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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Background

Kenya Forest Service (KFS) is a State Corporation established in February 2007 under the Forest Act 2005 to conserve, develop and sustainably manage forest resources for Kenya's social-economic development.

The KFS management structure comprises 10 conservancies that are ecologically demarcated, 76 Zonal Forest Offices, 150 forest Stations, and 250 divisional forest extension offices located countrywide, and critical in forest management and surveillance.

To participate in forest management, forest adjacent communities have formed registered groups and are currently working with KFS to sustainably manage forest resources. In total, there are 325 community forest associations.

The study targeted the employees of KFS and evaluated their prevalence of corruption by floating several factors inform of statements. These statements were analyzed and presented inform of index in the preceding sections of this report. The data was analyzed by the use of SPSS and presented inform of indices.

This Report on Corruption Survey presents the findings of the study conducted by Envag Associates Limited (the Consultant) with respect to corruption levels of employees.

2 Methodology

This involved the identification of KFS employees. Sample size was drawn from lists provided by KFS. Random sampling was used to arrive at the achieved sample size. The respondents were given equal opportunity to participate in the survey within the survey data collection timeframe.

Quantitative data was collected using Corruption Perception questionnaires while qualitative data was obtained by short clarification interviews/discussions with respondents during data collection to validate responses to the questionnaire. Secondary information was obtained from the website and previous reports.

Data coding and entry was done concurrently with data collection in the field. After which the consultant embarked on analysis of the data, comments and observations obtained from field
visits and secondary sources. The consultant carried out data coding, framework development for data entry and analysis of data using Ms Excel Platforms and SPSS.

3 Survey findings

The corruption index of 1.425. The Table below shows the summary of the corruption survey findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>NON ENCOM STAFF (%)</th>
<th>ENCOM STAFF (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrupt Practice</td>
<td>59.74 1.79</td>
<td>52.70 1.58</td>
<td>56.22 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of change next year in corruption</td>
<td>43.87 1.33</td>
<td>41.00 1.23</td>
<td>42.43 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of corruption</td>
<td>43.94 1.32</td>
<td>49.77 1.49</td>
<td>46.85 1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exerted Pressure</td>
<td>31.21 0.94</td>
<td>28.74 0.86</td>
<td>29.97 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>48.05 1.44</td>
<td>46.94 1.41</td>
<td>47.50 1.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore on score of 1 to 3
0= Corruption free
>0-1= Low
>1-2= medium
>2-3= high
A score of 1.425 will be considered to be at medium level when put on a scale of 0 to 3. Table 4.1 below depicts the findings.

4 Conclusions

The corruption level at the KFS was in between low levels moderate corruption level with an overall corruption index of 1.425.
5. Benchmarking CPI (International and Nationally)

According to Transparency International (TI), Mean Corruption Perception Index (2013) for 177 Countries is at 50% on a scale of 0-100. This translates to 1.5 on a scale of 0-3. This index captures informed views of analysts and experts in countries around the world. In Kenya, Ethics and Anti-corruption has provided a benchmark index of 67.7% or 2,031 on a scale of 0-3. Internationally Kenya’s CPI stands at 2.37 on a scale of 0-3 among 177 countries surveyed. The survey targeted public and government institutions. These scores compared to KFS CPI of 1.42 can be seen, by inspection that KFS has neither surpassed International nor National CPI levels.

6. Suggestion for Improvement

The Corruption index score was at 1.425, the index for NON ENCOM Staff was 1.44 and 1.41 for ENCOM Officers, these scores was informed by key parameters undertaken to establish the corruption perception at KFS.

7. Assessment of the level of corruption in KFS

The Survey established that the 63% of the respondents had been sensitized on corruption, 67% were aware of corruption in the workplace, 45% felt that procurement was well regulated and 35% were disagreeing to this. Of those interviewed 72% indicated that they had seen suggestion boxes at KFS, 50% knew what the available whistle were blowing channels while a further 40 percent did not agree. 50% indicated they had anti-corruption calendars at KFS and 39% disagreed. Integrity training was at 61% and Rewarding performance had an agreement level of 62%.

From the above it can be concluded that sensitization needs to be enhanced, awareness increased, whistle blowing channels, EACC calendars also needs to be increased.

