

FINAL REPORT

Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement on Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility for Peaceful Coexistence

Venue:

Weston Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya

Dates:

24th – 26th September 2024

Technical Support:

Africa Leadership Institute (AFLI)

and Karamoja Peace and Technology University (KAPATU) Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	15
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ENGAGEMENT	17
2.1 Overview	17
2.2 Overall Objective	17
2.3 Specific Objectives	17
2.3.1 Review and Amendment of the 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)	17
2.3.2 Negotiation of a Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)	18
2.3.3 Strengthening Inter-Ministerial and Bilateral Coordination	18
2.3.4 Facilitation of Structured Policy Dialogue and Consensus-Building	18
2.3.5 Development of Implementation and Review Mechanisms	18
2.3.6 Promotion of Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility	19
2.3.7 Advancement of Peace, Security, and Socio-Economic Development	19
2.4 Strategic Framing of the Objectives	19
2.5 Summary	19
3. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH (REWRITTEN)	21
3.1 Overview	21
3.2 Guiding Principles	21
3.3 Multi-Phase Implementation Approach	21
3.3.1 Phase I: Preparatory and Technical Scoping	22
3.3.2 Phase II: Structured Inter-Ministerial Engagement	22
3.3.3 Phase III: Documentation and Output Finalization	23
3.4 Facilitation and Dialogue Approach	24
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy	24
3.6 Decision-Making Framework	24
3.7 Documentation and Quality Assurance	25
3.8 Strengths of the Methodology	25

3.9 Summary	25
4. KEY ISSUES ADDRESSED.....	27
4.1 Overview.....	27
4.2 Unregulated Cross-Border Mobility	27
4.3 Resource Competition and Environmental Pressure.....	28
4.4 Insecurity and Transnational Crime	28
4.5 Governance and Institutional Coordination Gaps.....	29
4.6 Expiry and Limitations of the 2019 MoU.....	29
4.7 Livelihood Vulnerabilities and Socio-Economic Pressures	30
4.8 Climate Change and Environmental Stress.....	30
4.9 Lack of Operational Implementation and Review Mechanisms.....	31
4.10 Interconnected Nature of the Issues.....	31
4.11 Summary	31
5. MEETING PROCEEDINGS (REWRITTEN)	33
5.1 Overview.....	33
5.2 Phase I: Preparatory and Technical Readiness (10th – 23rd September 2024)	33
5.3 Phase II: Day 1 – Senior Officials Session (24th September 2024)	34
5.4 Phase III: Day 2 – Principal/Permanent Secretaries Session (25th September 2024) ...	35
5.5 Phase IV: Day 3 – Ministerial/Political Session (26th September 2024)	36
5.6 Key Milestones Achieved	37
5.7 Overall Assessment of Proceedings	37
5.8 Summary	37
6. KEY OUTPUTS (REWRITTEN).....	39
6.1 Overview.....	39
6.2 Output 1: Amended Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)	39
6.6 Output 5: Political Directives and Implementation Commitments.....	42
6.7 Integration of Outputs	42

6.8 Summary	43
7. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK	44
7.1 Overview	44
7.2 Participating Governments.....	44
7.3 Lead Ministries and National Institutions.....	44
7.4 Joint Bilateral Coordination Mechanisms.....	45
7.4.1 Joint Technical Steering Committee (JTSC).....	45
7.4.2 Joint Implementation and Monitoring Mechanism.....	46
7.5 Sub-National and Local Government Structures	46
7.6 Community-Level Structures.....	47
AFLI-KAPATU Project.....	47
7.8 Secretariat Functions.....	47
7.9 Regional and International Linkages	48
7.10 Institutional Coordination Principles	48
7.11 Summary	48
8. RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....	50
8.1 Overview	50
8.2 Results Chain	50
8.2.1 Impact (Long-Term Result)	50
8.2.2 Outcome (Intermediate Result).....	51
8.2.3 Outputs (Direct Deliverables).....	51
8.2.4 Activities (Implementation Level)	51
8.3 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs).....	52
8.4 Means of Verification.....	52
8.5 Critical Assumptions.....	53
8.6 Risk Considerations	53
8.7 Results-Based Implementation Approach.....	54

8.8 Strategic Significance of the Results Framework	54
8.9 Summary	54
9. FINANCIAL SUMMARY (REWRITTEN)	55
9.1 Overview	55
9.2 Budget Structure and Allocation	55
9.3 Resource Allocation Analysis	56
9.3.1 Core Delivery Investment	56
9.3.2 Strategic Investment in Policy Outputs	56
9.3.3 Cost Efficiency in Preparatory Activities	57
9.4 Financial Management and Oversight	57
9.5 Results-Based Financial Performance	57
9.6 Risk Management and Financial Controls	57
9.7 Strategic Significance of the Budget	58
9.8 Summary	58
10. IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP (REWRITTEN)	60
10.1 Overview	60
10.2 Immediate Post-Engagement Actions (Short-Term)	60
10.2.1 Formalization and Signing of Bilateral Instruments	60
10.2.2 Development of a Detailed Implementation Framework	60
10.2.3 Establishment of Coordination Structures	61
10.3 Medium-Term Implementation Actions	61
10.3.1 Operationalization of the MoU and RSA	61
10.3.2 Institutional Alignment and Capacity Building	61
10.3.3 Community Engagement and Awareness	62
10.4 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Review	62
10.4.1 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms	62
10.4.2 Periodic Bilateral Reviews	62

10.4.3 Evaluation of Outcomes and Impact.....	63
10.5 Resource Mobilization and Sustainability	63
10.5.1 Financial and Technical Resources	63
10.5.2 Long-Term Sustainability Measures	63
10.6 Risk Management and Mitigation.....	63
10.7 Implementation Sequencing.....	64
10.8 Roles and Responsibilities	64
10.9 Summary	65
11. RISKS AND MITIGATION	66
11.1 Overview	66
11.3 Security and Conflict Risks.....	67
11.4 Institutional and Coordination Risks.....	67
11.5 Operational and Implementation Risks.....	68
11.6 Financial and Resource Risks	68
11.7 Community and Social Risks	69
11.8 Environmental and Climate Risks.....	69
11.9 Legal and Compliance Risks.....	70
11.10 Interconnected Nature of Risks.....	71
11.11 Risk Management Approach	71
11.12 Summary	71
12. CONCLUSION.....	72
12.1 Overview	72
12.2 Achievement of Objectives	72
12.3 Strategic Significance	72
12.4 Policy and Institutional Implications	73
12.5 Pathway to Implementation	73
12.6 Sustainability and Forward Outlook	74

12.7 Final Reflection.....	74
----------------------------	----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFLI	Africa Leadership Institute
ASALs	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
EAC	East African Community
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
JTSC	Joint Technical Steering Committee
KAPATU	Karamoja Peace and Technology University
MDAs	Ministries, Departments, and Agencies
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
RSA	Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Bilateral Engagement

A structured process of dialogue and negotiation between two governments—in this case, Uganda and Kenya—aimed at addressing shared challenges and strengthening cooperation through agreed policy frameworks.

Cross-Border Mobility

The movement of people, livestock, and goods across international borders, particularly by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, often driven by seasonal patterns and resource availability.

Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility

A regulated system of cross-border movement that ensures security, predictability, and compliance with agreed protocols while supporting livelihoods and reducing conflict.

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

A formal bilateral agreement between Uganda and Kenya that establishes a framework for cooperation in areas such as peacebuilding, security, resource management, and socio-economic development.

Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)

A complementary operational agreement that defines practical modalities for:

- access to shared natural resources (water and pasture);
- regulated mobility;
- conflict prevention and resolution; and
- compliance and enforcement mechanisms.

Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Systems

Livelihood systems primarily based on livestock rearing (pastoralism), often combined with crop production (agro-pastoralism), characterized by seasonal mobility and dependence on natural resources.

Karamoja–Sebei Corridor

The cross-border region in northeastern Uganda comprising Karamoja and Sebei sub-regions, characterized by pastoral livelihoods, mobility, and shared resources with neighboring Kenyan communities.

Turkana–West Pokot Corridor

The cross-border region in northwestern Kenya comprising Turkana and West Pokot counties, closely linked socio-economically and culturally with communities in Uganda.

Cross-Border Governance

The systems, policies, and institutional arrangements through which neighboring countries jointly manage shared challenges, including mobility, security, and resource use.

Joint Technical Steering Committee (JTSC)

A bilateral coordination body composed of representatives from both governments, responsible for overseeing implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating coordination across sectors.

