents (9) blamed an increase in trade in illicit arms on the civil war and consequential instability.

\textsuperscript{90} Mearsheimer, op. cit., p.165-194.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.1. Findings From Turkana West Sub-County

This chapter presents findings in regards to research objective number two which endeavours, “To find out the security implication of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp.” The perspectives by the Host Community are presented followed by the Refugee Population. The findings from the External Actors form the final part in presentation of the findings from Turkana County.

4.1.1. Findings From Kakuma Host Community

The data collected and findings presented here below have been gathered from nine different villages scattered around Kakuma Refugees Camp with varying distances. The following villages have been included in the sample: Aule Aemenjen, Kalemchuch, Lejomaria, Nadapal 1&2, Natir 1 and 2, Tokioto, American.

Around half of the respondents have lived in Kakuma before the establishment of refugee camp. The other half moved to Kakuma from nearby areas after the construction of the camp (Appendix IV). A variety of key characteristics amongst the respondents such as age, gender and time lived in Kakuma have been included.

I have in total conducted 30 semi-structured interviews on households located in Kakuma host community. The interview carried 14 open ended questions. Further, there were follow-up questions prepared to help get in-depth information on the experiences brought on the host community by the establishment of the refugee camp hosting South Sudanese refugees, especially economic and security changes and adaptation of livelihoods. Moreover, the interviews probed on the economic and social relationship between South Sudanese refugees
and host community. Each interview lasted about 40-50 minutes allowing the researcher to conduct about 8 interviews every day.

It was extremely challenging to find a map with all villages mapped out. Given that Kakuma is a pastoralist community, there are no outstanding features expect Kakuma Town, Tarach River and Kakuma Refugees Camp. The Turkana Community surround the refugee camp and there is no exact border line between the host community and the refugee community, due to their pastoralist trends, hence providing an opportunity for the two groups to interact economically and socially intensively. The distance from the camp to different villages surrounding the refugee camp vary from one village to the other. As earlier mentioned, due to unavailability of maps showing clearly different villages, a map (Figure 1) has been developed to show geographical location of different villages where interviews were conducted. There are 3 different sections of the camp according to arrival by refugees named Section 1, Section 2 and Section 3 in the camp.
The map above (Figure 1) shows that Natir 1 and 2, and Nadapal 1 and 2 are located nearby each other and closely border Tarach River and Section 1 of Kakuma Refugee Camp. Kakuma Town borders Tokioto and Lejomaria villages. American village lies near Section One of Kakuma Refugee Camp. It is also adjacent to UNHCR compound. Kalemchuch village lies between Section 1 and Section 2 of the Refugee Camp. Aule Aemenjen (AA) village is located at the end of section 3 of the camp. This village is located furthest from the
camp of those in the sample. I experienced that walking distance from Aule Aemenjen village to the camp is considerably longer than the distance from other villages to the camp.

The findings from the Host Community have been categorized into 5 categories namely: The Impact of Camp on Hosts’ Livelihood, Magnitude of the Impact of the Camp, Adaptation to New Livelihood, Relationship between Host and Refugee Population, and Struggle and Cooperation between Host Community and Refugee Population.

4.1.1.1. The Impact of Camp on Hosts’ Livelihood

Provision of livelihood before the establishment of Kakuma Refugee Camp was quite challenging according to all 30 respondents. 4 out of 6 respondents in Natir and 3 out of 5 respondents in Nadapal described the situation as grave before the establishment of the camp and have welcomed the presence of the camp because it has brought multiple economic and social solutions like access to food, schools, income from wages etc. They revealed that it was very hard to access food, income and sustainability. 20 respondents said that the host community was surviving on wild fruits and dug river beds to access water for survival especially during the dry spells. The 20 respondents (from American, Lejomaria and Tokioto) revealed that they could starve for days without food whereas others succumbed to death due to malnutrition and hunger. This is in line with BBC News\(^9\) in 2011 which reported that 14 people died due to starvation in Turkana County. 21 respondents revealed that it was hard to get disposable income from provision of goods and services like labour and sale of firewood and charcoal. They revealed that they used to travel far distance to get the firewood and charcoal for sale which was making their proceeds low and unsustainable.

4 out of 5 respondents from Kalemchuch village said that since Turkana community is largely pastoralist, they didn’t feel any change in livelihood after South Sudanese refugees started

trickling in. They said that they depended on pastoralism and continued on the same economic path even after the establishment of the Kakuma Refugee Camp hosting South Sudanese Refugees. However, they confirmed that life was equally hard and challenging before the establishment of the refugee camp. They further said that some change has been experienced in provision of livelihoods though in different magnitude and impact on different villages. Similar findings are also noted in research by Maystadt and Verwimp in Tanzanian refugee camps in 2009.

Majority of the respondents reported that they have experienced change in livelihood after the establishment of Kakuma Refugee Camp. They indicated that the presence of the refugee camp has created market where they could sell their goods and services like firewood, charcoal, water, food (especially goat and cattle), and others. Additionally, they said that the presence of the refugee camp has created a new wage market for the host hence improving their cash liquidity levels. The market created for sale of goods and job opportunities created enhanced the situation and eased a bit the provision of livelihoods to the host community. Some respondents in Natir, American and Nadapal said that they don’t walk long distances to look for food, but can buy what has been provided freely by UNHCR to the refugees after they have worked for the refugees. However, majority of the respondents indicated that life is nonetheless still challenging because of lack of balanced market for demand and supply in food/land, labor/wages, services, and Common Property Resources (CPRs). They indicated that there is competition over economic and security resources between the Turkana as the Host Community and South Sudan refugees. This is supported by Jacobsen’s92 argument that scarcity of land and natural resources increases competition over remaining resources as was the case in refugee camps in East Africa and Horn of Africa.

In spite of some reports that there is no change experienced after the establishment of the refugees camp, residents from Kalemchuch village noted that they have changed in how they

92 Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 10-11
approach livelihood since they partly depend on pastoralism and partly depend on refugee camp where they either go to work in sole-proprietorships, on wage, or beg for food from the refugees. They feel that the refugees are being taken care of by the Government of Kenya through better security presence and provision of basic commodities like stipend, food and shelter to refugees by UNHCR and NGOs present in Kakuma. They further responded that their main reason for seeking alternative source of livelihood in refugee camps was due to drought, famine and clash with Karamajong (non-refugees) along Kenya-South Sudan border who cattle-rustle and almost deplete their stocks.

According to McCabe\textsuperscript{93}, drought has commonly ravaged Turkana in the recent times between 1980s and 2000s which has brought about problems for many pastoralists living in Turkana. Equally, Bush\textsuperscript{94} notes that the effects of drought makes nomad pastoralists of Turkana move into the camps in search of food which has made UNHCR and other bodies integrate host community into relief food assistance.

4.1.1.2. Magnitude of the Impact of the Camp

The positive and negative experiences on host community, as supported by Maystadt and Verwimp’s\textsuperscript{95} argument, are presented in this sub-chapter. How it will impact nonetheless depends on several factors and approaches where both positive and negative outcomes are possibilities. The positive experiences will precede the negative experiences. The experiences are graphically presented (Graph 6 and Graph 7) basing on collected data from the host community’s 30 respondents.

The presence of South Sudanese in Kakuma Refugee Camp has brought new positive and negative experiences to the Host Community according to the respondents, which is in line


\textsuperscript{95} Maystadt & Verwimp, op. cit., p. 2
with Chambers’\textsuperscript{96} explanation that hosting refugees comes with many economic, social and political implications to the host country. The presence of South Sudanese has, with no doubt, grown the demography in Turkana County especially around Kakuma Refugees Camp. According to UNHCR report\textsuperscript{97}, there are 87,950 South Sudan Refugees residing in Kenya’s Kakuma Refugees Camp. Migration nationally due to the presence of local and international NGOs has also brought in a good number of professional workers. This has led to designation of the host community as the minority around Kakuma Refugee Camp.

While asked whether the presence of South Sudanese in Kakuma Refugee Camp has brought positive or negative change, 23 respondents felt that the Camp has brought change in livelihood for the Host Community.

Table 8: Respondents View on Positive Impact of South Sudan Refugees in Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Opportunities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Water</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Opportunities</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Food</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Source: Survey Data}

\textsuperscript{96} Chambers, \textit{op. cit.}, p.245-263

\textsuperscript{97} \url{http://data.unhcr.org/SouthSudan/country.php?id=110} (last accessed 5\textsuperscript{th} August 2014)
As the above Graph 6 shows, 23 respondents reported that the presence of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma has brought new market opportunities. The creation of new common marketplaces within refugee camps where also external food aid are sold or exchanged have taken place in Kakuma much in line with the experiences from Maystadt and Verwimp (2009). They argued that the South Sudanese buy firewood, charcoal, water, some building materials for temporary structures, food (meat, milk) from the host community. They further said that they provide services than earn them daily wages. 17 respondents indicated that the presence of South Sudanese Refugees has brought new business opportunities and created jobs for them. These jobs vary from washing clothes, cleaning plots, building fences, shelter construction, carrying food rations and other household jobs. Other indicated that they have been employed in NGOs as guides and carriers of food rations for South Sudanese refugees as they receive the rations twice a month. They indicated that instead of overly depending on pastoralism, they have been able to diversify their economy and source of funds. They
however indicated that their trade is at times frustrated by free good provided by UNHCR and international NGOs hence affecting forces of demand and supply and at times they make huge loses especially over goods that expire. Nonetheless, they indicated that South Sudanese refugees sell the free goods at throw-away prices or do barter exchange with firewood, charcoal, etc. These goods end up in shops at lower and competitive prices which make access to these goods by Host Community easier and less expensive. This is equally confirmed by Whitaker\textsuperscript{98} that relief food at times ends up in free markets or barter trade as witnessed between 1992 and 1993 in Tanzania’s refugee camps where almost 75\% of relief foods distributed ended up in the free market.