It was also established that as much as majority of the respondents do have information about how to determine corrupt practices and that there is need to have frequent refresher course and information through training at the workplace. However, the management needs to create an in house mechanism that the respondents can use to report all forms of corruption. Correct information should be conveyed to the respondents who believe that there is corruption. This will help them in making the right decisions on corruption.
Training should also be continuous and should be carried out on the employees across all cadres/conservancies/forest stations and forest zones. This should be done by an external trainer. Ethics and Anti corruption Commission (EACC) should be consulted to train the respondents on corruption and what is expected of a public officer at the workplace.

8. Suggestions for Improvement

1. KFS is encouraged to frequently sensitize her suppliers and employees on the procurement process, as some of the supplier indicated that procurement process took too long. As one of the suppliers from Nairobi said “when we send our documents after they advertise it takes too long before we get any feedback” another from Kisii said “I wish they can increase the pace of evaluation and be informing us on the process as this will create a feeling that that procurement process is carried out in an open and timely manner” this alongside ensuring that employees know how to handle suppliers especially in the field and forest stations.

2. KFS staff needs to be sensitized on the available whistle blowing channels so as to enable them report such cases and incidence without fear of victimization. Training on integrity and Anti-corruption will enable staff to be able to discern what some of the corrupt practices are and be able to mitigate against such. A respondent from Mt Elgon had this to say “Top KFS officers to be transparent and accountable for any corruption practices that may take place” Another from Kwale said “No proper channels of dealing with matters e.g. a lot of discrimination of staffs.”

3. It is suggested that Enforcement and Compliance division need to be provided with dedicated vehicles for patrols and staff strength be enhanced as well as other staff package. As one Encom Officer from Isiolo put it “Encom staff are not well motivated look at KWS they have enough vehicles and are well motivated from Uniform to food” another from Gede said “by increasing staff numbers,pay and allowances so as not to be compromised by those who engage in illegal logging”.

4. There was a general growing consensus that low government wages might be a contributor to for corruption and misuse of public resources. This could be in the form over stated/quoted per diems and other allowances and not writing receipts for purchased seedlings thus denying the service much needed revenue. Respondents from Mt. Elgon had this to say “Not writing a receipt when a client purchase seedlings and procurement for office supplies without receipt” another from Mau said “In order to increase revenue
why can’t we embrace use of mobile money to a particular pay bill number”. Yet a similar concern was echoed from Majimazuri “Pay staffs good salary and benefits, transparency in all KFS operations.”

In view of the above KFS might consider carrying out a job evaluation and a salary survey so as to be able to remunerate her employees as per the market rates and also ensuring that staffs on the same job group are within the same pay bracket.

5. Asset tagging is another way of ensuring that small portable items and equipments are not looted. This can be further enhanced by having division wise inventories and further cascaded downward to departmental levels/ conservancies, forest stations and zones. Also by providing locks for electronic equipments such as laptops and printers will help safeguard KFS equipment’s. “Proper auditing of all office equipments by independent auditors” was made by a respondent in TaitaTeveta. While another said “If equipment’s are bought without a receipt and after a few weeks the equipment disappears how can you be accountable”.

6. The respondents indicated that some were posted to lower cadres yet more qualified for better grades. This was attributed to Nepotism, Tribalism and Favoritism. A respondent from Mwingi-Mumoni had this to say “The use of tall relatives-i.e. those in high offices&tribal umbrellas to push you through” another from Rumuruti said “Favoritism and tribalism are the cards being played in promotion” This can be tackled by doing a Job Evaluation and a Skills Audit to ascertain where there shortfall might be.

7. It is also encouraged for KFS to conduct frequent transfers and reshuffles from time to time, this can either be inter offices or inter-zones, this will de-link corrupt practices that tend to develop with employees staying for too long at a given work station.

8. Clear communication channels help organization work in harmony. KFS is also encouraged to enhance its communication channels to enable both its top level management to communicate effectively to its junior employees. “No proper channels of & ways of dealing with matters e.g. a lot of discrimination of staff” was a comment from a respondent in Suneka-Kisii and another from Wire had this to say “Poor communication to junior staffs leads to lack of understanding and conflict of interest”.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Kenya Forest Service (KFS) is a State Corporation established in February 2007 under the Forest Act 2005 to conserve, develop and sustainably manage forest resources for Kenya's social-economic development.

The KFS management structure comprises 10 conservancies that are ecologically demarcated, 76 Zonal Forest Offices, 150 forest Stations, and 250 divisional forest extension offices located countrywide, and critical in forest management and surveillance.