Inter-Ministerial Coordination

Collaboration among different government ministries, departments, and agencies to ensure coherent policy implementation and alignment across sectors.

Structured Inter-Ministerial Process

A tiered approach to decision-making involving technical experts, senior officials, and political leaders, ensuring that policies are technically sound, administratively feasible, and politically endorsed.

Resource Sharing

The equitable and regulated use of shared natural resources—particularly water and pasture—by communities across borders, guided by agreed frameworks.

Conflict Prevention and Resolution

Mechanisms and processes designed to prevent disputes and manage conflicts peacefully, including dialogue, mediation, and community-based approaches.

Transnational Crime

Illegal activities that cross national borders, including cattle rustling, arms trafficking, and other forms of organized crime.

Climate Variability and Environmental Stress

Changes in climate patterns—such as drought—that affect resource availability, livelihoods, and migration patterns, often increasing the risk of conflict.

Implementation Framework

A structured plan outlining how agreed policies and instruments will be operationalized, including roles, timelines, resources, and monitoring mechanisms.

Results-Based Management

An approach to planning and implementation that focuses on achieving measurable outputs, outcomes, and impact, with clear indicators and accountability mechanisms.

Socio-Economic Transformation

Long-term improvement in the economic and social conditions of communities, including increased livelihoods, resilience, and access to services.

Presidential Summit

A high-level meeting between Heads of State to formally adopt, sign, and provide political authority to bilateral agreements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Report presents the outcomes of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement on Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility for Peaceful Coexistence, convened in Nairobi, Kenya, from 24th to 26th September 2024. The engagement was designed as a structured, inter-ministerial policy process to strengthen bilateral cooperation, address complex cross-border challenges, and develop updated policy instruments to guide peace, security, and socio-economic transformation in the shared borderlands.

The Uganda–Kenya border corridor linking Karamoja–Sebei (Uganda) and Turkana–West Pokot (Kenya) is characterized by high levels of mobility, shared natural resources, and deep socio-economic interdependence. While these dynamics support livelihoods and cross-border trade, they also generate persistent challenges, including resource-based conflicts, insecurity, unregulated mobility, weak institutional coordination, and climate-induced pressures. The expiry of the 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) further created a policy gap, necessitating a comprehensive review and strengthening of the bilateral framework.

To address these challenges, the engagement adopted a tiered and results-oriented methodology, progressing from:

- technical negotiations by Senior Officials;
- to administrative validation by Principal and Permanent Secretaries;
- and culminating in political endorsement by Ministers, Governors, and Members of Parliament.

This structured approach ensured alignment between technical analysis, institutional feasibility, and political direction, resulting in coherent, policy-ready, and implementable outcomes.

The engagement successfully achieved its core objectives, including:

- review and amendment of the expired 2019 MoU to reflect evolving cross-border realities;
- negotiation of a Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) to provide operational mechanisms for mobility and resource management;
- strengthening of inter-ministerial and bilateral coordination; and

- establishment of a framework for safe, orderly, and regulated cross-border mobility.

The process delivered a set of interlinked and policy-relevant outputs, namely:

- an amended and initialled MoU, providing an updated strategic framework for cooperation;
- an initialled RSA, establishing practical modalities for resource sharing, mobility management, conflict prevention, and compliance; and
- agreed and initialled Minutes, documenting decisions, commitments, and implementation directives.

In addition, the engagement established a clear implementation pathway, including:

- development of a detailed implementation framework within a defined timeline;
- establishment of coordination, monitoring, and review mechanisms;
- commitment to annual bilateral reviews; and
- the convening of a Presidential Summit for the formal signing and adoption of the agreed instruments.

The outcomes of the engagement represent a strategic shift from fragmented and reactive approaches toward a structured, coordinated, and forward-looking bilateral framework. By integrating security, development, environmental, and governance considerations, the process provides a holistic approach to managing cross-border dynamics.

Overall, the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement constitutes a major milestone in strengthening bilateral relations, establishing a credible and actionable framework for:

- sustainable peace and security;
- regulated and predictable cross-border mobility;
- equitable and sustainable resource management; and
- long-term socio-economic transformation of border communities.

The successful implementation of these outcomes will depend on sustained political commitment, effective institutional coordination, adequate resource allocation, and active

community participation, ensuring that the agreed frameworks translate into lasting impact and regional stability.

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Uganda–Kenya borderlands linking Karamoja Sub-Region and Sebei (Uganda) with Turkana and West Pokot Counties (Kenya) constitute a highly dynamic and interconnected cross-border corridor. This region is characterized by pastoral and agro-pastoral livelihood systems, extensive seasonal mobility of people and livestock, shared natural resources—particularly water and pasture—and strong cultural, linguistic, and historical ties among communities.

These interconnections have historically supported cross-border trade, social cohesion, and economic interdependence, making the corridor a critical zone for both national and regional development. However, the same dynamics also create structural vulnerabilities, particularly in the context of climate variability, environmental stress, and limited governance coordination.

Over time, the region has experienced persistent and recurring challenges, including:

- competition over scarce natural resources such as water and pasture;
- cattle rustling and armed inter-community violence;
- proliferation of illicit small arms and transnational crime;
- unregulated cross-border mobility; and
- weak coordination between administrative and security institutions across the two countries.

These challenges have been further intensified by climate change and drought cycles, which increase pressure on already fragile ecosystems and compel pastoral communities to migrate across borders in search of survival resources. In the absence of sufficiently harmonized and enforceable bilateral frameworks, such movements have often resulted in conflict, insecurity, and strained relations between communities and state actors.

In recognition of these challenges, the Governments of the Republic of Uganda and the Republic of Kenya signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on 12th September 2019 to support a Cross-Border Programme for Sustainable Peace and Development. The MoU established a framework for cooperation in areas such as peacebuilding, resource management, and socio-economic transformation.

However, the 2019 MoU has since expired, and evolving cross-border realities—including changing mobility patterns, increased climate stress, and emerging security dynamics—have rendered its provisions insufficient to address current needs. This has created an urgent requirement for review, amendment, and strengthening of the bilateral cooperation framework, as well as the development of more operational and enforceable mechanisms for managing cross-border interactions.

In particular, there is a recognized need for a complementary instrument—the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)—to provide practical modalities for:

- regulated seasonal movement of pastoralists and livestock;
- equitable access to shared resources;
- conflict prevention and dispute resolution; and
- compliance and enforcement mechanisms.

It is within this broader policy, security, and development context that the Governments of Uganda and Kenya convened a high-level Bilateral Engagement in Nairobi from 24th to 26th September 2024, with technical support from AFLI–KAPATU. The engagement was designed as a structured inter-ministerial process to address the identified gaps, align bilateral priorities, and produce updated policy instruments to guide cross-border governance.

The engagement was anchored on the theme:

“Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility for Peaceful Coexistence,” reflecting the central policy objective of balancing mobility—which is essential for livelihoods—with security, governance, and sustainable resource management considerations.

The Bilateral Engagement therefore represents a critical milestone in the evolution of Uganda–Kenya cooperation, aimed at transitioning from fragmented and reactive approaches to a coherent, structured, and forward-looking bilateral framework capable of addressing the complex and interrelated challenges of cross-border mobility, peace, and development.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ENGAGEMENT

2.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement was convened as a structured, inter-ministerial policy process aimed at strengthening cooperation between the two countries in managing cross-border dynamics in the Karamoja–Sebei and Turkana–West Pokot corridor.

The objectives of the engagement were designed to move beyond dialogue to deliver concrete, policy-level outcomes, including updated bilateral instruments, strengthened institutional coordination, and a clear implementation pathway for sustainable peace, security, and development.

2.2 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the engagement was:

To strengthen bilateral cooperation between the Republic of Uganda and the Republic of Kenya through the review and amendment of the 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and the negotiation of a Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA), in order to promote safe and orderly cross-border mobility, enhance peace and security, and support sustainable socio-economic development in the border region.

This objective reflects the strategic intent to establish a coherent and operational bilateral framework capable of addressing evolving cross-border challenges.

2.3 Specific Objectives

To achieve the overall objective, the engagement pursued the following interrelated specific objectives:

2.3.1 Review and Amendment of the 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

To undertake a comprehensive review of the expired 2019 MoU and develop an amended framework that:

- reflects current cross-border realities and emerging challenges;
- strengthens provisions on peacebuilding, security cooperation, and governance; and

- aligns with national, regional, and international policy frameworks.

