



MURANG'A COUNTY GOVERNMENT

REPORT OF THE TASKFORCE ON COUNTY STAFF AUDIT

OCTOBER, 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Governor of the County Government of Murang'a, H.E Dr. Irungu Kang'ata, CBS vide Kenya Gazette Notice No 11074 dated 16th September, 2022 appointed a Taskforce on County Staff Audit. Further the Governor vide letter Ref. No MCG/ CS/ST/1(180) dated 31st August 2022, requested the Principal Secretary, State Department of Public Service (SDPS) for technical assistance to undertake the above exercise for the County. The Principal Secretary, vide letter Ref: MPSG/DPSM/ 24/7/ (18) dated 15th September, 2022 nominated a taskforce of officers from SDPS to join the taskforce.

The County Staff Audit was undertaken to ascertain the status of human resource capital management in Murang'a County. The aim of the exercise was to provide the baseline for the management of Human Capital in the County Public Service of Murang'a for consequent improvement of service delivery to Murang'a Citizenry. The Report will therefore contribute greatly to the enhancement of management and development of the human capital in the county.

The Taskforce Members

| | Name | Position |
|----|----------------------|------------------|
| 1 | Ms. Anne Thumbi | Chairperson |
| 2 | Mr. Edward Mwangi | Vice Chairperson |
| 3 | Ms. Catherine Mwaura | Member |
| 4 | Dr. Fredrick Mbugua | Member |
| 5 | Ms. Magdalene Kabui | Member |
| 6 | Ms. Jane Njuguna | Member |
| 7. | Mr. Eliud Wanja | Member |
| 8. | Mr. Daniel Maina | Member |
| 9. | Mr. Maingi Kamau | Member |
| 10 | Mr. Duncan Kihara | Member |

Technical Staff from the National Government

| | Name | Designation | Organization |
|----|-------------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Mrs. Catherine Ng'ang'a | Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 2. | Mrs. Flora Mutua | Deputy Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 3. | Mr. Martin Situma | Deputy Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 4. | Mrs. Elizabeth Ndegwa | Assistant Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 5. | Ms. Matilda Okhotso | Assistant Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 6. | Ms. Faith Ikiara | Assistant Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 7. | Mrs. Gorretti Gicheha | Assistant Director, Human Resource Management & Development | State Department For Public Service |
| 8. | Mr. Stephen Mbogo | Deputy Director, Planning, Research and Strategy | National Police Service Commission |
| 9. | Ms. Ann Mulea | Manager, Research & Statistics | National Government Constituency Development Fund Board |

Objectives of the County Staff Audit

The main objective of the County Staff Audit was to conduct an independent, objective and systematic examination on compliance of the County Human Resource Management with related employment laws and public service regulations. The examination was focused on functions including but not limited to recruitment, selection, appointments, training, promotions, re-designations, employee benefits and payroll administration.

Further, the audit was expected to examine the County's Human resource policies, practices, and procedures and identify any anomalies which may exist in the management of Human Resource. The audit was to provide recommendations and suggest appropriate measures and actions that the County would adopt in correcting deviations/non-compliance and improving the effectiveness and efficient management of the County Human Resource. The audit was also geared towards establishing a baseline on which the new administration will evaluate its performance against.

The specific objectives of the audit were to enable the County Government:

- i. Streamline processes relating to acquisition, development and retention of human resources;
- ii. Enable proper placement of staff;
- iii. Account for every staff benefiting from personnel emoluments;
- iv. Ensure smooth staff exit and reduce litigation;
- v. Recommend areas for future improvements; and
- vi. Align Human Resource systems with the County Government's mandate, vision, mission, values, objectives and the National Government Development Agenda.

The County Staff Audit comprised of three (3) components namely:

- i. Staff Headcount;
- ii. Systems Audit; and
- iii. Process Audit.

Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for the exercise were to:

- i. Review all the processes relating to recruitment, selection, appointments, training, promotions, re-designations, employee benefits and payroll administration and identify any gaps/non-compliance and short comings in the past years.
- ii. Link all the employees in both the IPPD and the manual payroll with rightful recruitment and placement.
- iii. Account for every staff benefiting from the personnel emoluments of the County Government of Murang'a.
- iv. Determine whether there has been recruitments/hiring/processing of salaries that has not been properly authorized and recorded.
- v. Compile report with recommendations of actions that the County should undertake to enhance compliance with employment related laws.

Scope

All the employees of the County Government of Murang'a.

Methodology

The following methodologies were deployed in undertaking the exercise:

a. Staff headcount

- i. Physical staff Headcount in all the Sub Counties; and
- ii. Staff Biodata capture.
- iii. Departmental staff returns
- iv. Random spot checks in workstations

b. Process audit

- i. Literature Review of critical strategic documents relating to recruitment, selection, appointments, training, promotions, re-designations; and
- ii. Discussions and consultations between the Taskforce and County leadership.

c. Payrolls Audit

- i. Review IPPD and Manual payrolls;
- ii. Compare Staff Biodata with staff payrolls; and
- iii. Analysis of the payrolls using unique personal identifiers such as National Identity numbers and Staff payroll numbers

It is important to note that the Report is not exhaustive of all the areas required for the improvement of Human Resource Management and Development in the County. It should therefore be read alongside laws, policies, guidelines and the best public service practices that enable public bodies to have a strongly motivated and performance oriented human resource.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Governor of the County Government of Murang'a, H.E Dr. Irungu Kang'ata, CBS vide Kenya Gazette Notice No 11074 dated 14th September, 2022 appointed a Taskforce on County Staff Audit. This was later joined by a taskforce of officers from State Department of Public Service (SDPS). The Committee held its inaugural meeting on 19th September, 2022.

The main objective of the Human Resource Audit was to conduct an independent, objective and systematic examination on compliance of the County Human Resource Management with related employment laws and public service regulations. The examination was focused on the following functions; recruitment, selection, appointments, training, promotions, re-designations, employee benefits and payroll administration among others.

In order to drive the County Government's development agenda in line with the National Governments' agenda, the County has prioritized five (5) key areas, namely, Healthcare, Ward Fund, Early Childhood Development Education (ECDE), Agriculture and Business environment. The results of the County staff audit would form a baseline on which the administration will assess its performance.

In order to conduct the audit successfully, the following methodology was used to arrive at the findings: - staff headcount, Process review and audit and Payroll audit.

The report shows the seven existing payrolls in Murang'a County. These payrolls are: - IPPD, CHVs, Casuals, Youth Polytechnics, HNIF, and volunteer nurses' payrolls.

At the inception of County Government, Murang'a County inherited staff from the national government, TSC and former local authorities. The County through CPSB has recruited approximately 2,168 staff in the last ten (10) years.

The Taskforce noted the following Human Resource management gaps: -

- i. That prior authority to recruit was never sought from County Executive Committee in accordance with public service regulations.
- ii. That there was no approved staff establishment against which recruitment should be based on.
- iii. Failure to follow best practices on the advertisement of vacant positions as per the provided standard procedures.
- iv. That there were cases where one advertisement would be used repeatedly to recruit more than the advertised numbers. In some cases, advertisements were neither concluded nor cancelled.
- v. That appointment on contract terms was not applied uniformly for all Chief Officers and that of casuals exceeded the requisite duration as per the Employment Act, 2007.
- vi. It was noted that there were cases where the decision of the board on appointments was varied.