To participate in forest management, forest adjacent communities have formed registered groups and are currently working with KFS to sustainably manage forest resources. In total, there are 325 community forest associations.

The study targeted the employees of KFS and evaluated their prevalence of corruption by floating several factors inform of statements. These statements were analyzed and presented inform of index in the preceding sections of this report. The data was analyzed by the use of SPSS and presented inform of indices.

This Report on Corruption Survey presents the findings of the study conducted by Envag Associates Limited (the Consultant) with respect to corruption levels of employees.

**Mandate**
To conserve, develop and sustainably manage forestry resources.

**Vision**
To be the leading organization of excellence in sustainable forest management and conservation globally.

**Mission**
Enhance conservation and sustainable management of forests and allied resources for environmental stability and social-economic development.

**Core Functions**
1. Sustainably manage natural forests for social, economic and environmental benefits.
2. Increase productivity of industrial forest plantations and enhance efficiency in wood utilization.
3. Promote farm forestry and commercial tree farming.
4. Promote efficient utilization and marketing of forest products.
5. Promote sustainable management of forests in the dry-lands.
6. Protect forestry resources and KFS properties.

Develop and maintain essential infrastructure for effective forest management and protection

1.2 Objective of the Survey

The general objective of the Corruption Perception Survey was to assess the levels of corruption as perceived by employees; then getting their views on the challenges they encounter in search for the services and their suggestions on how the service delivery could be improved.

1.3 Corruption Defined

Corruption is defined as “the misuse of Public Power for Private Gain”. Forms of corruption are:

- Bribery: When payment is made for services that should be freely given.
- Embezzlement: When public Property/money is collected for private use.
- Extortion: When money, services, or other gains are demanded with threats.
- Fraud - When private gain is obtained through trickery.
- Favoritism - When benefits are obtained through personal relations between those with power and those seeking favors (Jobs, Land or other property or other benefits).
  It may include nepotism and wealth or gender discrimination.

1.3.1 Corruption Survey

The Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes Act of 2003, the Public Officer Ethics Act of 2003 and the Public Service Integrity Programme provide the foundation and environment for developing, implementing and sustaining a sound and effective integrity system across the public sector and eradicating corruption. The corruption eradication indicator in the Performance Contracts is expected to provide the basis for mainstreaming mechanisms for prevention and detection of corruption in public institutions. The corruption eradication indicator entails fulfilling the following key measures: -
1. Formulation of an institutional Anti-Corruption Policy
2. Operationalizing Corruption Prevention/Integrity Committees
3. Developing Corruption Prevention Plans
4. Developing a Code of Conduct
5. Integrity Training
6. Baseline survey on corruption perception

The Corruption survey will seek to monitor corruption levels in institutions over time and to evaluate the impact of corruption prevention programmes. The survey is expected to assess whether public institutions have complied with the requirement of establishing the structures. Data collected is expected also be used to assess the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies put in place by institutions.

1.3.2 Key Corruption Indices

Corruption indices provide an assessment about the scope and the aspects of corruption in public institutions. The Survey output has measured the level of corruption, the magnitude of corruption and service delivery ratings within the institution.

To ensure that these measures are captured as required, focus and emphasis was placed on the following as guided by Kenya Anti-corruption Commission.

1 **Corrupt practices:** This is expected to establish the kind of corrupt practices that are taking place in an institutional setting -within its functional and service delivery areas. A clear understanding of the activities and actors/players involved in creating a situation for corrupt practices (the exercising of pressure) and the actual act of corrupt behavior generated.

2 **Corruption Pressure:** This is expected to measure the degree to which the employees are subjected to direct or indirect pressure to participate in corrupt practices within the institution. It accounts for cases in which the public officer shows they expect corrupt behavior from the customer. This will record cases when a customer is asked for money, gift, or favor in order to have a service provided or problem solved. It measures the level of potential corruption in this institution over a given period of time.

3 **Magnitude of Corruption:** This will reflect the assessment of the spread of corruption in the institution. The assessment of the spread of corruption reflects the general social environment and prevailing outlook on corruption, as well as the related
image of the institution. This will provide the level of corruption in the institution.

4 **Expectations about the Future of Corruption:** This will reflect the expectations about the capacity of the institution to curb corruption. Customers' expectations will reflect the degree of public confidence on public institutions in handling corruption.
CHAPTER TWO: APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design

The consultants employed both quantitative and qualitative survey designs. This entailed gathering information using self completion questionnaires forms, interpersonal interviews with employees and customers.