13 respondents indicated that the medical camps inside the Kakuma Refugee Camps started for South Sudanese refugees and others has made access to medical services easier as opposed to the times before the presence of the refugee camp. They revealed that instead of going to Kakuma Mission Hospital which practise cost-sharing method introduced by Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) in 1990s by charging some fee, they prefer frequenting camp dispensaries and clinics for free services.

More access to food (8) and water (5) is reported by some of the respondents. However, the water and food are not provided directly to the host community. They reported that they either borrow food, or work and paid with some of the food ration, or buy directly from the South Sudanese refugees at lower prices. They further said that they have to ask for permission to fill their jerry cans with piped water in the camps. They reported that they feel discriminated by the government and NGOs given that they are suffering from same hardship conditions as the refugees and they are not being treated equally. Most respondents feel that water and food problems still persist as was the case before the arrival of South Sudanese in Kakuma Refugee Camp

They reported (6) that before the introduction of the free education, only few of the host community were allowed into schools established by UNCHR and NGOs as an extension of Community Social Responsibility (CSR). They indicated that after the introduction of free primary education, it has become easier to access education locally. However, they said that children prefer schools meant for refugees due to provision of meals as opposed to public schools which do not regularly provide the same. This supports Chambers\(^{99}\) theory that presence of refugees does also help the host community through provision of social services such as schools and health services.

5 respondents felt that the presence of South Sudanese in Kakuma Refugee Camp has brought some humanitarian support to the host community. However, the majority of the respondents (25) felt that the host community is discriminated against the South Sudanese refugees which supports Chambers\(^{100}\) argument, in his Five Dimensions of Analysis of the Cost-Benefit Relationship between the Refugees and the Host Communities, that refugees benefit more and access education and health facilities than the local communities. They indicated that they lack most of what is provided freely to the host community. The 5 respondents reported that they have at least an authority they can report to because the presence of the Government of Kenya is too low in Turkana County.

Table 9: No. of Respondents’ on Negative Impacts of South Sudan Refugee Presence in Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic attacks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition over CPRs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution/Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Land</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespecting Culture/Nationality</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

\(^{99}\) Chambers, op. cit., p.234-236.

\(^{100}\) Chambers, op. cit., p.245-263
The Graph 7 above illustrates that the most reported negative impacts are competition over CPRs (18), Insecurity (23) Loss of Land (17) and Conflict (17) between the host community and refugees. The host community felt that the refugees have allowed cattle-rustling spies to live amongst them and relay the information to their counter-part in South Sudan. They further felt that the refugees have caused cross-border crimes like trade in illicit arms and weapons. The host community further felt that they have hosted some warlords/militant groups who plot war against section of South Sudan in Kakuma refugee camp and could equally engage in crime in Kakuma refugee’s camp. They cited fear for assault, harassment, or being subjected to other inhumane ways by the refugees when they are seeking assistance within the refugees’ camp. The graph 7 also shows that 23 respondents feel that insecurity has heightened in Kakuma after the establishment of the Refugee Camp.

The respondents (17) further add that the conflicting nature has resulted to murder, manslaughter, assaults, offence against properties, robberies, theft by host communities from refugees among others. Representatives (18) from all villages complained over increase in
conflict between the host and refugee community over CPRs like grazing land, trees, firewood, food and water. They reported that the refugees are increasingly evading the source of firewood, charcoals, practising livestock keeping and accessing water point along Tarach River causing overcrowding. They reported that increased interaction between the host community and South Sudanese refugees as they accessed CPRs has caused immense friction as the host community try to guard against depletion of the natural resources. The host community hold that the refugees are provided with free goodies by the government and international organizations and hence they shouldn’t access the natural resources freely. However, four respondents termed the attacks against the refugee community by the host community as xenophobic especially over professional jobs provided by the international organizations. The host community are willing to guard the professional jobs for their learned population as an extension of CSR by the international organizations. It was reported that this stance is championed by civil organizations formed to clamour for Turkana people’s rights.

17 respondents felt that they are increasingly losing their valuable land to South Sudanese refugee camps especially after the war between Machar and Kiir which has driven many South Sudanese from their country to the camp in the last one year. They reported about 45,000 refugees increase in Kakuma in the last one year. These respondents are all living in Aule Aemejen Village where there is high experience of new arrivals. They state that they have lost valuable grazing land used by their animals due to population growth and more specifically due to the construction of section three and four of the refugee camp. The respondents claimed that they were displaced and relocated to other villages due to construction of the new refugees’ camp.

Four respondents complained bitterly over prostitution and sexual exploitation of host community’s girls by South Sudanese refugees. They reported that the girls enter into villages
occupied by the South Sudanese refugees where they practice prostitution in exchange of money for their livelihood.

8 respondents felt that the South Sudanese refugees are disrespecting the Turkana culture and nationality. They note that the refugees have even changed names of villages and places, introduced various cultural practices that are against Turkana culture and brought bad omen due to their various criminal vices. They further claimed that they are harassed as they enter the camp to sell firewood and charcoal especially when they are demanding their money after credit sales. They felt that the South Sudanese refugees are ungrateful and they rarely respect and observe Turkana culture even after hosting them on their land.

There are common features deduced from the negative impacts. The most serious negative impacts have been noted, on one hand, due to the real experience, and on the other hand, due to perception. Losses of land, conflict, competition over CPRs have been noted as the most serious and are causing insecurity. This insecurity may have been caused simply due to their daily interaction between the two communities. This supports argument by Chambers\textsuperscript{101} that refugees’ presence will affect the host community security-wise and economically. He argues that in the face of scarce economic resources in a country, the host country and communities are likely to feel hurt especially in loss of CPR

Even if these graphs 6 and 7 present the experiences and perceptions by host community’s 30 representatives, it is important to explore the nature and context of these different impacts. For instance, even if establishment of new market and creation of new jobs are listed as positive impacts, they create a room for further interaction between the host community and South Sudanese refugees. This interaction results at times into conflict between the two communities. Most respondents noted that most conflicts start at markets, while working for refugees and while accessing CPRs. Consequently, it is noteworthy that the negative impacts cannot be handled in isolation but further analysed and handled within their right contexts.

\textsuperscript{101} Chambers, \textit{op. cit.}, pg 246-249
Hence, in the presentation of findings, this paper brings out a balance between the impacts and experiences with a view of making an objective conclusion.

4.1.1.3. Adaptation to New Livelihood

Adjustment to new order brought by the refugee camp’s presence has brought changes to some of the host community’s members according to the respondents. More than half of the respondents (17) noted that they have experienced some positive change at individual and community levels. One of the respondents in American noted that he sells goats to South Sudanese refugees, and then travel far wide to buy same goat half the price and he either keeps the remaining half amount, or buys two to come and make 200% profit from the sale again. He said that he has found the brokerage business very lucrative and has afforded him to buy a pick-up that he uses to ferry the goats to avoid loss of weight.

The other changes that they are adapting to include the provision of livelihood through work, business and trading. The other respondents (13) reported that they have seen a meagre change in livelihood and the struggle to continue feeding the household remains the same as were before the camp came into existence.

Two respondents from Natir noted that there has been urbanised migration from larger Turkana County to within and around Kakuma Town and Refugee Camps due to a relatively easy life around the camp as opposed to rural areas. Alix-Garcia and Saah\textsuperscript{102} confirms Chambers views that this migration can impact negatively the host community and viability of households.

This emigration has made native Turkana people from Kakuma not to benefit well from the presence of the camp. Two respondents from Aule Aemejen noted that it is only the presence of the refugees that has made local authorities (county government), national authority and

\textsuperscript{102} Alix-Garcia & Saah, op. cit., p.15
international community in Turkana otherwise; they were leaving without a government to
which to channel their problems.

The six respondents from Aule Aemejen reported that establishment of Section Three of the
refugee camp due to trickle in of refugees from South Sudan has denied them sizable land
that was otherwise meant for grazing. They claimed that the land was grabbed by influential
leaders from Turkana, leased to UNHCR and the leader benefited themselves at the expense
of the community.

