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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 Envaq 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 overall corruption index stood at 0.3609. This score indicates that corruption perception at KFS is low.

0= Corruption free
>0-1= Low
>1-2= medium
>2-3= high

A score of 0.3609 will be considered to be low corruption when put on a scale of 0 to 3.

Table E1 below depicts the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scores (%)</th>
<th>Scale 0-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Magnitude of corruption</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>0.43502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Expectation of change next year in corruption</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>0.39398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Corrupt Practice</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>0.33632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Exerted Pressure</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.27828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>0.36090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table above it can be deduced that “Magnitude of corruption” had the highest score of 14.5% followed by “Expectation of change next year in corruption” 13.13%. Exerted Pressure was last with “9.28% followed by “Corruption Practices” 11.21%.

4. Conclusions

The corruption level at the KFS was in between low levels moderate corruption level with an overall corruption index of 0.3609.
5. Suggestions for Improvement

Recommendations

The corruption perception at KFS is at low level; most employees agreed that although they have witnessed corruption at KFS, it is on the reducing trend compared to the previous years.

Although most customers perceive that there is corruption at KFS, they feel that it has reduced compared to previous years.

Some of the common corruption practices perceived at KFS include;

- Long procurement process
- Misuse of funds/resources
- Tribalism
- Favorism
- Procuring of sub-standard goods at a high price
- When recruiting new employees
- Training opportunities selection

Some of the reasons that lead to corruption at KFS include;

- Procurement given to the well connected people
- Senior officers wants their relatives employed
- Some staff are selected for training even if not qualified
- Unavailability of equal opportunities among staff
- Poor working environment
- Greed
- Poor monitoring
- Lack of accountability

It is therefore very important that KFS should address the causes of corruption within and without the Kenya Forest Service.
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 in form of statements. These statements were analyzed and presented in form of index in the preceding sections of this report. The data was analyzed by the use of SPSS and presented in form 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 survey targeted 500 employees and 150 customers as shown in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1. Respondents’ category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>650</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.

![Gender Chart]

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.
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 0.3609 indicating that the levels of corruption at KFS is low.

Therefore on of score of 0 to 3
0= Corruption free
>0-1= Low
>1-2= medium
>2-3= high

A score of 0.3609 will be considered to be at low level when put on a scale of 0 to 3. Table 4.1 below depicts the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scores (%)</th>
<th>Scale 0-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Magnitude of corruption</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>0.43502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Expectation of change next year in corruption</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>0.39398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Corrupt Practice</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>0.33632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Exerted Pressure</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.27828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>0.36090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Table above it can be deduced that “Magnitude of corruption” had the highest score of 14.5% followed by “Expectation of change next year in corruption” 13.13%. Exerted Pressure was last with “9.28% followed by “Corruption Practices” 11.21%.

4.2 Overall Corruption Index

This section and the subsequent sections present the findings the on corruption perception and incidences at KFS. The overall corruption index stood at 0.3609. This score Indicates that the corruption perception level at KFS is low.
4.3 Sensitization of corruption

The parameter of corruption was also done in the survey. 82% of the respondents interviewed have been sensitized on the effect of corruption at the workplace. 15% of the majorities of the respondents have not been sensitized on the effects of corruption at the workplace. 3% 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: 82% of the population were aware of corruption at the workplace while 18% were not aware of corruption risk at workplace.
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. 59% of the respondents do agree that KFS is strict on procurement regulations. 32% of the population on the other hand do not agree. 9% of the populations do not know whether KFS is strict on procurement regulations.
4.6 Anticorruption suggestions boxes at KFS

One way of curbing corruption at the workplace is the provision of suggestions boxes at KFS. 26% of the respondents said that there is no anti corruption suggestion boxes. KFS on the other hand 65% said there were anti-corruption suggestion boxes at KFS while 9% of respondents do not know whether there is any anti corruption suggestion boxes at KFS.

![Availability of Anti-Corruption Reporting Boxes](image)

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. 56% of the employees interviewed provided information that there was whistle blowing mechanism that detects corruption. 15% of the individuals interviewed do not know of any whistle blowing channel in case one detects corruption. 29% of the respondent further stated that there are not aware of whistle blower mechanism.
59% of the respondent said there were corruption channels at KFS, 29% said there in none while 12% were not aware whether there were reporting channels on not as shown in the Figure below.
4.9 Warning on corruption practices

85 per cent of the staff interviewed has been warned not to engage in any of the corruption practices at KFS 15 % of the staff interviewed have not been warned of any corruption practices.

![Warning on corruption practices graph]

4.10 Staff training on Integrity

Training on integrity is a critical component in the fight for corruption. 12 % of the respondent interviewed have not been trained on integrity 88 % of the staff have been trained on integrity.
83% of the respondents interviewed believe that KFS entertain members of staff suspected to be involved in corruption practices. 9% of the respondents interviewed agree that KFS does not entertain members of staff suspected to be involved in any corruption practices. 8% do not know whether KFS encourages or discourages staff involved in any corruption practices.
4.12 Rewarding performance

76% of the respondents do agree that KFS rewards high performing staff. On the other hand, 20% do not agree that KFS rewards high performing employees and a further 4% do not know whether KFS rewards high performing employees.