2.2 Sampling Procedure

Multistage and purposive sampling procedures were employed to draw a representative sample. A guideline for sampling process for the study developed, discussed and agreed upon by the Project Steering Committee of KFS and the Consultants.

2.3 Sample Size

The staff targeted for the survey at KFS involved all categories of employees that were available at the time of conducting the exercise. The staff sample size was derived from the total population size of 5500. By using the generic statistical formula for sampling a sample size of 1650 was arrived at.

The survey involved all categories of staff as shown in table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1. Respondents’ category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Data Collection Methods

The primary data collection method for this survey was a self administered questionnaire designed on a 5 point Likert scale. This was complimented by short interpersonal interviews for clarification during questionnaire collection.
The self administered questionnaires were developed and presented to KFS for review, comments and approval before being used in the field.

Research assistants were trained by the consultants before being dispatched for data collection. In order to facilitate and fast track the data collecting process, the KFS sent introductory letters to all the departments through respective heads of department to sensitize them and introduce the consultants and the study. The letter was meant to sensitize the officers on the importance of study and to galvanize their support for the survey.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data for this survey was analyzed on Ms Excel and SPSS Platforms. The open ended questions were tested for inter-rater reliability and recorded in the database. The survey responses were analyzed and reported using descriptive statistics.
CHAPTER THREE: SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS

3.1 Introduction

This section outlines the demographics of the respondents targeted and from which the findings are based. Various characteristics of the population under study are presented in the succeeding section. This includes gender, sex age brackets of respondents, marital status, Length of service and corruption assessment.

3.2 Respondents Demography

3.2.1 Sex

76% of the respondents who filled the questionnaires were male. While 24% of those who filled the questionnaire were female.

3.2.2 Age of the Respondents

The age brackets of the respondents were as follows: 29% of the respondents ranged between 35-44 years, 18% was between 25-34, 38% of the respondents ranged between 45-54 years, and 9% of the respondents were above 55 years and 6% was between 18-24 years.
3.2.3 Marital status

The majority of the respondents were married with 79% of the respondents being married and 17% of the population are single while others were 4%.

3.2.4 Length of Service

The lengths of service at (KFS) were as follows: 38% of the majorities of the respondents have been in the company for less than 1 year, 25% of the populations have worked between
1-4 years 24% of the respondents have worked more than 10 years and 5% for a period of 5-10 years.

**Lenght of service at KFS**

- **More than 10 Years**: 24%
- **Less than 1 year**: 38%
- **Between 5 - 10 Years**: 5%
- **Between 1 - 4 Years**: 33%
CHAPTER FOUR: SURVEY FINDINGS

4.1 Summary of findings on corruption

This chapter and subsequent sections present survey findings. The overall corruption level stood at 1.425 indicating that the levels of corruption at KFS are between medium and high levels of corruption. Therefore on of score of 1 to 3
0= Corruption free
>0-1= Low
>1-2= medium
>2-3= high
A score of 1.425 will be considered to be at medium level when put on a scale of 0 to 3. Table 4.1 below depicts the findings.

Table 4.1 Corrupton index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>NON ENCOM STAFF (%)</th>
<th>ENCOM STAFF (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
<td>% 0-3 Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrupt Practice</td>
<td>59.74 1.7922</td>
<td>52.7 1.581</td>
<td>56.22 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of change next year in corruption</td>
<td>43.87 1.3161</td>
<td>41 1.23</td>
<td>42.43 1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of corruption</td>
<td>43.94 1.3182</td>
<td>49.77 1.4931</td>
<td>46.85 1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exerted Pressure</td>
<td>31.21 0.9363</td>
<td>28.74 0.8622</td>
<td>29.97 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>48.05 1.4415</td>
<td>46.94 1.4082</td>
<td>47.5 1.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table above it can be deduced that “Corrupt practices”- which might included bribery, treating, undue influence, personating, and aiding, abetting, and procuring personating had the highest index at 1.67 followed by Magnitude of corruption at 1.41, “future expectation” at 1.27 and Pressure to engage in corruption at 0.90. This implies that most engaged in corruption willingly and the magnitude-widespreadness indicates that only a few individual engage in such vices.
4.2 Overall Corruption Index