The difference in experiencing positive or negative impacts varies from one respondent to the
other. While 17 noted that they have experienced positive change after the establishment and
expansion of the camp due to increasing numbers from South Sudan, others felt that they
have not felt any change that may bring an evolution of life around Kakuma. It is noteworthy
that experiences brought by loss of land, insecurity, competition over CPRs and conflicts
have had a negative impact on a large part of the host respondents.

The proximity of the villages either to old section of the camp (Section 1) or to the new
section of the camp (Section 3) can contribute to varying experiences within the villages.
Most respondents from American, Natir and Nadapal, which fall at the point where the camp
started in 1992, feel that they have benefited from the camp due to the length of time they
have interacted with the camp, on one hand. On the other hand, respondents from Aule
Aemejen and Kalemchuch feel they haven’t benefited much from the camp given that the
camp has been expanding slowly towards that side of Section 3.
4.1.1.4. Relationship between Host and Refugee Population

Table 10: Breakdown: Respondents’ view on relationship with the host community in Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BAD</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadapal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokioto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lejomaria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalemchuch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aule Aemejen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data

Graph 8: Respondents view their relationship with the host community in Kakuma

The largest group of 19 respondents stated that conflictual, violent and hostile relation exist commonly between the hosts and refugees. Four respondents each from Natir, Nadapal, Kalemchuch and Aule Aemejen felt that their relations with South Sudanese refugees have been good. As a result, respondents reported unbalanced relationship with the South Sudanese refugees. In the response from the respondents, they described that they can have good relationship with the refugees and the other minute, it turn different depending on various circumstance. One respondent from American stated that *children fight between those*
from host community and others from refugee community almost caused sporadic fight between Section 1 and American and Nadapal-Natir residents who are known to relate well in different situations.

Most of the respondents who stated that they enjoy bad relationship stated that they are increasingly experiencing hostile relationship between South Sudanese refugees and host community as both groups increase in numbers around Kakuma.

A small number of the respondents (7) feel that their relationship is moderate i.e. not too bad or good. They feel that increased interaction has improved relations over time between the host and refugees populations. They stated that they have learnt various languages from South Sudanese like Dinka, Nuer, Bari and Zande and the various South Sudanese refugees have equally appreciated Turkana language. Breaking of language barriers between the South Sudanese refugees and the Turkana host community has improved the relationship between the two groups. The highest number of respondents concedes that they highly interact with refugees especially when they enter into the camp to sell their goods and offer their services. Their relationships have equally been improved by increasing inter-marriages between the Turkana community and the South Sudanese refugees. Four respondents each from Tokioto, Nadapal, Natir and Kalemchuch indicated that they have become brothers and sisters with refugees as they frequently visit each other during the day. They however noted that they don’t entertain visiting the camp at night due to fear of harassment, or attacks from the refugees. They further said that it is not encouraged by security agencies to move frequently at night.

4.1.1.5. Struggle and Cooperation between Host Community and Refugee Population

This sub-chapter delves on community and individual conflict experienced by the respondents. This helps us understand structurally the kind of conflicts and how the conflicts
evolve between Host Community and South Sudanese refugees in and around Kakuma Refugees Camp. Community conflicts transcend individual conflicts. However, individual conflicts could also become a trigger to community conflict. Community conflicts could affect a larger area as opposed to individual conflicts that only affect at least two individuals or households.

All respondents except one from Aule Aemejen, who arrived in 2008, have conceded that they have ever experienced community conflict. They said that the conflicts drew many participants from Turkana and South Sudanese refugees and took a large scale magnitude. Respondents from Natir, Tokioto and Nadapal said that they experienced a raft of conflicts between 2002 and 2004 involving the local community and refugees over various issues within and outside the camp. They said that access to CPRs, theft of livestock, armed attacks were the causes of the community conflicts. However, there was one exceptional conflict according to 3 respondents from Natir involving inter-marriage. The conflict faced some family members of Turkana community against some South Sudanese family members from Dinka community. The incident over rejected marriage by Turkana was blown out of proportion and metamorphosed to a community conflict that lasted several days. Some Dinkas and Turkanas from Natir were displaced and returned back home after several days after cessation of conflict. Another infamous conflict happened in 2006 over fertile pieces of land along banks of Tarach River in Nadapal and Natir. The refugees from South Sudan wanted to control the land for farming as it is their exercise back in South Sudan. Upon realization of how the refugees are benefiting from the banks of Tarach River, some members of Turkana community in Nadapal and Natir forced the refugees to withdraw from the river banks or else they take the land through letting. Even if there were some underlying issues
including alleged rape, murder, armed robbery both in camp and outside camp by the Dinkas, the issue of farming along the banks was cited as the trigger cause of the conflict.

Respondents from American and Kalemchuch village also mention several community conflicts between hosts and refugees during the years around 2003. In specific the respondents from American village mentioned large conflicts between the years 2003 and 2006 that included the use of weapons where both refugees and hosts got killed. The Kalemchuch respondents describe a conflict between their village and a South Sudanese community from the camp that resulted in refugees chasing them into their own village and several girls from the host community got raped.

Some respondents from Tokioto and Lejomaria described an incidence in 2009 where two herd-boys were attacked by some refugees, some goats stolen and boys beaten to death. Upon realization of the act by the host community, this issue triggered a large scale conflict between their village and refugees from the camp.

Most of the respondents (17) agree that most of the community conflicts happened between 2000 and 2008 within refugees’ camp and in the villages, pitying the refugees against the host community. Most of these conflicts evolved from small to large conflict over common causes of disputes like land, inter-marriage, insecurity, shortage of food and water for the host community and competition over other CPRs.

Other external sources especially the Security Agencies have confirmed the existence of community conflicts between the host and refugees from South Sudan. The crime statistics from 2002 and 2005 held by Kenya Police in Kakuma Police Station indicate that there were various community conflicts involving the host and the South Sudanese refugees over various issues like rape, competition over CPRs, murder, inter-marriage and access to fertile arable lands.
One striking report in Kakuma Police Station state that there was a full-blown conflict between the South Sudanese refugees and some Turkana Community in 2003 which resulted to murders of 11 people, burning of houses and incidents of rape. It was reported by the Officer Commanding Station that some Paramilitary troops from the GSU were present during this conflicting period and withdrew in late 2004.

4.1.1.5.1. Cooperation

Several respondents have indicated several instances where the Host Community and South Sudanese refugees have shown will to create synergy and develop a better sense of cooperation and peaceful and secure co-existence. The most common areas where the two groups bring collaborative efforts include working for refugees in the camp, and at the business and market places in the camp. Some 4 respondents from Natir indicated that they have formed, through government initiatives, security committees like Nyumba Kumi and Community Policing, to offer protection within the villages and camp-sides that are adjacent to each other. One respondent from Tokioto village further indicated that inter-marriages and social amenities have had a great potential of bringing the two groups together. Even if the respondents concede that there is some collaboration amongst a group of individuals from host and refugees communities, they were quick to note that acceptance level for
collaboration at the overall community level is minimal and frustrating efforts being made at individual or members’ group level. 10 respondents called for more involvement by the Government of Kenya and Civil Societies in peace building activities for improving the relationship.

Most respondents (16) admitted that collaboration between the host community and South Sudanese refugees is mainly driven by community and individual realistic interests. On one hand, the respondents note that the host community derives satisfaction through creation of market for their goods and wage-based services they give to the refugees. The host also accepts presence of refugees due to jobs created, availability of free medical services, and food-for-services offered. On the other hand, the refugees are less hostile to the Turkana community given that they are hosted on their land, they have allowed them to practice farming along Tarach River beds, they provide firewood and charcoal at a charge and they receive security from the host community’s government. Collaboration between hosts and refugees tends to take place on the individual rather than the community level.

4.1.2. Findings From Kakuma Refugee Camp

This part presents characteristics of relationship between the host community and refugees. The data was collected from the three Sections of the refugee camp with various characteristics as sex, age, level of education, section in the camp that the respondents live in and time lived in the camp.
The respondents from the refugee camp’s 3 sections were picked in advance and told the time and day for the interview. However, after every interview, the researcher was obliged to part with some cash as a way of registering the hardship they face in the camp. The three sections of the camp border different villages. For instance, Section 1 of the Camp, which is the oldest, borders American, Nadapal, Natir, Tokioto, and Lejomaria. Section 2 borders Kalemchuch and the recently established Section 3 borders Aule Aemejen. I have in total conducted 40 semi-structured interviews with main questions guided by supplementary/ follow up questions. The research carried out many interviews (19) in Section 1 since it is the most
populated and oldest. 13 interviews were then conducted in Section 2, the second oldest with moderate population and Section 3 was offered 8 slots for respondents. However, Section 3 provided the latest information on relationship between South Sudanese refugees and host community given that they are the recent victims of civil war in South Sudan. With objective of collecting in-depth information from refugees’ respondents, the interviews lasted between 35-45 minutes.

The findings from the respondents within refugees’ population are presented in different categories as follows: Relationship between Host and Refugee Population, and Struggle and Cooperation between Host Community and Refugee Population.