2.3.2 Negotiation of a Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)

To negotiate and develop a new operational agreement that provides clear modalities for:

- regulated cross-border mobility of pastoral communities;
- equitable access to shared natural resources such as water and pasture;
- conflict prevention, management, and resolution; and
- compliance, enforcement, and accountability mechanisms.

2.3.3 Strengthening Inter-Ministerial and Bilateral Coordination

To enhance coordination among relevant ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) of both governments by:

- aligning institutional mandates and responsibilities;
- establishing mechanisms for joint planning, implementation, and review; and
- fostering collaboration across security, administrative, and development sectors.

2.3.4 Facilitation of Structured Policy Dialogue and Consensus-Building

To provide a platform for structured, multi-level dialogue involving technical experts, senior officials, and political leaders, aimed at:

- identifying and analysing cross-border challenges;
- building consensus on policy priorities and solutions; and
- ensuring coherence between technical negotiations, administrative validation, and political endorsement.

2.3.5 Development of Implementation and Review Mechanisms

To establish a clear framework for implementation, including:

- agreed roles and responsibilities of participating institutions;
- monitoring, reporting, and review mechanisms; and

- timelines and processes for follow-up engagement and evaluation.

2.3.6 Promotion of Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility

To develop policy and operational measures that ensure:

- mobility systems that are regulated, predictable, and secure;
- protection of livelihoods dependent on cross-border movement; and
- reduction of conflict risks associated with unregulated migration and resource competition.

2.3.7 Advancement of Peace, Security, and Socio-Economic Development

To contribute to long-term regional stability by:

- strengthening peace and security cooperation;
- promoting sustainable resource management; and
- supporting socio-economic transformation of border communities.

2.4 Strategic Framing of the Objectives

Collectively, these objectives were designed to achieve a transition from fragmented and reactive approaches to a structured, coordinated, and forward-looking bilateral framework.

The engagement sought to:

- integrate security, development, and governance perspectives;
- align technical, administrative, and political decision-making processes; and
- produce policy-ready, implementable instruments capable of delivering tangible impact in the border region.

2.5 Summary

The objectives of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement reflect a comprehensive and multi-dimensional approach to cross-border governance, emphasizing:

- policy reform and institutional strengthening;

- operational mechanisms for mobility and resource management;
- structured dialogue and consensus-building; and
- long-term peace and development outcomes.

These objectives provided the foundation for the successful negotiation, validation, and endorsement of key bilateral instruments and the establishment of a clear pathway for their implementation.

3. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH (REWRITTEN)

3.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement adopted a structured, multi-level, and results-oriented methodology designed to ensure that the process moved systematically from technical analysis to political decision-making.

The approach combined:

- evidence-based technical preparation;
- structured inter-ministerial dialogue; and
- tiered validation and endorsement mechanisms,

to produce coherent, policy-ready, and implementable bilateral instruments.

This methodology ensured that the engagement was not merely consultative, but action-oriented and outcome-driven.

3.2 Guiding Principles

The methodology was anchored on the following core principles:

- **Inclusivity:** Engagement of relevant stakeholders across technical, administrative, and political levels;
- **Consensus-Building:** Structured dialogue to align positions and reach agreement;
- **Policy Coherence:** Alignment with national, regional, and international frameworks;
- **Results Orientation:** Focus on producing concrete outputs and implementation pathways;
- **Transparency and Accountability:** Clear documentation and validation of all decisions.

3.3 Multi-Phase Implementation Approach

The engagement was implemented through a **three-phase approach**, ensuring logical progression and coherence:

3.3.1 Phase I: Preparatory and Technical Scoping

Objective

To establish a strong analytical and institutional foundation for the engagement.

Key Activities

- Review of the 2019 MoU and existing bilateral frameworks;
- Analysis of cross-border challenges, including mobility, security, and resource management;
- Development of issue matrices and technical briefs;
- Preparation of draft frameworks for the amended MoU and RSA;
- Coordination with participating ministries and agencies;
- Finalization of agenda, facilitation tools, and documentation systems.

Outcome

A shared technical understanding of issues and clearly defined negotiation parameters.

3.3.2 Phase II: Structured Inter-Ministerial Engagement

Objective

To conduct structured dialogue and negotiations across multiple levels of government.

Approach

A **tiered engagement model** was adopted, consisting of three sequential levels:

a) Technical Level – Senior Officials

- Clause-by-clause review of the MoU;
- Identification of gaps and emerging issues;
- Drafting and negotiation of amendments;
- Development of RSA provisions;
- Documentation of consensus and outstanding issues.

b) Administrative Level – Principal/Permanent Secretaries

- Validation of technical outputs;
- Legal and policy alignment;
- Clarification of institutional roles and responsibilities;
- Agreement on implementation and coordination mechanisms.

c) Political Level – Ministers, Governors, and MPs

- High-level policy dialogue;
- Review and endorsement of validated instruments;
- Provision of strategic direction and political guidance;
- Initialling of agreed outputs and commitments.

Outcome

A fully negotiated, validated, and politically endorsed set of bilateral instruments.

3.3.3 Phase III: Documentation and Output Finalization

Objective

To ensure that all outcomes are translated into formal, policy-ready documents.

Key Activities

- Consolidation of negotiated texts;
- Preparation of amended MoU and RSA;
- Drafting and validation of agreed Minutes;
- Documentation of implementation frameworks and directives.

Outcome

Production of **formal, validated, and initialled outputs** ready for adoption and implementation.

3.4 Facilitation and Dialogue Approach

The engagement employed structured facilitation techniques to guide discussions and ensure effective participation:

- use of thematic sessions aligned to key issues;
- moderated discussions to manage sensitive topics;
- real-time documentation of proceedings;
- iterative validation of emerging consensus.

This approach ensured that discussions remained focused, inclusive, and solution-oriented.

3.5 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

The methodology ensured participation of stakeholders at different levels:

- **Technical experts:** Provided analysis and drafting support;
- **Senior officials:** Ensured institutional alignment;
- **Political leaders:** Provided direction and legitimacy;
- **Technical support teams (AFLI–KAPATU):** Facilitated process design, documentation, and coordination.

This multi-level engagement ensured comprehensive representation and ownership of outcomes.

3.6 Decision-Making Framework

Decision-making followed a progressive validation model:

1. **Technical consensus** at Senior Officials level;
2. **Administrative validation** at Principal/Permanent Secretaries level;
3. **Political endorsement** at Ministerial level.

This ensured that decisions were:

- technically sound;

- administratively feasible; and
- politically legitimate.

3.7 Documentation and Quality Assurance

All proceedings were systematically documented to ensure:

- accuracy and consistency of outputs;
- traceability of decisions and agreements;
- alignment with legal and policy standards;
- readiness of documents for formal adoption.

Quality assurance processes included **review, validation, and formal initialling of outputs**.

3.8 Strengths of the Methodology

The adopted methodology demonstrated several strengths:

- Structured and sequential approach enabling clarity and efficiency;
- Integration of technical and political processes;
- Strong focus on results and deliverables;
- Effective coordination across institutions;
- High level of stakeholder ownership and participation.

3.9 Summary

The methodology and approach of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement were comprehensive, structured, and outcome-oriented, ensuring that the process progressed from technical analysis to political commitment.

By combining:

- rigorous preparation;
- structured multi-level dialogue; and
- systematic validation and documentation,

the engagement successfully delivered policy-ready, implementable bilateral instruments, providing a strong foundation for effective cross-border governance, cooperation, and long-term stability.

4. KEY ISSUES ADDRESSED

4.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement provided a structured platform for identifying, analysing, and addressing a set of critical cross-border challenges affecting the Karamoja–Sebei and Turkana–West Pokot corridor.

These issues are multi-dimensional and interdependent, cutting across security, governance, livelihoods, and environmental factors. They were addressed through a combination of technical negotiations, administrative validation, and political dialogue, with the aim of developing coherent and actionable policy responses.

4.2 Unregulated Cross-Border Mobility

Issue Description

Cross-border movement of pastoral communities and livestock is a long-standing and essential livelihood practice. However, such mobility has often been unregulated or weakly managed, resulting in tensions and conflict.

Key Concerns

- Absence of harmonized protocols governing cross-border movement;
- Increased risk of conflict due to uncontrolled access to grazing areas;
- Security vulnerabilities associated with undocumented movements;
- Strain on local administrative and security systems.