This section and the subsequent sections present the findings on corruption perception and incidences at KFS. The overall corruption index stood at 1.425. This score indicates that corruption was at medium levels. The summary of the findings are depicted in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Perception per department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Communication Department</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Service</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement and Compliance Division – ENCOM</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Extensions Service Division</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources &amp; Administration</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Forestry College</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Department</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Forest Conservation and Management</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation and Enterprise Division</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corruption index over the past three years has been reducing to the current 1.425. Enforcement and Compliance Division – ENCOM had the highest index at 1.70, followed by Natural Forest Conservation and Management at 1.67, Human Resource and Administration at 1.62, Plantation and Enterprise Division at 1.46, Forest Extensions Service Division at 1.45, Finance 1.44, Supply Chain Management 1.42, Corporate Communication Department 1.30, Kenya Forestry College at 1.25 and Corporate Service and Internal Audit at 1.22.

4.3 Sensitization of corruption

The parameter of corruption was also done in the survey 63% of the respondents interviewed have been sensitized on the effect of corruption at the workplace. 21% of the majorities of the respondents have not been sensitized on the effects of corruption at the workplace. 16%
of the respondents had no idea on whether sensitization on corruption at the workplace had been carried out

4.4 Awareness of corruption

Awareness of corruption risk at the workplace were as follows: 67% of the population were aware of corruption at the workplace, 24% were not aware and 9% of the respondent had no idea.
4.5 Procurement Regulations

Procurement is an important component in any company. Procurement regulations are necessary to avoid the risk of corruption in any workplace. 45% of the respondents do agree that KFS is strict on procurement regulations. 35% of the population on the other hand do not agree. 20% of the populations do not know whether KFS is strict on procurement regulations.

![KFS is strict on procurement regulations](image)

4.6 Anticorruption suggestions boxes at KFS

One way of curbing corruption at the workplace is the provision of suggestions boxes at KFS. 67% of the respondents provided that there is no anti-corruption suggestion boxes. KFS on the other hand 28% responded that there are no anticorruption boxes at KFS. 5% of respondents do not know whether there is any anti-corruption suggestion boxes at KFS.
4.7: Whistle Blowing Channel

Whistle blowing channel is essential in any organization. This calls for clear mechanism on reporting of corruption and the protection of the employees who does the reporting. 50% of the employees interviewed provided information that there is whistle blowing mechanism that detects corruption. 20% of the individuals interviewed do not know of any whistle blowing channel in case one detects corruption. 10% of the respondent further stated that there are not aware of whistle blower mechanism.
4.8 EACC calendars distribution

EACC Calendars provide important information and awareness to the organization on matters that deal with corruption. This is done through the provision of the Public officers and Ethics act. 50% of the respondents provided that there are no EACC calendars distributed at KFS offices. On the other hand 11% of the respondents do not know whether the calendars are distributed while 39% of the respondents agree that calendars are distributed at KFS offices.

4.9 Warning on corruption practices

80 per cent of the staff interviewed has been warned not to engage in any of the corruption practices in the organization 20% of the staff interviewed have not been warned of any corruption practices.
4.10 Staff training on Integrity

Training on integrity is a critical component in the fight for corruption. 61% of the respondents interviewed have not been trained on integrity 39% of the staff have been trained on integrity.

4.11 Staff and corruption practice

28% of the respondents interviewed believe that KFS entertain members of staff suspected to be involved in corruption practices. 61% of the respondents interviewed agree that KFS does not entertain members of staff suspected to be involved in any corruption practices.
11% do not know whether KFS encourages or discourages staff involved in any corruption practices.

### Rewarding performance

33% of the respondents do agree that KFS rewards high performing staff. On the other hand 62% do not agree that KFS rewards high performing employees and a further 5% do not know whether KFS rewards high performing employees.
Most Prevalent Types of Corruption

The reason why an individual decides to engage in corrupt behaviour is primarily influenced by a personal definition of corruption and individual perceptions of how widespread corrupt activities are (imitation). It is against this backdrop that we sought to find out what are some of the prevalent types of corruption at KFS and are outlined as follows:

1. Employment, salary payment, promotion
2. Illegal logging, transporting without valid permit and encroachment on forests
3. Misuse of funds and asset theft
4. Nepotism
5. Procurement, promotion and staff recruitment
6. Resources allocated are not efficiently used
7. Promotion of forest guards

Therefore from the above KFS need to establish that what the background of such vices is. Therefore at KFS we can conclude that Systemic, Individual and Petty. This occur when there is an oversight gap in the system i.e. in recruitment or an individual does it for personal i.e. misuse of fund/ resources or simply petty an ENCOM officer allowing transportation of wood, timber and other related items without a valid permit. Thus KFS needs to constantly ensure that all her employees are frequently sensitized and reminded of the effects of corruption within a work place. It would be imperative for KFS to monitor and give incentives to deserving ENCOM officer and come up with a community monitoring strategy where they partner with such individuals to protect natural resources and collaboration with NGO’s is another effective means of protecting the resources.