- vii. There were cases where officers were appointed to act for more than six months without evidence of intention to fill those positions substantively. Further, some officers are paid special duty allowance for performing duties that are more than two grades higher than their substantial grades against the public service regulations.
- viii. It was observed that there were volunteers in the health department some of whom had stayed for over one year.
- ix. The county had engaged officers beyond the mandatory retirement age of 60 years.
- x. There were positions that were advertised on contracts but terms were varied into permanent and pensionable terms before the expiry of the contracts.
- xi. The County has contracted guard services to man government premises which has resulted in duplication of roles and underutilisation of the county's security staff.
- xii. There was no report on identified training needs, such a report, generally informs prioritization of training programmes as well as allocation of resources to training. Thus, cases discussed at departmental level were neither informed by identified needs nor prioritized.
- xiii. There was no distinction between short- and long-term courses. Failure to distinguish between the two, results to the county failing to deduct and remit the training levy.
- xiv. Staff attending long courses and bonded were never followed up where they failed to return.
- xv. The taskforce could not establish whether staff provided back to office training reports.
- xvi. There was no evidence that impact evaluation of training is undertaken. Without such assessment, investment in training may not be justified.
- xvii. There was inadequate consultation between the County and the National Government on release of healthcare personnel such as the Doctors where capacity building is done by the National Government.
- xviii. The taskforce observed that some officers had stagnated in the same position for a period of more than three (3) years. Further that some cadres do not have career progression guideline thus inhibiting upward mobility.
- xix. Some of officers who had been promoted had not been issued with promotion letters though the promotions had been effected in the payroll.
- xx. Further, some officers from the former local authority with requisite qualifications had not been integrated into respective career progression frameworks. In addition, there were unresolved requests for promotions, re-designations and appeals.
- xxi. There was no evidence that performance contracts are signed between the respective officers. Therefore, no clear expression of the performance thresholds and expectations cascading down from the County Executive Committee to the other officers in service. The last manual performance appraisals were done in the FY 2019/2020.
- xxii. There was no evidence that the County had aligned itself to the Government Human Resource Information System (GHRIS) performance module where officers are appraised through the GHRIS.

- xxiii. There were delays in resolving these discipline cases. Such delays may result in serious financial implications occasioned by numerous litigations.
- xxiv. Some of the discipline cases had been concluded by the Board but the decision was yet to be implemented. There appeared to be no proper follow-up on some of the disciplinary actions.
- xxv. Commutation of Leave for cash was done in excess of 90 days which is contrary to provisions of the Human Resource Manual.
- xxvi. It was noted that at times the county failed to remit statutory deductions from employees which attracts penalties five-fold the amount.
- xxvii. A total of 5,366 employees turned up for the headcount of which 36% were male and 64% were female. Their age distribution was between 19 years and above 60. Technical staff were 25% while support staff were 75% for those who turned up for the headcount.

ANALYSIS, OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

HUMAN RESOURCE PROCESS AUDIT

The human resource process audit entailed recruitment, selection, appointment, training, promotions, re-designation and employee benefits.

Recruitment, Selection and Appointment

Since 2013, the County through CSPB has recruited approximately 2,168 members of staff on various terms of service. An analysis on records of recruitment, selection and appointment reveal the following HR management gaps:

- i. There was no evidence that prior authority to recruit was sought from County Executive Committee in accordance with public service regulations.
- ii. That there was no approved staff establishment against which recruitment should be based.
- iii. That there were cases where one advertisement was used repeatedly to recruit more than the advertised numbers without evidence of authority.
- iv. That appointment on contract terms was not applied uniformly especially for Chief Officers. Some Chief Officers were appointed to serve for the entire tenure of the Governor while others were appointed to serve on five (5) years fixed contract term which began much later after commencement of the Governor's term. The effect of this is that the Chief Officers continued to serve even after the expiry of the term of the Governor.
- v. Failure to follow best practices on the advertisement of vacant positions as per the provided standard procedures. For instance, interviews for the positions of Deputy County Secretary, Superintending Engineer and Community Oral Health officers were advertised on 22nd April 2022 with a closing date of 12th May 2022, interviews were conducted on 30th May 2022, selection, offer of appointment and acceptance of appointment were done the same day, 30th May 2022. In addition, there were cases of advertisements which were neither concluded nor cancelled.
- vi. Upon successful recruitment, employees were given letters of offer of appointment but were not appointed substantively to the positions vide appointment letters as per the standard procedures.
- vii. Variation of the Board decisions on appointment: Whereas the Board Secretary is supposed to communicate Board decisions, it was observed that there were some cases where the communication by the Secretary varied from the minuted decision of the Board.
- viii. Engagement of casuals: It was observed that the engagement of casuals exceeded the requisite duration as per the Employment Act 2007. Most casuals were engaged for a long and unspecified duration. In addition, there were no documentation to support their appointment and/or payment of salaries from the County Government.
- ix. Acting appointments: There were cases where officers were appointed to act for more than six months without evidence of intention to fill those positions substantively.