From the sample of 40 respondents, 2 have attained university degrees and are working as teachers within the camp. One female, aged 35 years, has attained a college certificate, 11 respondents have secondary certificates. 17 respondents have primary certificates issued within the camp or in Sudan. However, there are 9 illiterate respondents who blame their lack of education on many years of civil war in South Sudan.

4.1.2.1. Relationship between Host and Refugee Population

Table 11: Breakdown of Respondents’ Views on When Host Community Meet the South Sudanese Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessing water</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing Food</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing Grazing Pasture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Stations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for Refugees</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Survey Data*
Graph 9:  Presentation about When Host Community Meet the South Sudanese Refugees

25 respondents say they meet with host community while accessing water in the camp, and seven said that they meet with them when accessing food ration because the host community offer to carry their food ration at a fee. Four respondents said that they meet with the host community on grazing grounds especially where there has been intermarriage and Turkana family agrees to keep some herds on a gentleman agreement. Three respondents agree there has been interacted with host community in Kakuma Town where they have rented houses after their businesses improved and they were able to bribe their way outside the filthy camp. Seventeen, eighteen and twenty-four respondents agreed that they meet with host community at Police Stations following up cases, at schools for free education and access to food and while hosts are working for refugees respectively as shown in the above Graph 9.
The majority of the respondents described relationship between the host community and refugees as either bad (22) or poor (8) whereas the rest (10) described it as good. Graph 10 above portrays how various South Sudanese respondents in different sections respondent to the question about their relationship with host community.

22 respondents i.e. 10, 8 and 4 from Section 1, 2 and 3 respectively, reported that their relationship with the host community is marked with conflict and hostile relationship. They said that they fear walking from the camp to the villages due to fear of attack, assaults, and xenophobic tendencies by the host community.

The minority of the respondents (8) described their relationship with the host community as bad. They said that they hadn’t noted substantial hostile relations with the host community, but they feel they are not fully accepted on Turkana land. They feel that the host community has put many barriers like restricted inter-marriage, low access to arable land along Tarach River, denial to practice pastoralism among other things. They however say that they have experienced good and poor relations in different times. Most of the respondents said that they are currently enjoying cordial working relations with the host community but sporadic individual conflicts still persist between the host and refugee community. They say than main motivation for hostility from Turkana community stems from shortage of food and water.
When there is drought, the Turkana insists that they have to be provided with same rations as the refugees since they can’t starve on their own land in the face of relief food from international community provided to the refugees.

10 respondents reported that their relationship with the host community is unproblematic and good. The respondents attributed their good relationship with the host community due to lack of constant interaction and interact with them only in marketplace, social amenities like schools, clinics and dispensary, police station or when the host community is working for the refugees. Some respondents said that they have learnt even Turkana language to facilitate understanding in communication, depth of Turkana culture and to see how they can draw cordial co-existence between the two groups.

Most respondents report that they mainly meet with members of host community inside the camp especially at water collection points, marketplaces, relief food distribution centers, medical facilities, sale of firewood and charcoals, or when host are working for the refugees. Nonetheless, some respondents report that they equally interact with the host community outside the camp especially when they haven’t been provided with enough food ration, firewood or charcoal and have to walk outside the camp. Ten respondents from the category that feel that they are enjoying poor relations feel that some members of the host community come to survey the camp during the day about which household is holding money and lots of food ration and they come for it at night.

4.1.2.2. Struggle and Cooperation between Host Community and Refugee Population

Most respondents (22) feel that there have been various conflicts that are individual-based or community-based but they are all quick to note that it becomes hard to separate the two types of conflicts. They report that most conflicts happen or start in the camp because the host community gets into the camp more than the refugees leave the camp to the villages.
19 respondents indicate that they have witnessed more than thrice conflicts that take a community angle; involving different members of South Sudan refugees and the host Turkana community. As noted by the respondents from the host community, respondents from the refugee community say that most community-based conflicts happened between 2002 and 2009, worst of all in 2004 where several people were killed, raped and displaced by armed militants from their camp and villages. They reported that some criminal members of host community came into the camp armed, broke into homes, maimed males, raped females and got away with food rations and money.

The 19 respondents noted that in 2004 conflict, about 28,000 South Sudanese refugees were displaced from their camps and noted that at least 10 people from refugees and host community were killed during the conflicts. They blame the conflict as resource-based (water, grazing land) food-based, and encouraged by armed groups from both host and refugee communities. They further blame perception by the host community that the refugees are wealthy from the stipend provided by the NGOs and UN, have enough food resources among others.

The respondents equally note that an incidence can galvanize mob-psychology among the refugees who aim at defending themselves against any aggression from the host community. This causes the conflict to escalate and take a wider angle and long time to find a consensus.

Seven respondents in Section 1 of the Refugee Camp noted an individual conflict that escalated to a community conflict. A Turkana man took meal in a hotel within the camp and refused to pay hence being beaten by some South Sudanese refugees’ friends to owner of the hotel. In the evening, some Turkana men came back for revenge. This individual-cum-
community conflict ended up with the death of one Turkana and critically injured three South Sudanese refugees.

26 respondents feel that the presence of South Sudan refugees in Kakuma has changed the standard of living for the host community in various positive and negative ways. 30 respondents noted that prices of goods and services have increased due to high demand from increasing refugees’ population hence affecting the livelihood of the host community. 29 respondents refuted that the grazing land and water pods are shrinking due to the presence of refugees adding that the refugees are provided with free water and do not practice pastoralism in the camp. 7 respondents said ironically that relief food reach the host community by stealing from relief food distribution center and when the host community work for the refugees. On housing, 37 respondents refuted adding that they have been restricted from staying in Kakuma town and other rural areas due to security issues and could not make cost of housing any expensive. However, they criticized the government for just restricting them in the camp whereas they were used to freedom of association back in South Sudan. 20 and 32 respondents agreed that host community have benefited from free education and medical attention respectively due to education centers and clinics/dispensaries present in the camps.

Table 12: Breakdown of Respondents’ Views on Social- Economic Impact of South Sudanese Refugees in Kakuma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prices- goods and services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrinking of grazing land and water pods</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access of relief food by host</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in rent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to free education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to free medical attention</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data
Most individual conflicts are noted by the respondents even if not all respondents have been subjected to criminal incidences. However, there is a general consensus between 30 respondents in the category of poor and bad relationship that there are several incidence of crime including robberies, rape, assaults, armed violence and use of crude weapons, murder and wanton destruction of properties in the refugees’ camp.

The most central areas of conflict are at water collection points, marketplaces, relief food distribution centers, medical facilities, sale of firewood and charcoal, or when host are working for the refugees. The respondents noted that they have to keep changing their workers from host community with fear of spying and consequent attacks through the inside-job and guidance of the workers.

30 respondents refuted that they have ever been attacked xenophobically by the host community adding that \textit{they don’t have the requisite knowledge and experience to work in NGOs and UN bodies} as their lives were destroyed by many years of fighting in South Sudan.

A revenge game is further experienced between the host and refugee communities. For instance, if the host community’s members are refused access to use water taps in the camp,
they in return refuse to allow South Sudanese refugees collect extra firewood in the vast Turkana land and this can result to conflict. About 10 women respondents reported that they prefer sleeping during the day to sleeping at night so that they can protect their children from attacks from host community. Kakuma police Station’s Officer Commanding Police Station (OCS) reported that there is an increase in robberies inside the camp and individual conflicts in the last six years (2008-2013). He noted that some repatriation of some South Sudanese refugees from the camp left the camp under populated and made the host community have hide-outs in the camp and attack constant. He further noted that after the start of the South Sudan Civil War in 2013 which has driven about 42,000 South Sudanese into the camp, the crime statistics have reduced due to filling up of places that the criminals from host community were living in and increased beats and patrols by Kenya security machineries. Armed robberies in the Kakuma camp especially using AK-47 and Ceska pistol are common. Most respondents believe that the weapons are sourced from Ethiopia, South Sudan, Chad and Eritrea where there have been conflicts. One respondent in Section 2 reports that a male South Sudanese refugee was shot and murdered in Kakuma Refugee Camp on the night of 6th of August 2012 using an AK-47. From his household, several staffs were stolen including ration foods, cash and some souvenirs sent to him from South Sudan by relatives. This happened in the face of a curfew, prohibiting the host community not to access the camp beyond 1800 hours. However, there are no clear borders between the villages and the camp as well as loose borders between camps hence making it close to impossible to deny easy entry and exit. Lack of adequate security facilitated with beat and patrol vehicles, inside the camp in the face of few base patrols and police posts, is also emphasized as a concern by many of the respondents. Despite lack of enough police presence, 25 respondents all drawn from all the three sections of the camp noted that most of the police officers present there are of Turkana origin and
have in the past downplayed many cases reported to police stations and posts and bases hence frustrating efforts to curb insecurity in the camp. Three respondents added that they fear volunteering information to the police because they same police officers can pass the same information to their tribe-mates/perpetrators which can turn out dangerous.