Reasons that Lead to Corruption at KFS

Desire for unfair advantage, Lack of punitive measures, lack of incentives poor transparency, dysfunctional system, complex processes and procedures as well as Lack of social control mechanism are some of the most commonly mentioned causes of corruption. However this might differ from organization to another depending of the structures, policies and penalties put in place.
When this was measured against KFS the following were mentioned as the most probable causes of corruption:

1. Grading structure
2. Procurement process
3. Ignorance of provision of the forest Act 2005
4. Bureaucracy in sale of forest products
5. Issuing of permits and transporting twice with the same permit
6. Lack of check and balances within the KFS mostly heads are prone to that
7. Meagre wages and greediness
8. Nepotism and tribalism which leads to non qualified staff being employed
9. Recruitment of personnel and promotion of staff
10. Strategic deployment and posting
11. Top management unwanted tours and travels.
12. Unintended / unplanned programmes

From the above it was established that structures and policies need to be strengthened further by ensuring that ENCOM officer’s responsibilities are commensurate with pay might solve the issues of allowing Permit holders from using the same permit twice. Strengthening the Human Resource policies will help ease and enlighten the employees on salary and wage structure, employment and promotion criteria among others. The internal audit might also help to curb spending.

4.15 Changes to ease corruption at KFS

Educating the employees and customers on the effects of corruption to the organization and the economy, Changing the process/ system, increasing contact with customers and transparency and accountability are some ways that can curb corruption. KFS has readily embraced some of this such as open plan offices, communicating with customers through text message among others are strategies already being implemented. When asked what were some areas that they felt if changed would ease corruption levels at KFS. They are outlined as shown herein below:
1. Allow offices in station to dispose of minor forest produce without necessarily seeking authority from the HQ but also informing the headquarter about the same
2. Good payments in terms of salaries and allowances
3. Carry out an audit of all staff to establish their qualification this will lead to staff being posted in correct grades and without favour and discrimination but on merit to avoid demoralization among staff
4. Provide enough working tools
5. Enhance mode of recruitment
6. Promotion devoid of nepotism, promotion purely on meritocracy
7. The responsibility of each cadre of their areas of work should be respected
8. Employ more guards
9. Increase sensitization programmes
10. Train staff about integrity so to create independent oversight team

Too much bureaucracy from the headquarters were some areas mentioned that lead to corrupt practices especially in the forest zones where the duration taken to get information takes long thus taking officers make decisions on their own and without reporting structures after that makes them not report. Placement and promotion need to be conducted in a free and transparent manner whereby in such a case a job evaluation might help to sole that.
5.1 Recommendation and conclusion

The Corruption index score was at 1.425, the index for NON ENCOM Staff was 1.44 and 1.41 for ENCOM Officers, these scores was informed by key parameters undertaken to establish the corruption perception at KFS.

5.2 Benchmarking CPI (International and Nationally)

According to Transparency International (TI), Mean Corruption Perception Index (2013) for 177 Countries is at 50% on a scale of 0-100. This translates to 1.5 on a scale of 0-3. This index captures informed views of analysts and experts in countries around the world. In Kenya, Ethics and Anti-corruption has provided a benchmark index of 67.7% or 2,031 on a scale of 0-3. Internationally Kenya’s CPI stands at 2.37 on a scale of 0-3 among 177 countries surveyed. The survey targeted public and government institutions. These scores compared to KFS CPI of 1.42 can be seen, by inspection that KFS has neither surpassed International nor National CPI levels.

5.3 Assessment of the level of corruption in KFS

The Survey established that the 63% of the respondents had been sensitized on corruption, 67% were aware of corruption in the workplace, 45% felt that procurement was well regulated and 35% were disagreeing to this. Of those interviewed 72% indicated that they had seen suggestion boxes at KFS, 50% knew what the available whistle were blowing channels while a further 40 percent did not agree. 50% indicated they had anti-corruption calendars at KFS and 39% disagreed. Integrity training was at 61% and Rewarding performance had an agreement level of 62%.