Policy Implication

The need for a structured and regulated mobility framework that balances livelihood needs with security and governance considerations.

4.3 Resource Competition and Environmental Pressure

Issue Description

Competition over shared natural resources, particularly water and pasture, remains a primary driver of conflict in the border region.

Key Concerns

- Scarcity of resources due to climate variability and drought;
- Overlapping claims to grazing areas;
- Environmental degradation resulting from overuse of fragile ecosystems;
- Lack of agreed mechanisms for equitable resource access.

Policy Implication

The necessity for a formalized Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) to regulate access, promote sustainability, and prevent conflict.

4.4 Insecurity and Transnational Crime

Issue Description

The region continues to experience insecurity linked to cattle rustling, proliferation of small arms, and transnational criminal activities.

Key Concerns

- Armed incursions and retaliatory attacks between communities;
- Weak coordination between security agencies across borders;
- Illicit trafficking of arms and livestock;
- Limited intelligence-sharing mechanisms.

Policy Implication

Strengthening joint security coordination frameworks, including information-sharing, joint operations, and harmonized enforcement strategies.

4.5 Governance and Institutional Coordination Gaps

Issue Description

There are significant gaps in coordination between national and sub-national institutions responsible for managing cross-border issues.

Key Concerns

- Fragmentation of mandates across ministries and agencies;
- Weak coordination between central and local governments;
- Absence of structured bilateral governance mechanisms;
- Limited alignment of policies between Uganda and Kenya.

Policy Implication

Establishment of integrated bilateral governance and coordination mechanisms, supported by clearly defined roles and responsibilities.

4.6 Expiry and Limitations of the 2019 MoU

Issue Description

The 2019 Memorandum of Understanding, which previously guided bilateral cooperation, has expired and no longer adequately reflects current realities.

Key Concerns

- Outdated provisions that do not address emerging challenges;
- Lack of operational detail for implementation;
- Insufficient mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement;
- Gaps in addressing mobility and resource-sharing issues.

Policy Implication

Comprehensive review and amendment of the MoU, coupled with the development of complementary instruments such as the RSA.

4.7 Livelihood Vulnerabilities and Socio-Economic Pressures

Issue Description

Pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the border region face **significant socio-economic vulnerabilities**, exacerbated by environmental and security challenges.

Key Concerns

- Dependence on livestock and cross-border mobility for survival;
- Disruption of trade and market access;
- Increased poverty and economic instability;
- Limited access to social services and infrastructure.

Policy Implication

Integration of livelihood support and socio-economic development measures into cross-border governance frameworks.

4.8 Climate Change and Environmental Stress

Issue Description

Climate change has intensified drought cycles, resource scarcity, and migration pressures, amplifying existing vulnerabilities.

Key Concerns

- Increased frequency and severity of drought;
- Degradation of grazing land and water sources;
- Forced migration and heightened competition for resources;
- Limited adaptation and resilience mechanisms.

Policy Implication

Incorporation of climate-sensitive planning and sustainable resource management strategies within bilateral agreements.

4.9 Lack of Operational Implementation and Review Mechanisms

Issue Description

Previous frameworks lacked **clear implementation, monitoring, and review mechanisms**, limiting their effectiveness.

Key Concerns

- Weak follow-up on agreed actions;
- Absence of structured monitoring and evaluation systems;
- Limited accountability for implementation;
- Inadequate feedback loops for continuous improvement.

Policy Implication

Development of robust implementation frameworks, including monitoring, reporting, and periodic review mechanisms.

4.10 Interconnected Nature of the Issues

A key finding of the engagement is that these issues are **deeply interconnected**:

- Unregulated mobility exacerbates resource competition;
- Resource scarcity fuels insecurity and conflict;
- Insecurity undermines livelihoods and governance;
- Weak governance limits effective response to all other challenges.

This underscores the need for a holistic, integrated, and multi-sectoral approach rather than isolated interventions.

4.11 Summary

The issues addressed during the Bilateral Engagement reflect a complex interplay of security, environmental, economic, and governance challenges in the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

Their resolution requires:

- coordinated bilateral action;

- strengthened institutional frameworks;
- integration of security and development approaches; and
- sustained political commitment.

These issues formed the basis for the negotiation of the amended MoU and the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA), and they define the priority areas for implementation and follow-up action.

5. MEETING PROCEEDINGS (REWRITTEN)

5.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement was conducted over a three-day structured inter-ministerial process (24th–26th September 2024) in Nairobi, Kenya. The proceedings were deliberately organized along a tiered decision-making framework, ensuring that technical deliberations informed administrative validation, which in turn enabled political endorsement and direction.

This structured sequencing enhanced coherence, ensured institutional alignment, and strengthened the legitimacy of the final outcomes.

5.2 Phase I: Preparatory and Technical Readiness (10th – 23rd September 2024)

Prior to the formal engagement, a preparatory phase was undertaken to ensure technical, legal, and institutional readiness for effective negotiations.

Key Activities

- Review of the 2019 MoU and relevant bilateral, regional, and international frameworks;
- Development of issue matrices covering cross-border mobility, peace, and resource sharing;
- Preparation of draft frameworks for the amended MoU and the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA);
- Coordination with participating ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs) to confirm mandates and delegation composition;
- Finalization of the engagement agenda, facilitation approach, and documentation tools.

Key Outputs

- Technical briefing materials;
- Draft amendment framework for the MoU;

- Draft RSA framework;
- Confirmed delegations and structured agenda.

This phase ensured that all participants entered the engagement with a shared understanding of issues and clearly defined negotiation parameters.

5.3 Phase II: Day 1 – Senior Officials Session (24th September 2024)

Objective

To conduct **technical negotiations** on the review of the 2019 MoU and the development of the RSA.

Proceedings

The Senior Officials session focused on detailed, clause-by-clause engagement with the existing MoU and structured negotiation of new provisions.

Key Activities

- Clause-by-clause review of the 2019 MoU to identify gaps and areas for amendment;
- Identification of emerging cross-border challenges and governance gaps;
- Drafting and negotiation of proposed amendments to the MoU;
- Technical negotiation of principles, provisions, and operational modalities for the RSA;
- Documentation of areas of consensus and outstanding issues requiring further consideration.

Key Outputs

- Draft amended MoU text;
- Draft Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA);
- Technical negotiation record capturing agreed positions and outstanding issues.

Assessment

This phase successfully generated technically sound and negotiation-ready draft instruments, forming the foundation for subsequent validation and endorsement.

5.4 Phase III: Day 2 – Principal/Permanent Secretaries Session (25th September 2024)

Objective

To achieve administrative validation, legal alignment, and institutional coherence of the negotiated texts.

Proceedings

The Principal/Permanent Secretaries reviewed outputs from the Senior Officials session, ensuring that the draft instruments were aligned with national legal frameworks, policy priorities, and institutional mandates.

Key Activities

- Review and validation of draft amended MoU and RSA;
- Harmonization of provisions with national laws, policies, and international obligations;
- Clarification of roles and responsibilities of participating institutions;
- Agreement on implementation arrangements, including coordination structures;
- Development of monitoring, reporting, and review mechanisms.

Key Outputs

- Validated amended MoU;
- Validated RSA;
- Agreed implementation matrix outlining institutional responsibilities;
- Established monitoring and review framework.

Assessment

This phase ensured that the negotiated instruments were administratively feasible, legally sound, and institutionally implementable, bridging the gap between technical drafting and political decision-making.

5.5 Phase IV: Day 3 – Ministerial/Political Session (26th September 2024)

Objective

To secure **high-level political endorsement, direction, and formal initialling** of the bilateral instruments.

Proceedings

The Ministerial session brought together Cabinet Secretaries, Ministers, Governors, and Members of Parliament to deliberate on the validated instruments and provide political guidance.

Key Activities

- High-level policy dialogue on cross-border peace, security, and mobility;
- Presentation and consideration of the validated MoU and RSA;
- Endorsement of the negotiated instruments;
- Provision of political direction on signing modalities, timelines, and implementation priorities;
- Issuance of directives to MDAs regarding implementation and resource mobilization;
- Initialling of agreed Minutes, amended MoU, and RSA.

Key Outputs

- Agreed and initialled Minutes of the Bilateral Engagement;
- Amended and initialled MoU;
- Agreed and initialled Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA);
- Political directives on implementation and follow-up.

Assessment

This phase successfully translated technical and administrative consensus into politically endorsed and actionable commitments, completing the decision-making cycle.