- x. Special duty allowance: It was noted that some officers were paid special duty allowance for performing duties that were more than two grades higher than their substantial grades against the public service regulations.

Engagement of Volunteers

It was observed that there were volunteers in the Health Department some of whom had served for over one year. The standard practise requires that volunteers serves for a period between 6 months to one year. These included volunteer nurses, community health volunteers and other health professionals. Some of these volunteers were being paid a stipend.

Engagement of Retirees

It was noted that there were officers who were engaged beyond the mandatory retirement age of 60 years against the Public Service regulations. During the audit, fifteen (15) officers were identified to be serving beyond the mandatory retirement age. This category excludes CECs, Board Members and PWDs.

The Breakdown of the officers is as shown below:

| No | Department | Number Of Officers |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Health, Water and Sanitation | 4 |
| 2. | Governorship and Coordination | 4 |
| 3. | County Public Service Board | 1 |
| 4. | Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation | 3 |
| 5. | Education and Technical Training | 3 |

Variation and Backdated terms

There were positions that were advertised on contracts terms. However, the same were varied into permanent and pensionable terms before the expiry of the contract. The variations were backdated to the first date of appointment on contract terms. This resulted to payment of double benefits by the County Government to the officers in form of gratuity and pension contribution.

Contracted Guard Services

The County had engaged contracted approximately three hundred and six (306) guards to man government premises. The County recently recruited one hundred (100) Enforcement Officers to undertake the security function in addition to the existing enforcement officers. This has resulted in duplication of roles and underutilisation of security personnel.

Training and Development

The County trained employees for both long and short-term training programmes. The trainings were for both skill development as well as career development. To undertake training there were several committees structured at departmental level. Further, Health facilities have their own committees. The committees are responsible for identification of training needs, prioritizing the needs, deliberating and recommending cases of training to the County Human Resource Management and Advisory Committee (CHRMAC) for approval. Staff interested in training made formal application to the respective Supervisors who then recommended the cases to the Departmental committee.

The CHRMAC, upon confirmation of availability of funds may approve the cases or decline.

The successful trainees were issued with course approvals to enable them undertake the respective training programmes. Staff undertaking long-term training were bonded to ensure the skills gained are utilized by the County upon completion of the training. The bond varied depending on the length of the course.

During the last two years, staff were trained in the following short courses; Supervisory skills management, Senior management course, Strategic Leadership Development Programme, Supervisory skills development, Environmental Impact Assessment & Audit, Certificate course in Meat Inspection, KDSP group training (KRA3), KDSP group Planning & M&E(KRA2), Project Development and Management Course, KDSP KRA 5 (Environment), Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation.

It was also observed that the following long courses were undertaken, Masters of Science in Commerce, Masters in Psychiatry, General Surgery COSECSA Fellowship, MBA in HealthCare Management, MSc. of Science in Health Economics and Policy, Masters of Dental Surgery in Periodontology, Masters of Dental Surgery in Oral &Maxillofacial Surgery, BSc. In Nursing, Higher Diploma in Pediatric Critical Care Nursing, Diploma in Renal Nursing, Higher Diploma in Clinical Medicine and Surgery, Upgrading Course for Medical Laboratory Technician, Diploma in Environmental Health Sciences, Masters in Dairy Chain Management, Diploma in Animal Health & Production, Higher Diploma in Addictive Science, BSc. in Medical Engineering and BSc. in Management & Leadership among others.