Asked whether the host community blame the South Sudan refugees, 25 respondents said that they are accused by the host community for importing crime from South Sudan as well as dangerous weapons. They further revealed that they have been accused of planning war against South Sudan government after secession and against Sudan government before secession. The other 15 respondents revealed that they haven’t been accused in past over crimes in and around the camp.

More than half of the respondents felt that they have been accused mostly because of rape, assaults, stock theft and dangerous drugs entering Turkana County. A large number diffused that they have been accused of murder, manslaughter, breakings and handling of stolen properties as the Graph 12 below shows.

**Table 13: Breakdown of Respondents’ View on Security Implication of the Refugees in Kakuma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENCE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape including attempts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock theft</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous drugs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling stolen properties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data*
10 respondents revealed that some South Sudanese refugees have come into the camp with illicit arms and 30 refuted presence of illicit arms among South Sudanese refugees. Asked why they have the arms, the respondents revealed that they have the arms for self-protection (26), commit crime (10), stockpiling (4) and trade in illicit arms (7) as the below Graph 13 shows.

**Graph 13: Views on why Host Community and Refugees Arm Themselves**
4.1.2.2.1. Cooperation between the South Sudan Refugees and Host Communities

About 23 respondents explained that they have not experienced cooperation between the host and South Sudanese refugee communities due to great fear that refugees over the host community. They claim that South Sudanese refugees are always receptive of the Turkana community members but they are left hurt in one way or another due to their trial of collaborative efforts in past that have gone soar. They feel that Turkana community members come to the camp to survey what to steal at night. 10 respondents said that they prefer making collaborative efforts at the market place, water points, and other communal areas rather than make personal friendship with the Turkana members.

The other less than half of the respondents (17) said that they have experienced some collaborative efforts between the two groups. Some of them include employing local community members to do some jobs in business center or at home for a daily wage. They report that some members of the host community become so well behaved to a point they adopt them as part of the family and share the food ration together.

12 respondents reported that they belong to some peace and security initiatives that bring both local and host community together under the helm of the Chief or Sub-Chief. Besides, the respondents add that they go to Kakuma Mission Hospital which practises cost-sharing method to seek superior medical services and the local community doesn’t bar them from accessing the hospital. The host and refugee communities have started learning each other’s language and this has improved the levels of integration and brought positive coexistence between the two communities.
4.1.3. Findings From External Actors

Perspectives from external actors working in Kakuma Refugee Camp by 5 Kenya’s Security Departments on how the Refugee Camp has impacted on Turkana host community’s livelihood and the relationship between hosts and refugees are presented here.

All the 5 security departments have been present in Kakuma for more than 20 years. From them, ten male respondents, every two from Kenya Police, Administration Police, G.S.U., National Administration and Criminal Investigation Department, were interviewed each lasting about 45 minutes. Two, four and four respondents are aged between 35-40 years, 40-45 years and 50-55 years respectively. Four, two, two respondents passed out of Kiganjo Police College and Embakasi Administration Police College and GSU Training School respectively. The two National Coordinators are graduates from Kenya School of Administration (KIA)

An interview guide including 15 open-ended questions has been used. During the interviews, some follow up questions were generated to draw more information from the respondents. The findings were sought with the following categories in mind: The Impact of Camp on Hosts’ Livelihood, Relationship between Host and Refugee Population, and Means to Promote Peace and Security.

The senior officers cover Turkana West Sub-County where Kakuma Refugee Camp lies in. The Sub-County Security Committee is chaired by Mr. Mohamed Dara and draws membership of Officer Commanding Police Division (OCPD), District Administration Police Commander (DAPC), District Criminal Investigation Officer (DCIO), and National Intelligence Service Officer (NIS).

All the departments gear towards provision of peace and security between the host and refugee communities. National Coordination team is headquartered in Kakuma Town and has various locations and sub-locations within Kakuma Refugee Camp. Kenya Police Department
has one Police Station and four Police Posts namely Kakuma 1 Police Post, Kakuma 2 Police Post, Kakuma 3 Police Post, and Kakuma 4 Police Post which is partially complete. Administration Police Department is headquartered at National Coordination’s compound in Kakuma Town and has two police posts namely Kakuma 1 AP (Administration Police) Post and Kakuma 2 AP Post. GSU has one DCOY in Kakuma 2 and Criminal Investigation Department (CID) has one Police Station.

4.1.3.1. The Impact of Camp on Hosts’ Livelihood

Out of ten (10) respondents, four (4) respondents indicated that were it not for the security enforcement initiatives that the Government of Kenya has put in place and humanitarian support by NGOs and IGOs like UNHCR, Lutheran World Federation, World Vision etc. that extends CSR, the security and economic challenges would be more. This would be as a result of Turkana’s host community feeling that their lives have been affected adversely by the presence of South Sudanese’s refugees in Turkana West Sub-County. They further say that it would be even worse if the enmity takes political angles i.e. if the refugees are eligible to vote in Kenya’s elections since they could tilt existing voting systems and politicians would work hard to destabilise their presence in Kakuma.

Graph 14: Relationship between Host and South Sudanese Refugees
As the Graph 14 above shows, three respondents feel that the relationship has been improving over the last 22 years since the establishment of the camp because of the peace and security efforts that are put co-jointly between the state and non-state actors. They claimed that there is natural suspicion that exists between the two communities largely because the host community feel that the refugees come from war-torn country and could import crime into Turkana West Sub-County where as the refugees feel a sense of non-acceptance by the host community. The three claimed that the host community are ready to protect against depletion of the natural resources (CPRs) and leave the community in problems in future. According to Jacobsen\textsuperscript{103}, host community reacts when they lose on CPRs and become hostile to refugee population as exemplified in refugee camps in the Sudan-Uganda-Kenya border region. They say that tension has increased after more South Sudanese refugees started trickling into the Refugees Camp after civil war started over political power dispute between Machar and Kiir from December 2013 to date and has forced establishment of Kakuma 4 (Section 4) which is taking away host community’s grazing last and making them minorities more and more hence reducing their influence on their own land.

The other three respondents claimed that the relationship between the host community and South Sudan refugees has remained cordial especially after grooving in many years, the fact that South Sudanese and Turkanas share common historical and cultural issues, South Sudanese know the effect of war and wouldn’t like a repeat anywhere else and the host community would love to maintain peace and security balance as before the establishment of the camp. These are the reasons given by three respondents from the security agencies.

On crime statistics, 8 out of 10 respondents reported that the security situations in Kakuma Refugees Camp have changed since the establishment of the camp and arrival of South Sudanese refugees.

\textsuperscript{103} Jacobsen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 10-11
More specifically, respondents reported that murder (7), manslaughter (6), rape including attempts (8), assaults (6), other small offences against persons (5), breakings (6) and possession of stolen properties have increased since the establishment of the camp. However, 3 respondents reported that such forms of crime were rampant in 1990s and 2000s but they have remained moderate and constant for the last 7 years due to peace building efforts and crackdown by government security agencies.

Conversely, the respondents (8) refuted vehemently any change in trade in drugs between South Sudanese refugees and host community. They reported that handling of dangerous drugs has been noticed among the Somali and Ethiopian Refugees within the Camp. Equally, they refuted any increase in stock theft adding that this is simply a common practice near the border between Kenya and South Sudan but not within the camp. The Graph 15 below presents the data on respondents’ views on crime statistics.

**Graph 15: Types of Crime Committed in Kakuma**

As the Graph 16 below shows, nine respondents said that going by crime statistics drawn
from reports over interaction between host and South Sudanese refugee communities, most reports are made over conflict due to access to piped water within the camps and theft of ration food from the camp by members of host community. Eight respondents also claimed that they have received complaints when members of host community are working for the South Sudanese refugees’ population. Two respondents said that the host community take their children to schools within refugee camp. Hence some individual conflicts emanate from small conflicts between kids and have ever become a full blown conflict between the host and refugees community. One respondent said that the host and South Sudan refugees meet when grazing but stated quickly that very few South Sudanese refugees try pastoralism or herding own foreign land with fear of reprisal from host community. The host and South Sudanese refugees rarely meet over housing/common residence and religious activities as this was supported by only one respondent.

**Graph 16: Interaction Opportunities between the Two Communities**
4.1.3.2. Cooperation

The respondents noted that there are some aspects in their relationships that are creating positive relationships and collaboration between the refugee population and host community. They noted that trade (8) and inter-marriage (5) are the highest contributors to cooperation among the South Sudan refugees and the Turkanas. However, community policing (4), communal work (2), cultural showcasing (1) haven’t contributed much in cooperation between the two communities. The Graph 17 below presents the findings.