5.6 Key Milestones Achieved

The engagement achieved all planned milestones within the scheduled timeframe:

- Completion of preparatory technical work – **23 September 2024**;
- Senior Officials technical negotiations – **24 September 2024**;
- Administrative validation by Principal/Permanent Secretaries – **25 September 2024**;
- Political endorsement and initialling of instruments – **26 September 2024**.

5.7 Overall Assessment of Proceedings

The meeting proceedings demonstrated several key strengths:

- **Structured sequencing:** Ensured logical progression from technical analysis to political decision-making;
- **Inclusive participation:** Engaged technical experts, senior officials, and political leaders;
- **Effective facilitation:** Enabled focused discussions and consensus-building;
- **Time discipline:** Achieved all outputs within a defined timeframe;
- **Outcome orientation:** Maintained focus on producing concrete, policy-ready instruments.

5.8 Summary

The proceedings of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement were systematic, inclusive, and results-oriented, successfully delivering:

- technically negotiated and administratively validated instruments;
- politically endorsed agreements; and
- a clear pathway for implementation and follow-up.

The structured process ensured that the engagement moved efficiently from analysis to agreement, establishing a strong foundation for strengthened bilateral cooperation and sustainable cross-border governance.

6. KEY OUTPUTS (REWRITTEN)

6.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement delivered a set of high-level, policy-ready outputs that collectively constitute a strengthened framework for cross-border governance, cooperation, and sustainable peace.

These outputs were the result of a structured process integrating technical negotiation, administrative validation, and political endorsement. They are designed to provide both strategic direction and operational mechanisms for managing cross-border mobility, resource sharing, and security cooperation.

6.2 Output 1: Amended Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

Description

A revised and strengthened Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was developed, reflecting updated realities and emerging challenges in the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

Key Features

- Incorporation of current cross-border dynamics, including mobility, security, and climate pressures;
- Strengthened provisions on peacebuilding, security cooperation, and governance coordination;
- Alignment with national legal frameworks, regional protocols, and international commitments;
- Clearer articulation of institutional roles and responsibilities.

Status

The amended MoU was **validated and formally initialled** by both parties, pending formal signing at the Presidential level.

Strategic Value

The MoU provides the **overarching policy framework** guiding bilateral cooperation on cross-border peace, security, and development.

6.3 Output 2: Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)

Description

A **new operational agreement** was negotiated to regulate access to and management of shared natural resources across the border.

Key Features

- Defined protocols for **regulated cross-border mobility** of pastoral communities and livestock;
- Mechanisms for **equitable access to water and pasture**;
- Provisions for **conflict prevention, management, and resolution**;
- Framework for **compliance, enforcement, and accountability**;
- Integration of climate-sensitive and sustainability considerations.

Status

The RSA was **agreed, validated, and initialled**, forming a key operational instrument complementing the MoU.

Strategic Value

The RSA translates policy into practice by providing **clear, enforceable modalities** for managing cross-border resource use and reducing conflict.

6.4 Output 3: Agreed Minutes of the Bilateral Engagement

Description

A formal record of the proceedings, decisions, and commitments made during the engagement.

Key Features

- Documentation of deliberations across all three phases of the engagement;
- Capture of agreed positions, commitments, and action points;
- Record of consensus achieved at technical, administrative, and political levels;
- Inclusion of directives for implementation and follow-up.

Status

The Minutes were **formally agreed and initialled** by authorized representatives of both governments.

Strategic Value

The Minutes serve as an **authoritative reference document**, ensuring accountability and continuity in implementation.

6.5 Output 4: Implementation and Review Framework

Description

An agreed framework outlining how the amended MoU and RSA will be operationalized.

Key Components

- Defined roles and responsibilities of participating ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs);
- Establishment of coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels;
- Monitoring, reporting, and evaluation structures;
- Timelines for implementation and review;
- Commitment to periodic bilateral reviews.

Status

Framework agreed in principle, with detailed operationalization to be developed within a defined timeline following the engagement.

Strategic Value

Provides a **clear pathway from agreement to implementation**, ensuring that commitments translate into measurable outcomes.

6.6 Output 5: Political Directives and Implementation Commitments

Description

High-level political guidance issued during the Ministerial session to steer implementation and ensure alignment across institutions.

Key Elements

- Direction on formal signing modalities and timelines;
- Mandate for MDAs to commence implementation;
- Commitment to resource mobilization;
- Agreement to convene a Presidential Summit for formal adoption of instruments.

Status

Directives issued and endorsed at the political level.

Strategic Value

Ensures political ownership and accountability, which are critical for effective implementation.

6.7 Integration of Outputs

The outputs are designed to function as an integrated framework:

- **MoU** – Provides strategic policy direction;
- **RSA** – Operationalizes resource sharing and mobility management;
- **Minutes** – Capture commitments and decisions;
- **Implementation Framework** – Guides execution;
- **Political Directives** – Ensure leadership and accountability.

Together, they establish a **coherent and comprehensive system** for cross-border governance.

6.8 Summary

The Bilateral Engagement successfully delivered a **complete set of interlinked outputs** that move beyond dialogue to actionable policy and operational frameworks.

These outputs:

- address the root causes of cross-border tensions;
- strengthen institutional coordination;
- provide mechanisms for sustainable resource management; and
- establish a clear pathway for implementation and long-term cooperation.

Collectively, they represent a major advancement in Uganda–Kenya bilateral relations, laying a strong foundation for peace, stability, and socio-economic transformation in the border region.

7. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

7.1 Overview

The successful implementation of the amended Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) requires a robust, coordinated, and multi-level institutional framework.

This framework is designed to ensure:

- effective coordination between the Governments of Uganda and Kenya;
- clear allocation of roles and responsibilities across institutions;
- alignment between national, sub-national, and community-level actors; and
- sustained monitoring, accountability, and policy oversight.

The institutional architecture reflects a whole-of-government and multi-stakeholder approach, recognizing the complex and inter-sectoral nature of cross-border governance.

7.2 Participating Governments

a) Government of the Republic of Uganda

b) Government of the Republic of Kenya

The two national governments serve as the **primary actors** responsible for:

- providing overall policy direction and leadership;
- ensuring alignment with national laws and development priorities;
- allocating resources for implementation; and
- overseeing bilateral coordination and compliance.

Their joint commitment underpins the legitimacy and sustainability of the bilateral framework.

7.3 Lead Ministries and National Institutions

Implementation will be coordinated through relevant Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs) in both countries, particularly those responsible for:

- regional cooperation and East African Community (EAC) affairs;
- peacebuilding and conflict management;
- internal affairs and security;
- pastoral development and arid/semi-arid lands (ASALs);
- environment, water, and natural resource management; and
- local government and cross-border coordination.

Core Functions of Lead Ministries

- policy formulation and implementation;
- coordination of sectoral interventions;
- harmonization of national and bilateral priorities;
- technical oversight and reporting; and
- engagement with sub-national and community actors.

7.4 Joint Bilateral Coordination Mechanisms

7.4.1 Joint Technical Steering Committee (JTSC)

A Joint Technical Steering Committee will serve as the central coordination body for implementation.

Key Responsibilities

- oversee implementation of the MoU and RSA;
- coordinate activities across sectors and institutions;
- monitor progress and address implementation challenges;
- facilitate information sharing between the two governments;
- prepare periodic progress reports.

Composition

- representatives from key MDAs in both countries;
- technical experts and advisors;
- designated focal points for cross-border coordination.

7.4.2 Joint Implementation and Monitoring Mechanism

A structured mechanism will be established to:

- track implementation of agreed actions;
- monitor compliance with provisions of the MoU and RSA;
- evaluate outcomes and impact;
- support periodic review and adjustment of strategies.

This mechanism ensures accountability, transparency, and continuous improvement.

7.5 Sub-National and Local Government Structures

a) Regional and County Governments (Kenya)

b) District and Regional Authorities (Uganda)

Sub-national governments play a critical role in operationalizing agreements at the local level, particularly in:

- managing cross-border mobility;
- facilitating community engagement and participation;
- implementing development and peacebuilding initiatives;
- coordinating local security and administrative responses;
- supporting conflict prevention and dispute resolution mechanisms.

Their involvement ensures that policy frameworks are translated into practical, context-specific actions.

7.6 Community-Level Structures

Local communities and traditional leadership structures are essential stakeholders in the implementation process.