Issues

- i. The taskforce was never presented with a Training Needs Assessment report that would generally inform prioritization of training programmes as well as allocate resources to training. Thus, cases discussed at departmental level were not informed by an identified need.
- ii. The taskforce also observed that there was no distinction between short- and long-term courses. Failure to distinguish between the two, resulted in the county failing to deduct and remit training levy for the staff affected.
- iii. Staff attending long courses are supposed to be bonded to ensure that the county benefits from the investment in training. However, there was no evidence that staff on long courses who were bonded were ever followed up where they failed to return.

- iv. There was no follow up on staff who were on training. Back to office reports provide valuable insights on the relevance of the courses undertaken. The taskforce could not establish whether staff provided back to office reports.
- v. Impact evaluation of training is important in determining the effectiveness of training. There was no evidence that impact evaluation of training is undertaken. Without impact assessment of training, investment in training may not be justified.
- vi. There was inadequate consultation between the County and the National Government on release of healthcare personnel such as the Doctors where capacity building is done by the National Government.

Promotions and Re-Designations

Promotions and re-designations are guided by availability of vacancies in the authorised establishment, acquisition of requisite qualifications, availability of funds and work performance (merit). However, on perusal of records, the following issues were noted:

- i. Some officers had stagnated in the same position for a period of more than three (3) years.
- ii. There were cases of officers who had been promoted but were yet to be issued with promotional letters though the promotion had been effected in the payroll.
- iii. Some cadres did not have career progression guideline thus inhibiting upward mobility.
- iv. There were cases of officers from the former local authorities with requisite qualifications but were yet to be integrated into respective career progression frameworks.
- v. There were unresolved requests for promotions, re-designations and appeals.

Performance Management

Public bodies are required to adopt performance management framework in which there should be performance contracting where performance targets are set and then cascaded down to all levels of staff. This should be exemplified through a robust staff performance appraisal system. The performance contracting should commence from the Governor signing performance contract with the County Executive Committee Members and the same cascaded down to all the officers.

Issues

The taskforce identified the following issues on auditing performance management in the County:

- i. There was no evidence that performance contracts were signed between the respective officers. There was therefore no clear expression of the performance thresholds and expectations cascading down from the County Executive Committee to the other officers in service.

- ii. There was no evidence that the County had aligned itself to the Government Human Resource Information System (GHRIS) performance module where officers are appraised through the GHRIS.
- iii. The last manual performance appraisals evident from some of the personnel files was for the FY 2019/2020.

Discipline

The Public Service regulations require that discipline cases are resolved within six months. There were sixty-seven (67) active disciplinary cases during the audit.

The taskforce noted that there were forty-nine cases that were beyond the six months' period allowed for resolving discipline cases, six of which were for the period 2014, 2015 calendar year. Further, a majority of the cases were for 2021 and before.

Issues

- i. Delay in resolving these discipline cases may result in serious financial implications occasioned by numerous litigations.
- ii. Some of the cases had been concluded by the Board but the decision was yet to be implemented.
- iii. There was no proper mechanism for follow-up on disciplinary actions.

Commutation of Leave for Cash

Public Service regulations provide for commutation of leave for cash in cases where due to exigencies of duty, authority is granted to a member of staff to carry forward half of his/her leave days to the next leave year.

The taskforce noted that commutation of leave for cash was done for senior was done for CECs, Chief Officers, Directors and Members of the Board. In certain cases, commutation was done in excess of 90 days which is contrary to provisions of the Human Resource Manual.

Payment of Service Gratuity

Service gratuity is paid to staff serving on contract terms. However, it was noted that service gratuity for some employees was paid for the period that was covered by pension resulting from change of terms which was irregular.

Further, some employees though employed on contract were not informed of their rights of payment of service gratuity after lapse of their contracts.

Non-Remittance of Statutory Deductions

It was noted that there were occasions the County failed to remit statutory deductions generated from employees' salaries. Failure to remit such deductions attracts penalties sometimes five-fold the amount.

Further, during payroll processing for casuals the statutory deductions were not recovered and remitted as required by law.