From the above it can be concluded that sensitization needs to be enhanced, awareness increased, whistle blowing channels, EACC calendars also needs to be increased.

It was also established that as much as majority of the respondents do have information about corruption there is need to have frequent refresher course and information through training at the workplace .however. The management should create an in house mechanism that the respondents can use to report all forms of corruption. Correct information should be
conveyed to the respondents who believe that there is corruption. This will help them in making the right decisions on corruption.

Training should also be continuous and should be carried out on the respondents. This should be done by an external trainer. Ethics and Anti corruption Commission (EACC) should be consulted to train the respondents on corruption and what is expected of a public officer at the workplace.

5.4 Recommendations

The Following are recommendations that the consultant is proposing for implementation by KFS to ensure that the corruption perception index is brought down.

1. KFS is encouraged to frequently sensitize her suppliers and employees on the procurement process, as some of the supplier indicated that procurement process took too long. As one of the suppliers from Nairobi said “when we send our documents after they advertise it takes too long before we get any feedback” another from Kisii said “I wish they can increase the pace of evaluation and be informing us on the process as this will create a feeling that that procurement process is carried out in an open and timely manner” this alongside ensuring that employees know how to handle suppliers especially in the field and forest stations.

2. KFS staff needs to be sensitized on the available whistle blowing channels so as to enable them report such cases and incidence without fear of victimization. Training on integrity and Anti-corruption will enable staff to be able to discern what some of the corrupt practices are and be able to mitigate against such. A respondent from Mt Elgon had this to say “Top KFS officers to be transparent and accountable for any corruption practices that may take place” Another from Kwale said “no proper channels of & ways of dealing with matters e.g. a lot of discrimination of staffs.”

3. It is suggested that Enforcement and Compliance division need to be provided with dedicated vehicles for patrols and staff strength be enhanced as well as other staff package. As one Encom Officer from Isiolo put it “Encom staff are not well motivated look at KWS they have enough vehicles and are well motivated from Uniform to food” another from Gede said “by increasing staff numbers, pay and allowances so as not to be compromised by those who engage in illegal logging”. 
4. There was a general growing consensus that low government wages might be a contributor to corruption and misuse of public resources. This could be in the form over stated/quoted per diems and other allowances and not writing receipts for purchased seedlings thus denying the service much needed revenue. Respondents from Mt. Elgon had this to say “Not writing a receipt when a client purchase seedlings and procurement for office supplies without receipt” another from Mau said “In order to increase revenue why can’t we embrace use of mobile money to a particular pay bill number”. Yet a similar concern was echoed from Majimazuri “Pay staffs good salary and benefits, transparency in all KFS operations.”

In view of the above KFS might consider carrying out a job evaluation and a salary survey so as to be able to remunerate her employees as per the market rates and also ensuring that staffs on the same job group are within the same pay bracket.

5. Asset tagging is another way of ensuring that small portable items and equipments are not looted. This can be further enhanced by having division wise inventories and further cascaded downward to departmental levels/ conservancies, forest stations and zones. Also by providing locks for electronic equipments such as laptops and printers will help safeguard KFS equipment’s. “Proper auditing of all office equipments by independent auditors” was made by a respondent in TaitaTeveta. While another said “If equipment’s are bought without a receipt and after a few weeks the equipment disappears how can you be accountable”.

6. The respondents indicated that some were posted to lower cadres yet more qualified for better grades. This was attributed to Nepotism, Tribalism and Favoritism. A respondent from Mwingi-Mumoni had this to say “The use of tall relatives i.e. those in high offices & tribal umbrellas to push you through” another from Ramuruti said “Favoritism and tribalism are the cards being played in promotion” This can be tacked by doing a Job Evaluation and a Skills Audit to ascertain where there shortfall might be.

7. It is also highly encouraged for KFS to conduct frequent transfers and reshuffles from time to time, this can either be inter offices or inter-zones, this will de-link corrupt practices that tend to develop with employees staying for too long at a given work station.

8. Clear communication channels help organization work in harmony. KFS is also encouraged to enhance its communication channels to enable both its top level management to communicate effectively to its junior employees. “No proper channels of & ways of dealing with matters e.g. a lot of discrimination of staff” was a comment from a
respondent in Suneka-Kisii and another from Wire had this to say “Poor communication to junior staffs leads to lack of understanding and conflict of interest”.
APPENDIX 1: CORRUPTION PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

CORRUPTION PERCEPTION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE No___________

Introduction
The Kenya Forest Service (KFS) has contracted Envag Associates Ltd to carry out Corruption Perception survey. The purpose of this survey is to find out the perception of Customers /Employees towards Corruption at KFS. We are therefore kindly requesting you to fill in all sections of this questionnaire and return it to Envag Associates Officer who will also be available for any assistance. All questions should have only one answer. Do not indicate your name.