Key Roles

- supporting peaceful coexistence and adherence to agreed frameworks;
- participating in conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms;
- facilitating compliance with mobility and resource-sharing protocols;
- contributing to early warning and response systems.

Engagement at this level ensures ownership, legitimacy, and sustainability of interventions.

AFLI–KAPATU Project

The AFLI–KAPATU Project provides technical support across key areas, including:

- policy analysis and advisory services;
- legal drafting and review of bilateral instruments;
- facilitation of dialogue and coordination processes;
- documentation and reporting;
- capacity building for institutions and stakeholders.

This support strengthens the technical quality and effectiveness of implementation.

7.8 Secretariat Functions

A designated **Secretariat** will support the institutional framework by:

- coordinating meetings and engagements;
- managing documentation and records;
- facilitating communication between stakeholders;
- supporting reporting and follow-up actions;
- ensuring continuity and institutional memory.

7.9 Regional and International Linkages

The institutional framework is aligned with broader regional and international systems, including:

- **East African Community (EAC)** frameworks on regional integration and cross-border cooperation;
- **IGAD** initiatives on peace, security, and pastoral development;
- relevant international conventions on resource management, mobility, and conflict prevention.

These linkages enhance policy coherence and regional alignment.

7.10 Institutional Coordination Principles

The framework is guided by the following principles:

- **Joint ownership:** Shared responsibility between Uganda and Kenya;
- **Subsidiarity:** Decisions taken at the most appropriate level;
- **Coordination:** Integration across sectors and institutions;
- **Accountability:** Clear roles and reporting mechanisms;
- **Inclusivity:** Engagement of all relevant stakeholders;
- **Sustainability:** Long-term institutional strengthening.

7.11 Summary

The institutional framework establishes a multi-tiered, coordinated, and accountable governance structure for implementing the outcomes of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement.

By integrating national leadership, technical coordination, sub-national implementation, and community participation, the framework provides a comprehensive system for translating policy commitments into practical, sustainable outcomes.

It ensures that the amended MoU and RSA are not merely agreements on paper, but operational instruments supported by strong institutions, clear responsibilities, and **continuous oversight**, thereby enabling effective cross-border governance and long-term stability.

8. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

8.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement was designed and implemented within a results-based management framework, ensuring a clear and logical linkage between activities, outputs, outcomes, and long-term impact.

This framework provides:

- a structured pathway from negotiation to implementation;
- measurable indicators of performance;
- mechanisms for accountability and verification; and
- a basis for monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement.

The results framework reflects a transition from policy dialogue to operational implementation, ensuring that the agreed bilateral instruments deliver tangible benefits for cross-border communities.

8.2 Results Chain

The intervention’s results are structured across four levels: Impact, Outcome, Outputs, and Activities, each logically linked and mutually reinforcing.

8.2.1 Impact (Long-Term Result)

Enhanced peace, security, and socio-economic transformation in the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

This impact is expected to manifest through:

- sustained reduction in cross-border conflict and insecurity;
- improved management of shared natural resources;
- strengthened cooperation between Uganda and Kenya; and
- increased resilience and livelihoods of border communities.

8.2.2 Outcome (Intermediate Result)

A strengthened and operational bilateral framework for safe and orderly cross-border mobility and resource sharing.

This outcome reflects the immediate effect of the engagement and includes:

- adoption of updated bilateral policy instruments;
- improved coordination between institutions;
- enhanced predictability and regulation of cross-border mobility; and
- increased alignment of security, development, and governance approaches.

8.2.3 Outputs (Direct Deliverables)

The engagement delivered four primary outputs:

1. Amended Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)
 - Provides an updated policy framework for cooperation.
2. Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)
 - Establishes operational mechanisms for mobility and resource access.
3. Agreed and Initialled Minutes
 - Document commitments, decisions, and agreed actions.
4. Implementation and Review Framework
 - Defines roles, responsibilities, and monitoring mechanisms.

These outputs are time-bound, verifiable, and directly linked to the achievement of the outcome.

8.2.4 Activities (Implementation Level)

The outputs were achieved through a sequence of structured activities:

- Preparatory technical work and stakeholder coordination;
- Technical negotiations by Senior Officials;

- Administrative validation by Principal/Permanent Secretaries;
- Political endorsement by Ministers and leaders;
- Documentation and initialling of bilateral instruments.

8.3 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Performance is measured using both qualitative and quantitative indicators:

Output-Level Indicators

- Completion and validation of amended MoU;
- Completion and validation of RSA;
- Formal initialling of agreed Minutes;
- Establishment of implementation framework.

Outcome-Level Indicators

- Level of institutional coordination between Uganda and Kenya;
- Adoption and operationalization of mobility and resource-sharing protocols;
- Reduction in cross-border disputes and incidents;
- Increased compliance with agreed frameworks.

Impact-Level Indicators

- Long-term reduction in conflict and insecurity;
- Improved socio-economic conditions in border communities;
- Enhanced regional cooperation and integration.

8.4 Means of Verification

The achievement of results will be verified through:

- signed and initialled MoU, RSA, and Minutes;
- official records of meetings and proceedings;
- implementation reports from responsible institutions;

- monitoring and evaluation reports;
- periodic bilateral review outcomes.

These mechanisms ensure **transparency, traceability, and accountability**.

8.5 Critical Assumptions

The results framework is based on several key assumptions:

- sustained political commitment from both governments;
- effective coordination among participating institutions;
- availability of resources for implementation;
- cooperation and compliance by local communities;
- stable security environment enabling implementation.

8.6 Risk Considerations

Potential risks to achieving results include:

- divergence in political priorities or policy positions;
- delays in formal signing or implementation;
- insecurity or conflict escalation;
- resource constraints;
- weak coordination across institutions.

Mitigation Measures

- structured engagement and phased decision-making;
- strong institutional coordination mechanisms;
- continuous monitoring and review;
- alignment with regional frameworks and partners.

8.7 Results-Based Implementation Approach

The engagement adopted a results-oriented approach, ensuring that:

- activities were directly linked to outputs;
- outputs were aligned with outcomes;
- outcomes contributed to long-term impact;
- resources were allocated based on expected results; and
- progress could be measured and evaluated.

This approach enhances efficiency, accountability, and effectiveness.

8.8 Strategic Significance of the Results Framework

The results framework plays a critical role in:

- ensuring coherence between planning, implementation, and outcomes;
- guiding institutional coordination and resource allocation;
- enabling monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive management;
- supporting evidence-based decision-making; and
- ensuring that bilateral agreements translate into tangible benefits.

8.9 Summary

The Results Framework provides a comprehensive, structured, and measurable pathway from policy dialogue to implementation and long-term impact.

By linking activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact within a coherent system, it ensures that the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement is not only a negotiation process, but a results-driven initiative capable of delivering sustainable peace, regulated mobility, and socio-economic transformation in the border region.

9. FINANCIAL SUMMARY (REWRITTEN)

9.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement was implemented using a results-based budgeting framework, ensuring that financial resources were strategically aligned to clearly defined outputs, activities, and outcomes.

The total approved budget for the engagement was:

UGX 170,000,000

This budget covered the full implementation cycle, including preparatory technical work, convening of the bilateral sessions, facilitation and documentation, and production of final policy instruments.

The financial design prioritized efficiency, accountability, and value for money, ensuring that resources were directly linked to deliverables and measurable results.

9.2 Budget Structure and Allocation

The budget was structured in alignment with the key outputs of the engagement, ensuring a direct linkage between financial inputs and expected results.

Key Budget Components

- **Technical Preparation and Scoping:**

Costs associated with review of the 2019 MoU, development of issue matrices, drafting frameworks, and coordination of stakeholders.

- **Bilateral Engagement Sessions:**

The largest share of the budget was allocated to the three-day engagement, including:

- venue and conference facilities;
- accommodation and subsistence for participants;
- transport and logistical coordination;
- facilitation and interpretation services.

- **Technical Support and Documentation:**

Costs for policy analysis, legal drafting, facilitation, and preparation of official documents.

- **Production of Final Outputs:**

Preparation, formatting, printing, and dissemination of:

- amended MoU;
- Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA);
- agreed Minutes and supporting documentation.

This allocation ensured that all critical stages of the engagement—from preparation to output delivery—were adequately resourced.

9.3 Resource Allocation Analysis

9.3.1 Core Delivery Investment

The majority of the budget was directed toward the bilateral engagement sessions, reflecting their central role as the primary platform for negotiation, validation, and endorsement of policy instruments.