**Graph 17: Cooperation Opportunities Created by Various Initiatives**

The respondents noted that the host community are using various options to challenge the security situations brought about by the presence of South Sudan’s Refugee in Kakuma. More than half of the respondents noted that the host community are taking up Community Policing (7) adoption of *Nyumba Kumi* Initiative (8) and illicitly arming themselves (5) to challenge security challenges. One of the respondents noted that community policing has been encouraged at *community and intern-community levels especially where villages border the*
Further, another respondent noted that Nyumba Kumi Initiative is fairly new and has been tested for less than an year, however, it has brought good results and they are looking at how it will not in future conflict with Community Policing but they complement each other. However, six respondents dispelled that the host community has adopted counter-attack measures against South Sudan refugee community and formed vigilante groups to ensure they protected themselves. Two respondents said that Turkana community members aren’t in a state of war with their South Sudanese refugee counterparts but occasionally conflict over an individual-cum-community issue and protects their economic and security interests like any other human being. The Graph 18 below shows how the respondents gave their views on measures adopted to enhance more security.

**Graph 18: Measures Taken by Host and South Sudanese Refugees to Protect Themselves**

![Graph 18](image)

4.1.3.3. **Means to Promote Peace and Security**

While asked about possible measures that can promote coexistence between the Turkana host community and South Sudanese Refugees in Kakuma, more than half of the respondents indicated Corporate Social Responsibility by NGOs/IGOs (9) by promoting Turkana livelihood to almost the same standard of living with South Sudanese refugees with specific
provision of food and water in drought as shown in Graph 19 below. 8 respondents indicated that forming more integrative peace and security committee for the host and refugees communities could promote more coexistence and enhance communication between opinion leaders for the host and refugee communities. Five and six respondents suggested that long-term solution ought to be sought for locals to access education as well as profiling of criminal suspects in host community and refugee camps respectively. The respondents reported that containment of refugees in camp (1) or allowing free movement of host community (3) or even destocking by the host community would not solve the security and economic challenges as the same communities will feel so much restrained and barred from practising their culture of stocking as form of wealth.

Graph 19: Means to Promote Peace and Security
CHAPTER FIVE

4.2. Summary of the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

With regard to research objective number one, it can be concluded that this research has clearly shown that civil instability in one country can hamper economic development of the other country as exemplified by all traders who claim to have lost vital South Sudan market and reduced profitability of their business ventures. The Civil Wars have caused under-utilization of capacity for Kenyan export traders and increased long-run average costs in running export business. According to the sampled Kenyan companies, export businesses are reducing their profitability due to reduced export trade in the face of fixed and variable costs. Some of the export goods are either stolen, vandalised, perish or expire before they reach the market.

Kenya export commodities have experienced high elasticity of prices caused by irregular supplies. Some goods aren’t accessing South Sudanese markets due to volatility of peace and security. Moreover, higher cost of transport decrease the competitiveness of Kenyan products as compared to Uganda products exported to South Sudan. The distance between Nairobi and Juba is 896Kms or 556.8miles through Malaba (Kenya-Uganda border post) and Nimule Border Point (Uganda-South Sudan). For a truck carrying import goods between Nimule and Juba (163km), they are stopped on average 6 times. In between they have to pay for escort especially when the peace and security along the route is volatile hence increasing directly and indirectly cost of doing business in South Sudan due to conflict. Other times, these inconveniences increases incidences of corruption between traders and South Sudanese government officials as traders seek to access the market faster and favourably.

Due to reduced operations in the companies, all this results in redundancy of employment and high cost of maintaining a human capital that is not productive in a capitalistic set-up. Further, there is noted level of unemployment, though mild because Kenya-South Sudan
trade isn’t so voluminous, due to lack of company expansion and growth. Despite the poor legal trade regimes in South Sudan, underdeveloped institutional capacity, overlapping government structures, low competences, the instability due to civil war has increase cost of business due to corruption, kickbacks with view of gaining protective security in the market. There is high emergence of grey market between Kenya and South Sudan due to porosity within South Sudan. Some manufacturers find their products in South Sudan market which do not use the intended channel that can protect the brand. Equally, a black market or underground economy has equally emerged due to instability where transactions are illegal even if the goods traded are themselves legal or illegal.

Kenya has failed to initiate joint bilateral trade agreement with Government of South Sudan that would see protection of investments and businesses made by partners in the home market even in face of civil strife/war. Coupled with instability in South Sudan, this failure has resulted to cross-border trade of counterfeit Kenyan products hence reducing competitiveness of Kenya’s original export goods.

Kenya has equally failed to propose equivocally the inclusion of South Sudan into East Africa Community (EAC) to improve trade which may mitigate occurrence of war; internally and externally for South Sudan. Within this economic diplomacy, the LAPPSET Project has failed to achieve the timeline-based targets for completion of the project and spur economic growth.

Physical attacks on Kenyan traders happen occasionally in South Sudan and reduce their confidence to continue cross-border trading especially when war has erupted. Moreover, due to war in South Sudan, Kenya is faced by several economic challenges as noted by many respondents including South Sudanese illegal workers, trade in illicit arms and cattle rustling.
In respect to research objective number two, we can conclude that security and economic impacts of South Sudan refugees on Turkana host community can either be positive or negative and very complex. Cordial relationship between South Sudan and Turkana host community cannot be overstated and it is good for the UNHCR and other international organizations protect the refugees with provision of humanitarian support as well as extending CSRs to the host community to a void a sense of discrimination. Equally the government of Kenya should continue providing adequate security for the refugees and the host community. The relationship between the host and the South Sudan refugees in Turkana is shaped by the negative or positive impact felt by the host community. Negative impacts from the camp have been noted to increase insecurity and promote conflictual relationship, whereas positive impacts are probable to promote coexistence between hosts and refugees. Some other impacts have taken socio-economic nature including accessibility of education and health care by the host community within the camp. Equally, the presence of South Sudanese refugees has increased the market base for goods and services provided by the host community including charcoal, firewood, labour within camp in exchange of either food or money.

Most negative effects have been related to daily relationship with refugees and the UNHCR and other actors’ refugee policies. Indeed, host community’s interaction with refugees has led to more insecurity and conflict in Kakuma. Their conflicts have ranged from dispute over CPRs, incidents of individual conflicts between hosts and refugees, theft in camp by some member of host community, dispute over tap water and arable land along River Tarach. Moreover, several forms of crime have become very common after the establishment of the camp according to this study. They include murder, manslaughter, rape including attempts, assaults, other small offences against persons, breakings and possession of stolen properties.
This research has noted that if host community takes the presence of the South Sudanese in the camp objectively, then the Turkanas around Kakuma Refugee Camp have benefited immensely from the camp especially those who have adapted their livelihoods to opportunities presented be the camp. Nonetheless, some of the members of the host community still languish in poverty, hunger despite the opportunities in the camp.

Both the Turkanas and South Sudanese refugees around Kakuma continue to conflict hence causing insecurity around Kakuma where residents live in fear of attacks or full blown conflicts due to differences between the two groups. Especially lack of important basic needs like food and water as well as discriminative humanitarian support given to the refugees has led to increased tension and conflicts between them and refugees.

There is reluctance for collaboration between the South Sudanese refugees and host Turkana community even if other collaborative areas have recorded some success. For instance, schools that admit both host community and South Sudanese pupils/students have become an integrative factor between the two communities. Economically, trade, business and employment have also promoted coexistence between host and South Sudanese refugee communities. Conversely, the main economic areas promoting collaborative efforts and coexistence between hosts and South Sudanese refugees are the recipe for conflict in the relationship between the host and South Sudanese refugees.

The international treaties and legal framework that govern the humanitarian agencies seem to favour the South Sudanese refugees against the host community. However, it is not fair when the host community channel its frustrations on humanitarian agencies or refugees themselves when they haven’t been provided with food ration, water and stipends since the agencies are bound by certain rules and regulations. Nevertheless, unless the current international rules and regulations governing the management of refugees’ camp are changed, there will be
perceived preferential treatments of the refugees against the host community and forever be
the source of grievances and conflict.

There is urgent need to improve the livelihood of the host community with a view of reducing
perception of differential treatments by the government of Kenya and humanitarian agencies.
This is key and an integral factor that can, with no doubt, improve relationship between the
South Sudanese refugees and Host Turkana community. The camp management, both the
government of Kenya and a consortium of humanitarian agencies led by UNHCR, have to
maximise on positive economic and security impact and mitigate the negative economic and
security impact so as to promote more coexistence between the two groups. Improving living
standards of the Turkana host community will definitely help them cope with challenges
meted out on them due to the presence of the South Sudanese in the camp and is subsequently
likely to limit negative impacts of tensions and conflicts with refugee communities. The
government of Kenya need to improve economic conditions of the host community and
subsequently reduce tension between the Turkana Host community, the humanitarian
agencies and South Sudanese refugees.

The research aimed at establishing the impact of instability in South Sudan due to Civil Wars
on Kenyan export traders. Moreover, it also aimed at providing more information on security
and economic impact, due to influx of South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma Refugee Camp,
on Turkana host community and track the issues that come up due to interaction of the two
communities in Kakuma.