Your response will be treated confidentially.

Kindly respond to the following questions appropriately.

1. Kindly indicate your Sex
   a. Female [  ]
   b. Male [  ]

2. Kindly indicate your Age (Please tick appropriately below)
   a. 18 -24 years [  ]
   b. 25 -34 years [  ]
   c. 35 -44 years [  ]
   d. 45 -54 years [  ]
   e. 55 years and over [  ]

3. Kindly indicate your Marital Status
   a. Single [  ]
   b. Married [  ]
   c. Other [  ]

Specify__________________________________________________________________

4. Kindly indicate your job grade (where applicable)________________________

5. Kindly indicate your Department/ Section (where applicable)_______________

6. How long have you worked/ Associated with KFS?
   a) Less than 1 year [  ]
   b) Between 1 - 4 years [  ]
   b) Between 5-10 years [  ]
   c) More than 10 years [  ]

7. How long do you expect to continue working/ associating with KFS? _________

8. KFS has sensitized staff/ customers on effects of corruption at work place
   1. Yes [  ]
   2. No [  ]
   3. Do not know [  ]
9. I am aware of corruption risk at my KFS
   1. Yes [ ]
   2. No [ ]
   3. Do not know [ ]

10. KFS is strict on procurement regulations
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

11. There are Anti-corruption suggestion boxes at the KFS
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

12. There is a whistle blowing channel in case one detects corruption at KFS
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

13. EACC calendars are distributed to KFS offices
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

14. Staff/ Customers have been warned on corrupt practices
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

15. KFS staff have been trained on integrity
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

16. KFS does not entertain suspects involved in any corrupt practices
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

17. KFS rewards high performing staff
    1. Yes [ ]
    2. No [ ]
    3. Do not know [ ]

18. State any three most prevalent types of corruption at KFS
    a. ________________________________________
    b. ________________________________________
19. State any three reasons that lead to corruption at KFS
   a. __________________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________________

20. Kindly give your perception level on prevalence of corruption in the KFS Departments based on services offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Department/ Sections</th>
<th>Level of prevalence of corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kenya Forestry College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Human Resources and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corporate communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enforcement And Compliance Division (ENCOM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Corporate Services Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plantation and Enterprise Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Forest Conservation and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Forest Extension Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MitiMingiMaisha Bora Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How would you rate the level of corruption in KFS today?
   1. Very high [ ]
   2. Moderate [ ]
   3. Low [ ]
   4. Don't know [ ]

22. When rating the level of corruption in KFS, what do you base your assessment on?
   1. Personal experience [ ]
   2. Discussions with others [e.g. colleagues etc] [ ]
   3. Information from the institution [ ]
   4. Information from the media [ ]
   5. Information from Ethics and Anti Corruption Commission [ ]
   6. Information from politicians [ ]
   7. Information from a place of worship [ ]
   8. Other (Specify) [ ]

23. Compared to one year ago how has the level of corruption changed in KFS?
   1. Increased [ ]
   2. Reduced [ ]
   3. Remained the same [ ]
24. What would you attribute your answer in 21 above to?

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

25. What are your expectations next year in corruption levels at KFS?
   1. Very high [ ]
   2. Moderate [ ]
   3. Low [ ]
   4. Don't know [ ]

26. In your own assessment, how widespread is corruption among the employees of KFS?
   1. Almost all officials are involved in it [ ]
   2. Most officials are involved in it [ ]
   3. Only a few officials are involved in it [ ]
   4. Hardly any officials are involved in it [ ]
   5. Don't Know/Not Applicable [ ]

27. Was any Pressure exerted on you to engage in corrupt practice?
   1. Yes [ ]
   2. No [ ]

28. If Yes, How much pressure was exerted on you to engage in corruption?
   1. A lot of pressure [ ]
   2. Fair amount of pressure [ ]
   3. A little pressure [ ]
   4. No pressure at all [ ]

29. Please state/explain two things that you want changed at KFS to reduce corruption

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking time to fill in this questionnaire

For official use only
Name of Enumerator ___________________________ Date __________________________