![KFS rewards high performing staff](image)

4.13 Forms or practices of corruption encountered or witnessed at KFS

Forms of corruption practices at KFS are as follows: Tribalism/Nepotism at 31%, Favouritism at 25%, Abuse of office at 18%, Misuse and misappropriation of government resources 11%, Un-procedural tendering at 9%, Bribery demand at 4% and extortion at 2%. The Figure below shows the response on “forms or practices of corruption”.

![Forms of corruption](image)
4.14 Rating of level of corruption at KFS

This was to measure the level of corruption prevalence and incidences at KFS, 6% indicated that they were very high, 31% indicated that they were moderate, 33% indicated that corruption levels at KFS were low, and 28% were indifferent. The Figure below shows the response on “how would you rate the level of corruption.”
4.15 Assessment based on Respondents’ Rating

When rating the level of corruption the respondents based personal experience at 39%, their ratings on discussion with others at 34%, information from media at 13%, information from the institution at 8%, 4% was based on the information got from EACC, others at 3% and place of worship and information from politician at 0%. Sources of information on corruption are shown in the chart below. The Figure below shows the response on “basis of rating corruption level in KFS”.

![Assessment Based on respondents rating]

4.16 Comparison with a year ago

As compared to one year ago, the majority 27% indicated corruption remained the same compared to 1 year ago, 24% were of the opinion it had reduced, 12% thought there was an increase and 36% did not know. The Figure below shows the response on “comparison with one year ago on corruption level.
4.17 Expectations for the coming year

The respondents anticipate that corruption levels in the coming year will reduce at 50% and 26% were indifferent towards the same, 17% of the respondents selected that corruption levels will be moderate and 6% indicate they expect corruption levels to increase. The Figure below shows the response on “expectations of the coming year”.

![Graph showing expectation of corruption level next year](image)
4.18: How much pressure was exerted on you to engage in Corruption

When asked if pressure was exerted on them to engage in corruption, 82% of the respondents denied that pressure was exerted 3% and 14% admitted that little pressure and a fair amount of pressure was exerted on them respectively. 0% agreed that a lot of pressure was exerted on them. The Figure below shows the response on “How much pressure was exerted on you to engage in corruption at KFS?”

![Pressure exerted to Engage in corruption](image)

4.19 Spread of Corruption among KFS Staff

The respondents indicated that only a few officials are involved in it at 46%, the indifferent respondents each posted a score of 43%, Most officials are involved in it at 6%, 6% said that almost all officials are involved in it and hardly any officials and The Figure below shows the response on “how wide spread is corruption at KFS?”

![Spread of Corruption among KFS Staff](image)
4.20 Who initiates a bribe?

At KFS bribe is usually initiated by 9% The person offers a payment on his/ her own accord, 9% know before hand how to pay and how much to pay and only 6% KFS staff indicates or asks for a payment.38 % and 38% do not know and have no opinion if bribe is usually initiated. The Figure below shows response on who usually initiates a bribe.
4.21 What happens when there are delays on services at KFS?

The respondents indicated that when there are delays on services, most 49% lodge complaints with the management. 30% just wait until the service is delivered while 18% use people at the top to help them access the service. Only a few respondents report to Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission 3%. The Figure below shows the response on “what happens when there are delays in services at KFS?”
4.22 Spread of Corruption among KFS Staff

The respondents indicated that only a few officials are involved in it at 46%, the indifferent respondents each posted a score of 43%, Most officials are involved in it at 6%, 6% said that almost all officials are involved in it and hardly any officials and Figure below shows the response on “how wide spread is corruption at KFS?”. 

Widespread of corruption among employees

- Most officials are involved in it 6%
- Only few officials are involved in it 46%
- Hardly officials are involved 6%
- Do not Know 43%
4.23 Who initiates a bribe?

At KFS bribe is usually initiated by 9% The person offers a payment on his/ her own accord, 9% know before hand how to pay and how much to pay and only 6% KFS staff indicates or asks for a payment. 38 % and 38% do not know and have no opinion if bribe is usually initiated. The Figure below shows response on who usually initiates a bribe.

4.24 What happens when there are delays on services at KFS?

The respondents indicated that when there are delays on services, most 49% lodge complaints with the management. 30% just wait until the service is delivered while 18% use people at the top to help them access the service. Only a few respondents report to Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission 3%. The Figure below shows the response on “what happens when there are delays in services at KFS?”
Won't worry, just wait, until it comes 30%
Lodge a complaint to the top management 49%
Use influential people to help you 18%
Report to Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission 3%
5.1 Recommendations

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

Recommendations

The corruption perception at KFS is at low level; most employees agreed that although they have witnessed corruption at KFS, it is on the reducing trend compared to the previous years.