4.3. Recommendations
The following recommendations are presented by this research. They are intended to mitigate
the effect of instability in South Sudan on Kenya’s economic and human security and can be
used by export traders in Nairobi City County and by those working in Kakuma who intend
to overcome some of economic and security issues in Kakuma Refugees Camp and
surrounding Host Community. The recommendations are drawn from the findings of this research on how to improve relationship between Kenya and South Sudan as far as trade and refugees’ management is concerned.

1. Kenya may initiate bilateral trade agreement with South Sudan. Most of the economic and security threats faced in South Sudan can be addressed through the establishment of a bilateral trade agreement between Kenya and South Sudan. Kenya has been the custodian of CPA Agreement and has promoted peace and security in South Sudan. Consequently, she can tap peace dividends by drawing bilateral trade agreements that enhance inter-state cooperation and increases further cost of war internally and externally. Given that EPC is the Kenya’s export promotion body, it could be charged in facilitation of bilateral negotiations between Kenya and South Sudan. This could involve protection of trade and investments and businesses made by partners in both home markets.

2. Kenya should immerse herself more in search of peace, security and stability in South Sudan by involving herself more in reconstruction of South Sudan. This may involve pacific settlement of disputes like mediation process between Machar and Kiir, capacity building among others. This will promote Kenya’s image in South Sudan and reduce xenophobic attacks, increase peace and security that will allow Kenyan traders penetrate the market further.

3. To reduce the effects of instability on trade, shorter and more secure transport routes are desired between Kenya and South Sudan. These routes may interconnect Kenya and South Sudan. This may include Northern Corridor and LAPPSET Highway Components of Lamu Port, Crude Oil pipeline, highway, railway, airport, resort cities, associated infrastructure (Power, water, communications) from Kenya to South Sudan. The Kenya National Highways Authority (KENHA) should improve the Northern Corridor i.e. Road A1: Lesseru – Kitale – Marich Pass – Lodwar – Lokichoggio – Nadapal, and then Juba to create
more secure and shorter routes. Equally, delivery of LAPPSET Project as enshrined in Vision 2030 aims at fostering transport linkages between Kenya and South Sudan, dynamic promotion of regional socio-economic development along the transport corridor especially in South Sudan and increase social, political and economic stability and promotion of economic development of the partnering states including South Sudan through enhanced cross-border trade.

4. Kenya should lobby further for inclusion of South Sudan in EAC bloc. By doing so, a raft of issues and measures that South Sudan should fulfill including peace, security and stability may be imposed before her admission into the bloc. This can consequently open up trade opportunities for Kenya in South Sudan and exploitation of natural resources in South Sudan.

5. The government and humanitarian agencies may aim at developing Turkana host community in Kakuma and reduce their dependence on the camp. This will improve their livelihoods and improve their relationship with South Sudanese refugees by reduction of constant tensions. More specifically, food and water security could be addressed. The government of Kenya may press for a sustainable balance between humanitarian and development assistance in Kakuma so that neither of them become a recipe for chaos. Promoting sustainable ways of providing livelihood could be more efficient in the long-term. The NGOs and other present international agencies may increase employment of hosts, particularly the unskilled labor. The NGOs could equally come up with capacity building module as part of CSR to make some members of Turkana host community become more attractive in the job market.

6. Economic and security tensions between hosts and refugees occur constantly in Kakuma for several reasons discussed in this research. Approaches that foster peace and security amongst the two communities may be pursued further. Peace and Security
Committees, *Nyumba Kumi* Initiatives spearheaded by Kenya Security agencies like National Coordination should continue and bring more and influential actors on board. Joint initiatives like common markets, common schools, common hospitals and recreation places equally create good relationship and interactions between hosts and refugees. However, these same places create room for both conflicts and mutual benefits. Further improvement of these areas could benefit both South Sudanese refugees and Kenyan’s Turkana host community. Improving this area could benefit both groups.
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### APPENDIX III: OVERVIEW OF EXPORTING COMPANIES TO SOUTH SUDAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat rolled products of iron or non-alloy steel, clad, plated or coated</td>
<td>Katchy Distributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adephi Agencies Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marid International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Exporters</td>
<td>Jekez Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betka Growers Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syms Beverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Exporters</td>
<td>Rejitek Coffee Co. Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee Exporters K. Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packed Cereals, Vegetable Fats</td>
<td>Mace Foods Kenya Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Products Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya Food Processors Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TruFoods Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soaps and Detergents</td>
<td>Elephants Soaps Industries Ltd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camelia Soap Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp. No.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX V: OVERVIEW OF REFUGEE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resp. No.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Kamp section</th>
<th>Time lived in the camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Since 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Since 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Born in the camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Since 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX VI: OVERVIEW OF EXTERNAL RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Period Worked in Kakuma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya Police</strong></td>
<td>One Police Station/ Four Police Posts&lt;br&gt;1. Kakuma Police Station in Kakuma Town&lt;br&gt;Posts&lt;br&gt;Kakuma 1-1 police post&lt;br&gt;Kakuma 2-1 police post&lt;br&gt;Kakuma 3-2 police post&lt;br&gt;Kakuma 4-1 police post (incomplete)</td>
<td>-OCPD, Superintendent of Police (SP)&lt;br&gt;-DEPUTY OCPD</td>
<td>-4 years, 1 year as OCPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-DEPUTY OCPD</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration Police</strong></td>
<td>Kakuma 1-one post&lt;br&gt;Kakuma 2- one post</td>
<td>-DAPC, SP&lt;br&gt;-Inspector of Police (IP)</td>
<td>-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSU</td>
<td>One DCOY in Kakuma 2</td>
<td>-Officer Commanding&lt;br&gt;-NADAPAL- SP&lt;br&gt;-CORPORAL</td>
<td>-2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coordinators</td>
<td>Sub-County Headquarters in Kakuma Town</td>
<td>-DEPUTY COUNTY COMMISSIONER&lt;br&gt;-ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>-1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>One Kakuma Police Station</td>
<td>District Criminal Investigation Officer (DCIO)- Chief Inspector of Police (CIP)</td>
<td>-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Deput DCIO-IP</td>
<td>-5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII: INTERVIEW GUIDE: KEY IMFORMANTS OF HOST COMMUNITY OF KAKUMA

1. Name of Respondent (optional)__________________________________________
2. Gender of respondent? ( ) Male          ( ) Female
3. Age of respondent? ( )35-40 years ( )40-45 years ( )50-55 years ( )60-65 years
   ( )65-70 years
4. Level of Education____________________________________________________
5. Occupation____________________________________________________________
6. You or (and your family) have lived in Kakuma for how long? ( ) 0-5 years
   ( )5-10 years ( )10-15 years ( )15-20 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Came/ born before the refugee started streaming in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moved to Kakuma after the influx of refugees, if so why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. According to your experience, has Kakuma transformed economically and security-wise since the refugee camp was established? ( ) Yes ( ) No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor/wages issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/land issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of services e.g. health, education etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Property Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How accessible were basic resources such as food, clothing, firewood etc. before the refugee presence in Kakuma?
   ( ) Easily ( ) Hard ( ) Not known
   Explain your reason:
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. 22 years after refugees camp was established, how accessible are basic resources such as food, clothing, firewood, etc. presently in Kakuma?
( ) Very Accessible ( ) Accessible ( ) Not accessible ( ) I don’t know

### Supplementary/ Follow-up questions

What are the contributing factors to the change? ( ) Population ( ) Competition ( ) Insecurity ( ) Cost of living ( ) Others ________
Positive/ negative?
Have there been variations of incomes and other common resources?
( ) Yes ( ) No

10. Has the Kakuma Refugee Camp brought new changes/experiences economically and security-wise in your daily life as a result of the refugees and camp presence in Kakuma? ( ) Yes ( ) No

### Supplementary/ Follow-up questions

What experiences/changes (especially economic and security situations)?
( ) Access to Food ( ) Job
( ) Business Opportunities
( ) Access to Water ( ) Education Opportunities ( 5 ) Humanitarian Assistance
( ) Market Opportunities ( ) Medical Services
( ) Disrespecting Culture/Nationality
( ) Loss of Land ( ) Prostitution/Sexual Exploitation ( ) Conflict ( ) Insecurity
( ) Competition over CPRs
( ) Xenophobic attacks ( ) Others

11. Have you and/or household experienced and conformed to weakness, challenges, opportunities and threats accompanied by the refugee camp presence in Kakuma?
( ) Yes ( ) No
If yes, how
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________

### Challenges supporting livelihoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges supporting livelihoods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed livelihoods (security-wise)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New economic opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. (i) Do you interact with refugees in Kakuma? ( ) Yes ( ) No
(ii) If yes, how do you term the relationship between the Turkana and South Sudanese refugee population in Kakuma?

(   ) Bad (   ) Poor (   ) Good

Why

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

13. Have you ever witnessed conflict between Turkana community (host community) and the refugee population? (   ) Yes (   ) No

Supplementary/ Follow-up questions

In what kind of situations? (   ) Accessing Water (   ) Accessing Food (   ) Accessing Grazing Pasture (   ) Housing (   ) Criminal accusation (   ) School
(   ) Others

..................................................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................