This investment ensured:

- inclusive participation of key stakeholders from both countries;
- high-quality facilitation and structured dialogue;
- effective coordination across multiple institutions.

9.3.2 Strategic Investment in Policy Outputs

A dedicated portion of the budget supported the development of policy-ready outputs, ensuring that:

- technical drafting and legal review were conducted to high standards;
- documents were professionally produced and suitable for formal adoption;
- outputs were aligned with national and regional policy frameworks.

9.3.3 Cost Efficiency in Preparatory Activities

The preparatory phase was implemented with relatively modest resources, focusing on technical readiness and coordination.

This reflects efficient resource utilization while ensuring that the engagement was well-prepared and outcome-oriented.

9.4 Financial Management and Oversight

The financial implementation of the engagement was guided by strong governance and accountability mechanisms, including:

- oversight by lead government institutions;
- coordination through designated implementing agencies;
- technical support from AFLI–KAPATU experts;
- adherence to approved budget lines and expenditure controls.

These measures ensured that resources were used transparently, efficiently, and in accordance with agreed objectives.

9.5 Results-Based Financial Performance

The financial performance of the engagement can be assessed as effective and aligned with results, as evidenced by:

- Full delivery of planned outputs within the approved budget envelope;
- Efficient allocation of resources to high-impact activities;
- Timely deployment of funds in line with the implementation schedule;
- Strong linkage between expenditure and deliverables, ensuring accountability.

9.6 Risk Management and Financial Controls

The budget incorporated provisions to manage potential risks, including:

- logistical uncertainties associated with cross-border participation;
- potential delays in coordination or implementation;

- unforeseen operational costs.

Mitigation measures included:

- contingency planning;
- structured budgeting aligned to outputs;
- close monitoring of expenditures.

These measures enhanced the resilience and reliability of financial execution.

9.7 Strategic Significance of the Budget

The financial resources allocated to the engagement played a critical enabling role in:

- facilitating high-level bilateral participation and dialogue;
- ensuring the quality and credibility of technical and policy outputs;
- supporting coordination across multiple institutions and sectors;
- enabling the transition from negotiation to implementation.

The budget therefore directly contributed to achieving the strategic objectives of peacebuilding, regulated mobility, and strengthened bilateral cooperation.

9.8 Summary

The financial management of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement demonstrates a well-structured, efficient, and accountable approach to resource utilization.

By aligning financial inputs with clearly defined outputs and outcomes, the engagement ensured:

- value for money;
- transparency and accountability; and
- effective delivery of results.

Overall, the financial framework provided a strong foundation for the successful implementation of the engagement and the sustainability of its outcomes, supporting the

broader objective of long-term peace, stability, and development in the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

10. IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP (REWRITTEN)

10.1 Overview

The successful conclusion of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement marks the transition from policy formulation and agreement to implementation and operationalization.

This section outlines the structured approach required to ensure that the amended Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) are effectively translated into practical, measurable, and sustainable outcomes.

Implementation will be guided by a phased, coordinated, and results-oriented framework, supported by clear institutional responsibilities, timelines, and monitoring mechanisms.

10.2 Immediate Post-Engagement Actions (Short-Term)

10.2.1 Formalization and Signing of Bilateral Instruments

It is recommended that:

- The amended MoU and RSA be **submitted for formal approval and signing** by the respective governments;
- A **Presidential Summit** be convened to formally adopt and sign the instruments;
- All procedural and protocol requirements for formalization be completed within an agreed timeframe.

Purpose:

To confer full legal and political authority to the agreed instruments.

10.2.2 Development of a Detailed Implementation Framework

Both governments should jointly develop a comprehensive implementation plan within two months of the engagement, including:

- detailed activity schedules;
- institutional roles and responsibilities;
- resource requirements and mobilization strategies;

- monitoring and reporting arrangements.

Purpose:

To operationalize agreements and ensure clarity in execution.

10.2.3 Establishment of Coordination Structures

It is recommended that:

- the Joint Technical Steering Committee (JTSC) be formally constituted;
- focal points be designated within all relevant ministries and agencies;
- a functional Secretariat be established to support coordination and communication.

Purpose:

To ensure structured coordination and effective implementation across institutions.

10.3 Medium-Term Implementation Actions

10.3.1 Operationalization of the MoU and RSA

Participating institutions should commence implementation of key provisions, including:

- regulated cross-border mobility protocols;
- resource-sharing arrangements for water and pasture;
- joint security coordination and information-sharing mechanisms;
- conflict prevention and resolution systems.

Purpose:

To translate policy commitments into practical actions on the ground.

10.3.2 Institutional Alignment and Capacity Building

It is recommended that:

- ministries and agencies align their internal policies and procedures with the bilateral framework;

- capacity-building programs be implemented for technical and administrative personnel;
- coordination between national and sub-national institutions be strengthened.

Purpose:

To ensure readiness and effectiveness of implementing institutions.

10.3.3 Community Engagement and Awareness

Both governments should:

- engage local communities, leaders, and stakeholders to promote awareness of the agreements;
- support community participation in implementation;
- establish communication channels for feedback and dispute resolution.

Purpose:

To enhance ownership, compliance, and sustainability at the grassroots level.

10.4 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Review

10.4.1 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms

A structured monitoring system should be established to:

- track implementation progress against agreed indicators;
- ensure compliance with MoU and RSA provisions;
- identify challenges and recommend corrective actions.

10.4.2 Periodic Bilateral Reviews

The two governments agreed to conduct regular (annual) bilateral review meetings to:

- assess progress and performance;
- review effectiveness of implemented measures;
- update strategies and priorities as necessary.

10.4.3 Evaluation of Outcomes and Impact

Periodic evaluations should be conducted to measure:

- reduction in cross-border conflicts;
- improvements in resource management;
- socio-economic benefits to communities;
- effectiveness of institutional coordination.

Purpose:

To ensure continuous learning, accountability, and improvement.

10.5 Resource Mobilization and Sustainability

10.5.1 Financial and Technical Resources

Both governments should:

- allocate adequate budgetary resources for implementation;
- mobilize additional support from development partners where necessary;
- ensure efficient utilization of available resources.

10.5.2 Long-Term Sustainability Measures

It is recommended that:

- implementation be integrated into national and regional development plans;
- institutional capacity be strengthened for long-term management;
- partnerships with regional organizations (EAC, IGAD) be leveraged.

Purpose:

To ensure continuity and sustainability beyond the initial implementation phase.

10.6 Risk Management and Mitigation

Potential Risks

- delays in formal signing and implementation;

- divergence in policy priorities;
- insecurity or conflict resurgence;
- limited resources or capacity constraints.

Mitigation Measures

- sustained political engagement and commitment;
- structured coordination and communication mechanisms;
- phased implementation and adaptive management;
- continuous monitoring and early response systems.

10.7 Implementation Sequencing

The implementation process follows a clear logical sequence:

1. Formalization and signing of agreements;
2. Development of implementation framework;
3. Establishment of coordination structures;
4. Operationalization of agreements;
5. Monitoring, evaluation, and review;
6. Sustained engagement and institutionalization.

This sequencing ensures a balance between immediate action and long-term sustainability.

10.8 Roles and Responsibilities

Governments (Uganda and Kenya)

- Provide policy direction and leadership;
- Allocate resources and oversee implementation.

Lead Ministries and Agencies

- Coordinate sectoral implementation;

- Ensure alignment with national policies.

Joint Technical Steering Committee

- Oversee implementation and monitoring;
- Facilitate coordination and reporting.

Sub-National Governments

- Implement agreements at local level;
- Engage communities and stakeholders.

AFLI–KAPATU (Technical Support)

- Provide technical advisory, facilitation, and documentation support.

10.9 Summary

The implementation and follow-up framework provides a clear, structured, and actionable roadmap for translating the outcomes of the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement into sustainable results.

By combining:

- strong political commitment;
- coordinated institutional action;
- structured monitoring and review; and
- sustained stakeholder engagement,

the framework ensures that the amended MoU and RSA are effectively operationalized, delivering tangible improvements in peace, security, mobility, and socio-economic development across the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

11. RISKS AND MITIGATION

11.1 Overview

The implementation of the Uganda–Kenya bilateral framework for safe and orderly cross-border mobility is subject to a range of political, security, institutional, environmental, and operational risks.

Given the complexity of cross-border dynamics in the Karamoja–Sebei and Turkana–West Pokot corridor, effective risk management is essential to ensure that the amended MoU and Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA) are successfully implemented and sustained over time.