Although most customers perceive that there is corruption at KFS, they feel that it has reduced compared to previous years.

Some of the common corruption practices perceived at KFS include;

- Long procurement process
- Misuse of funds/resources
- Tribalism
- Favorism
- Procuring of sub-standard goods at a high price
- When recruiting new employees
- Training opportunities selection

Some of the reasons that lead to corruption at KFS include;

- Procurement given to the well connected people
- Senior officers wants their relatives employed
- Some staff are selected for training even if not qualified
- Unavailability of equal opportunities among staff
- Poor working environment
- Greed
- Poor monitoring
- Lack of accountability

It is therefore very important that KFS should address the causes of corruption within and without the Kenya Forest Service.
APPENDIX I: CORRUPTION PERCEPTION STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

CORRUPTION PERCEPTION SURVEY STAFF 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>MittiMingiMaisha 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 [ ]
4. Don't Know [ ]

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 _____________________
APPENDIX I: CORRUPTION PERCEPTION CUSTOMERS QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

Kenya Forest Service (KFS) has contracted Envag Associates Ltd to carry out Corruption Perception Survey. KFS will use the findings of this study to effect changes that will help it to accomplish its mission. We are therefore kindly requesting you to fill 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. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the level of prevalence of corruption in KFS on a five point scale (1-5) Scored as:

No.: Description
Not at all
Little
Indifferent
Much
Very much

1. Based on above scores, give your perception level on prevalence of corruption in the Departments that you sought services at KFS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Level of prevalence of corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department [Specify]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What form(s) or practice(s) of corruption have you encountered/witnessed in the course of seeking services?

a. Abuse of office [ ]
b. Bribery demand [ ]
c. Extortion [ ]
d. Favouritism [ ]
e. Tribalism/nepotism [ ]
f. Misuse and misappropriation of government resources [ ]
g. Un-procedural tendering [ ]
   Other (specify) [ ]

3. At the place or department where services are being offered, have you ever given unofficial payment or a favour in order to get the services?

a. Yes [ ]
b. No [ ]
4. If yes, how many times? ________________________________________________

5. If you gave money/gift, how much? (Approximate the value) ______________

6. What made you give the money/gift?
   a. I voluntarily offered as a token [ ]
   b. I usually give to obtain service [ ]
   c. Too much delay in service delivery [ ]
   d. It was demanded [ ]
   e. Others (specify) ____________________ [ ]

7. How would you rate the level of corruption in KFS today?
   a. Very high [ ]
   b. Moderate [ ]
   c. Low [ ]
   d. Don’t know [ ]

8. When rating the level of corruption in KFS, what do you base your assessment on?
   a. Personal experience [ ]
   b. Discussions with others [ ]
   c. Information from the institution [ ]
   d. Information from the media [ ]
   e. Information from Kenya Anti Corruption Commission [ ]
   f. Information from politicians [ ]
   g. Information from a place of worship [ ]
   h. Other(Specify) [ ]

9. Compared to one year ago, how has the level of corruption changed in KFS?
   a. Increased [ ]
   b. Reduced [ ]
   c. Remained the same [ ]
   d. Don’t know [ ]

10. What would you attribute your answer in 9 above to:

11. What are your expectations next year in corruption levels
    a. Very high [ ]
    b. Moderate [ ]
    c. Low [ ]
    d. Don’t know [ ]

12. How much pressure was exerted on you by officers of KFS to engage in corruption?
    a. A lot of pressure [ ]
    b. A fair amount of pressure [ ]
    c. A little pressure [ ]
    d. No pressure at all [ ]

13. In your own assessment, how widespread is corruption among the employees of KFS?
    a. Almost all officials are involved in it [ ]
    b. Most officials are involved in it [ ]
    c. Only a few officials are involved in it [ ]
    d. Hardly any officials are involved in it [ ]
    e. Don’t Know/Not Applicable [ ]
14. Who usually initiates a bribe (read the options and tick as appropriate)
   a. A service provider indicates or asks for a payment
   b. The person offers a payment on his/ her own accord
   c. It is known beforehand how to pay and how much to pay
   d. Do not Know
   e. No opinion

15. What would you do if you experience delays while waiting for the services in this institution?
   a. Won’t worry, just wait, until it comes
   b. Offer a bribe or a gift to the official
   c. Use influential people to help you
   d. Lodge a complaint to the top management
   e. Report to Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission
   f. Do nothing and give up
   g. Other (Specify)

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

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

17. State/Explain the facility or area most affected by corruption at KFS

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

18. Any other additional suggestion(s)

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

19. How long have you partnered with KFS?
   a) Less than 1 year
   b) Between 1 – 4 years
   b) Between 5-10 years
   c) More than 10 years

20. 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

21. Gender
   a. Female
   b. Male

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Enumerator ________________________ Date _________________________