Is it a common occurrence? (   ) Yes (   ) No

14. Have you witnessed good relationships and collaborative efforts between Turkana (host community) and South Sudanese refugees in Kakuma?

Supplementary/ Follow-up questions

In which situation? (   ) Trade (   ) Community Policing (   ) Communal work (   ) Others

..................................................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................................................

Is it a common occurrence? (   ) Yes (   ) No
APPENDIX VIII: INTERVIEW GUIDE: REFUGEE POPULATION IN KAKUMA

1. Name of Respondent (optional)_________________________________

2. Gender of respondent? ( ) Male ( ) Female

3. Age of respondent? ( ) 35-40 years ( ) 40-45 years ( ) 50-55 years ( ) 60-65 years ( ) 65-70 years

4. Level of Education______________________________________________

5. Occupation_____________________________________________________

6. You or (and your family) have lived in Kakuma for how long? ( ) 0-5 years ( ) 5-10 years ( ) 10-15 years ( ) 15-20 years

| Supplementary/ Follow-up questions | Came/ born before the refugee started streaming in? 
| Moved to Kakuma after the influx of refugees, if so why? |

7. In what kind of situation do you engage directly with host community in Kakuma?
   ( ) Accessing Water ( ) Accessing Food ( ) Accessing Grazing Pasture
   ( ) Housing ( ) Police Stations over Criminal accusation ( ) School
   ( ) Others .................................................................
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

8. How would you term the relationship between the host community and the refugees over the economic resources in Kakuma? ( ) Bad ( ) Poor ( ) Good
   Why
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

9. (i) Is there competition over economic resources? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   (ii) If yes above, which resources? ( ) Firewood ( ) Grazing land ( ) Water
   ( ) Labor ( ) Relief food

10. (i) Does the competition over economic resources generate conflicts between the refugee and host community? ( ) Yes ( ) No
(ii) If yes, how does the competition generate conflict?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

11. (i) Does the influx of refugees affect living standards for the host community?
(   ) Yes (   ) No
(ii) If yes above, how
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do prices of goods and services change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do grazing land and water pods shrink?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does relief food reach the host community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does housing become expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to free education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to free medical attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Have you experienced situations of positive relationships and economic collaborations between refugees and the local community of Kakuma? (   ) Yes (   ) No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In which situation? (   ) Trade (   ) Community Policing (   ) Communal work (   ) Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a common situation of the relationship? (   ) Yes (   ) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Have you ever witnessed conflict between Turkana community (host community) and the refugee population? (   ) Yes (   ) No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what kind of situations? (   ) Accessing Water (   ) Accessing Food (   ) Accessing Grazing Pasture (   ) Housing (   ) Criminal accusation (   ) School (   ) Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it a common occurrence? (   ) Yes (   ) No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. (i) Have you (and your family/household) ever had xenophobic attack from a member of host community? (   ) Yes (   ) No
(ii) If yes above, how often …………………………………

15. How is the relationship, as far as security is concerned, between refugees and local community of Kakuma affecting life? ( ) Positive ( ) Negative

16. (i) Do members of host community blame you of any security situations?

( ) Yes ( ) No

(ii) If yes, which security situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape including attempts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling stolen properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. (i) Do some refugees enter camps with illicit arms from war zone? ( )Yes ( ) No

(ii) If yes above, what do they do with them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary/ Follow-up questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock piling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicit trade in arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Is there anything you would like to add in relation to the economic and security questions and topic presented?
APPENDIX IX: INTERVIEW GUIDE: EXTERNAL ACTORS

1. Name of Respondent (optional)______________________________

2. Gender of respondent? ( ) Male ( ) Female

3. Age of respondent? ( ) 35-40 years ( ) 40-45 years ( ) 50-55 years ( ) 60-65 years ( ) 65-70 years

4. Level of Education____

5. Occupation_________________________

6. Which security department do you work for?
   ( ) Kenya Police ( ) National Administration
   ( ) Criminal Investigation Department ( ) General Service Unit
   ( ) Administration Police

7. How long have you and/or your organization been present/working in Kakuma?
   ( ) 0-5 years ( ) 5-10 years ( ) 10-15 years ( ) 15-20 years ( )
   Others__________________________

8. (i) How would you describe the relationship between the host community and refugee population in Kakuma? ( ) Bad ( ) Poor ( ) Good
   (ii) Why do you describe it that way?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

9. (i) In which situations do the refugee population and the host community come in contact with each other?
   ( ) Accessing Water ( ) Accessing Food ( ) Accessing Grazing Pasture
   ( ) Housing ( ) Accessing Education ( ) Religious activities
   Others: ......................................................
   (ii) How do these situations affect the security in Kakuma?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

10. What experiences, in your view, are creating positive relationships and collaboration between the refugee population and host community?
    ( ) Trade ( ) Community Policing ( ) Communal work ( ) Cultural Showcasing
    ( ) Inter-marriage Others: .................................................................
11. What do you think could be done for improving the relationship between the refugee population and host community and promote coexistence and collaborations?

( ) Corporate Social Responsibility by NGOs/IGOs
( ) Forming Peace and Security Committees for Host and Refugee Communities
( ) Access to Education by locals
( ) Trade
( ) Containment of Refugees in Camps
( ) Free movement of hosts in Camps
( ) Profiling of criminal suspects in host community and refugee camps
( ) Destocking by Host Community
Other……………………………………………………………………………..

12. (i) In your perception/experience has Kakuma changed security-wise since the refugee camp establishments? ( ) Yes ( ) No

(ii) If yes, how has the following security aspect changed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Aspect</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape including attempts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences against persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Stolen Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In your perception/experience how is the host community adapting to security and economic changes brought on by the refugee camp presence in Kakuma?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptation Method</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopting Community Policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopting <em>Nyumba Kumi</em> Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilicitly Arming themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking Refugee Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming Vigilante Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EXPORTERS

Instructions
Kindly respond to the questions as honestly as possible.
Tick (√) inside the box to indicate your choice of answer.

Introduction:
1) Name of Respondent (optional) ……N/A………………………………………………
2) Gender of respondent? ( ) Male ( ) Female
3) Level of Education ……………………………………………..................................
4) Occupation ………………………………………………………………………………..
5) Main export goods: ……………………………………………………………………..
6) How many years have you exported to South Sudan?………………………………

Section One: Civil Wars’ Threats to Cross-Border Trade
7) (i) Has South Sudan civil wars affected your export business Yes { } No { }
(ii) If yes, by how much?..................................................................................

8) (i) Does South Sudan Civic Wars affect Kenya’s Price of Export Goods, Availability of
Market in South Sudan, Cost of Transport, Cost of Input (Raw Materials),
Employment, Security of Export Goods, Freshness of Fast-Moving Consumer Goods,
and Corruption Incidence? Yes { } No { }
(ii) If yes, to what extent do you agree that South Sudan Civil Wars is affecting Price of
Export Goods, Availability of Market in South Sudan, Cost of Transport, Cost of Input
(Raw Materials), Employment, Security of Export Goods, Freshness of Fast-Moving
Consumer Goods (FMCG), and Corruption Incidence? Use a five point scale provided
in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prices of Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Input (Raw Materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of Export Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness of Fast Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Goods (FCMG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) South Sudan Civil Wars are an economic and security threat to Kenya’s trade. To what extent do you think South Sudan Civil Wars is a threat to Kenya’s trade and employment in the following ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of grey market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of black market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of counterfeit goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Two: Kenya’s Stakes in Sudan Civil War

10) (i) In your view, has Kenya intervened to help businesspeople exporting goods to South Sudan?

   Yes { } No { }

   (ii) If yes, specify

   1.________
   2.__________________________________
   3.__________________________________
   4.________________

11) (i) Have government agencies done enough to maintain and expand South Sudan market during the crisis? Yes { } No { }

   If yes, how have they used the following mechanisms to counter Civil Wars threats to Trade and Employment? Use a five point scale provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated tariffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapping of Export Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative means of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-counterfeit measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12) (i) Have you ever been attacked while exporting goods to South Sudan

   Yes { }    No { }

   (ii) If yes, how frequent have there been incidences in South Sudan where Manufacturing Exporters have been attacked by civil militants?

   Not at all { }    Slight Frequency { }    Somewhat Common { }

   Common { }    Very Common { }

Section Three: Present Challenges to Kenya’s Current Economic Ties with South Sudan

13) What do you think is the current state of Kenya’s trade ties with South Sudan with regard to threats from South Sudan Civil Wars?

   Excellent { }    Above Average { }    Average { }

   Below Average { }    Extremely Poor { }

14) In your view, to what extent does the following economic insecurity in Kenya been contributed by South Sudan Civil Wars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Rustling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low International Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling of cross-border projects e.g. Lappset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade in illicit arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other____________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Give three suggestions of how to improve trade ties and movement of labor between Kenya and South Sudan.
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## APPENDIX XI: TIME SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>YEAR 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing/ Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection - continued literature review, interviews and observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project writing and submission for examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>