This section identifies key risks and outlines corresponding mitigation measures to support adaptive, resilient, and results-oriented implementation.

11.2 Political and Policy Risks

Risk Description

Divergence in political priorities, changes in leadership, or delays in formal approval and signing of bilateral instruments may affect implementation.

Key Risks

- Delayed or postponed Presidential Summit for formal signing;
- Inconsistent political commitment across government levels;
- Policy shifts that undermine agreed frameworks.

Mitigation Measures

- Sustain high-level political engagement and dialogue between the two governments;
- Establish clear timelines and accountability for formalization processes;
- Embed agreements within national policy frameworks to ensure continuity;
- Maintain regular bilateral consultations to reinforce alignment.

11.3 Security and Conflict Risks

Risk Description

Persistent insecurity, including cattle rustling, armed incursions, and retaliatory attacks, may disrupt implementation.

Key Risks

- Escalation of cross-border violence;
- Weak coordination between security agencies;
- Illicit arms proliferation and transnational crime.

Mitigation Measures

- Strengthen joint security coordination mechanisms and information-sharing;
- Promote community-based conflict prevention and early warning systems;
- Align enforcement strategies across both countries;
- Integrate peacebuilding initiatives within implementation activities.

11.4 Institutional and Coordination Risks

Risk Description

Weak coordination among ministries, agencies, and levels of government may hinder effective implementation.

Key Risks

- Overlapping mandates and unclear roles;
- Limited capacity within implementing institutions;
- Fragmented communication and decision-making processes.

Mitigation Measures

- Establish and operationalize the Joint Technical Steering Committee (JTSC);

- Clearly define roles and responsibilities within the implementation framework;
- Strengthen inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms;
- Provide capacity-building support to implementing institutions.

11.5 Operational and Implementation Risks

Risk Description

Challenges in executing agreed activities, including logistical, administrative, and technical constraints.

Key Risks

- Delays in implementation of agreed actions;
- Weak monitoring and follow-up mechanisms;
- Limited technical capacity for execution.

Mitigation Measures

- Develop a detailed and time-bound implementation plan;
- Establish a functional Secretariat to support coordination;
- Implement robust monitoring, reporting, and evaluation systems;
- Ensure availability of technical support and expertise.

11.6 Financial and Resource Risks

Risk Description

Insufficient or delayed financial resources may limit the ability to implement agreed interventions.

Key Risks

- Budget constraints within government institutions;
- Delays in resource allocation and disbursement;

- Dependence on external funding.

Mitigation Measures

- Prioritize allocation of national budget resources for implementation;
- Mobilize additional support from development partners;
- Ensure efficient and results-based use of available resources;
- Integrate implementation activities into existing programs where possible.

11.7 Community and Social Risks

Risk Description

Limited community buy-in or resistance to new frameworks may affect compliance and sustainability.

Key Risks

- Lack of awareness of agreements among local communities;
- Resistance to regulated mobility and resource-sharing arrangements;
- Persistent mistrust between communities.

Mitigation Measures

- Conduct sustained community engagement and awareness campaigns;
- Involve local leaders and traditional institutions in implementation;
- Promote inclusive participation and dialogue;
- Establish accessible dispute resolution mechanisms.

11.8 Environmental and Climate Risks

Risk Description

Climate variability and environmental degradation may intensify resource scarcity and mobility pressures.

Key Risks

- Increased drought frequency and severity;
- Depletion of water and pasture resources;
- Environmental stress leading to conflict.

Mitigation Measures

- Integrate climate-sensitive planning into implementation;
- Promote sustainable resource management practices;
- Support resilience-building initiatives for communities;
- Strengthen data collection and forecasting for early response.

11.9 Legal and Compliance Risks

Risk Description

Challenges in harmonizing legal frameworks and ensuring compliance with agreed provisions.

Key Risks

- Misalignment between national laws and bilateral agreements;
- Weak enforcement of agreed protocols;
- Disputes over interpretation of provisions.

Mitigation Measures

- Ensure legal review and alignment during implementation;
- Develop clear compliance and enforcement mechanisms;
- Establish dispute resolution procedures within the framework;
- Provide continuous legal advisory support.

11.10 Interconnected Nature of Risks

The identified risks are interrelated and mutually reinforcing:

- Security risks can undermine community trust and compliance;
- Institutional weaknesses can delay implementation and coordination;
- Environmental stress can exacerbate resource competition and conflict.

This underscores the need for a holistic, integrated risk management approach that addresses multiple dimensions simultaneously.

11.11 Risk Management Approach

The engagement adopts a proactive and adaptive risk management approach, characterized by:

- continuous monitoring and early identification of risks;
- flexible and responsive mitigation strategies;
- coordination across institutions and stakeholders;
- integration of risk management into implementation processes.

11.12 Summary

The successful implementation of the Uganda–Kenya bilateral framework depends on effective identification, management, and mitigation of risks.

By addressing political, security, institutional, operational, financial, social, environmental, and legal risks through structured measures, the two governments can ensure:

- resilience of the implementation process;
- sustainability of outcomes; and
- achievement of long-term objectives of peace, stability, and socio-economic transformation.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1 Overview

The Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement on *Safe and Orderly Cross-Border Mobility for Peaceful Coexistence* represents a significant milestone in advancing structured, policy-driven cooperation between the two countries.

The engagement successfully addressed longstanding and emerging cross-border challenges through a coherent, inclusive, and results-oriented process, culminating in the development and initialling of key bilateral instruments.

12.2 Achievement of Objectives

The engagement achieved its primary objectives by:

- **reviewing and amending the 2019 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)** to reflect current realities and emerging challenges;
- **negotiating a Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA)** to operationalize mobility and resource management;
- **strengthening inter-ministerial coordination** across relevant sectors and institutions;
- **facilitating structured, multi-level dialogue** that enabled consensus-building; and
- **establishing a clear framework for implementation, monitoring, and follow-up.**

These achievements demonstrate the effectiveness of a **tiered inter-ministerial approach** in addressing complex cross-border issues.

12.3 Strategic Significance

The outcomes of the engagement are of broader strategic importance for both countries and the region:

- They provide a comprehensive governance framework for managing cross-border mobility, resource sharing, and security cooperation;

- They demonstrate a shift from fragmented and reactive approaches to coordinated and forward-looking policy frameworks;
- They reinforce the importance of integrating security, development, and environmental considerations in cross-border management;
- They offer a replicable model for regional cooperation, particularly in pastoral and borderland contexts.

12.4 Policy and Institutional Implications

The engagement underscores several key policy and institutional lessons:

- **Cross-border challenges require coordinated bilateral solutions**, rather than unilateral interventions;
- **Effective governance depends on strong institutional coordination**, both within and between countries;
- **Operational frameworks are essential** to translate policy commitments into practical outcomes;
- **Community engagement and local ownership are critical** for sustainability and compliance;
- **Integration of climate and environmental considerations** is necessary for long-term resilience.

12.5 Pathway to Implementation

The engagement has established a clear and actionable pathway for implementation, including:

- formal signing and adoption of the amended MoU and RSA;
- development of a detailed implementation framework;
- establishment of coordination, monitoring, and review mechanisms;
- operationalization of agreed protocols and interventions;
- sustained bilateral engagement and periodic review.

The effectiveness of this pathway will depend on timely execution and sustained commitment by both governments.

12.6 Sustainability and Forward Outlook

The engagement has laid a strong foundation for long-term peace, stability, and development in the Uganda–Kenya borderlands.

However, sustaining these gains will require:

- continued political commitment at the highest levels;
- adequate allocation of financial and technical resources;
- institutional strengthening and capacity building;
- ongoing engagement with communities and stakeholders;
- adaptive management to respond to emerging challenges.

12.7 Final Reflection

In conclusion, the Uganda–Kenya Bilateral Engagement has successfully transformed a complex and multi-dimensional set of cross-border challenges into a structured, policy-driven, and actionable framework for cooperation.

By integrating:

- technical expertise;
- administrative coordination; and
- political leadership,

the process has produced outcomes that are not only strategically sound, but also practically implementable.

The amended MoU and the Cross-Border Resource Sharing Agreement (RSA), supported by a robust institutional and implementation framework, provide a credible pathway toward safe and orderly cross-border mobility, strengthened peace and security, and enhanced socio-economic transformation.

The continued commitment of both governments and stakeholders will be critical to translating these achievements into sustained impact and lasting regional stability.