HEAD-COUNT

A physical headcount was conducted across the County from 27th to 29th September 2022. Further, staff for one reason or another were unable to participate were given another opportunity to present themselves for the headcount at the County Headquarters on 3rd to 4th October 2022. The data received from Headcount was collated and recorded to generate staff bio-data for analysis. The analysis has been discussed and presented in the following thematic areas presented here below.

Total number of staff who turned up for the Headcount

A total of 5,366 employees turned up for the headcount.

Distribution of employees by Job Group

The audit also sought to establish staff distribution by job grade.

| Job Group | Percentage of Employees |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| S | 0.15% |
| P-R | 3% |
| K-N | 22% |
| F-J | 39% |
| A-E | 7% |
| CASUALS | 29% |

Data collected from the headcount indicate 29% of the total employees are casuals. This is followed by employees on Job Group F-J which comprises of ECDE Care givers, clerical officers, support staff and drivers.

The data reveals that technical officers across key departments that support the Governors' manifesto account for 25% against support staff at 75% meaning that they are grossly understaffed. Clearly, this level of staffing may not be able to adequately deliver on key areas of the current manifesto including, Universal HealthCare, establishment of a model hospital, Minimum Guaranteed Returns for certain agricultural value chain products, establish model ECDE Centers, revamp community polytechnics, career counseling program for secondary school students and reduction of business regulations among others.

Consequently, there is need to enhance capacity of the technical departments with the right numbers and officers with the right skills to deliver on the mandate. This could be achieved through scaling down the casual workers so as to release funds for hiring technical staff.

Distribution of employees per Department

The audit also revealed that the majority of staff are deployed in the Health, Water & Sanitation and Education & Technical Departments respectively while the office of the Governor and Department of Lands, Planning & Housing had the least respectively.

| Department | Number of Employees |
|---|---------------------|
| Agriculture, Livestock & Irrigation | 268 |
| Commerce, Trade, Industry and Investment | 38 |
| Education & Technical Training | 1388 |
| Energy, Transport and Infrastructure Development | 47 |
| Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change | 183 |
| Finance, IT and Economic Planning | 460 |
| Health, Water and Sanitation | 2456 |
| Land Planning and Housing | 22 |
| Office of the Governor | 3 |
| Public Service | 407 |
| Youth, Culture and Social Services | 94 |

PAYROLL ANALYSIS

Types of County Payroll

| County Payroll Summary | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------|
| S/No | Payroll Type | No. of Staff | % |
| 1 | IPPD | 3,643 | 49.58 |
| 2 | CHVs | 1,500 | 20.42 |
| 3 | Casual | 1,326 | 18.05 |
| 4 | Youth Polytechnics | 274 | 3.73 |
| 5 | Manual Payroll | 143 | 1.95 |
| 6 | NHIF | 113 | 1.54 |
| 7 | Volunteer Nurses | 42 | 0.57 |
| 8 | Contracted Guard | 306 | 4.16 |
| | Total | 7,347 | 100 |

Note:

- i. IPPD Payroll: This is the payroll for all the staff whose salary is processed through IPPD System and includes staff on permanent and pensionable terms, contract and secondment.
- ii. CHVs Payroll: This is the payroll for community health volunteers normally processed manually through Health department.
- iii. Casual payroll: This is the payroll for all staff employed on casual terms and includes General Clerks, Support Staff, Security Personnel and Revenue Clerks.
- iv. Youth Polytechnics payroll: This is the payroll for Instructors at various youth polytechnics. It is noted that the Instructors are employed on Casuals basis.
- v. Manual Payroll: This is the payroll for officers employed on permanent and on contract terms who have not been integrated in the IPPD either because they do not have personal numbers or their personal numbers have not been activated.
- vi. NHIF Payroll: This is the payroll for NHIF Claim Officers stationed in the health facilities for purposes of processing and linking claims between the NHIF National Office and the County Offices
- vii. Volunteer Nurses: This is the payroll for nurses who have been engaged as volunteers and most of them are retirees.
- viii. Contracted Security Guards: This is a contracted security service. The guards are over three hundred (300) in number and are paid through contracted services vote. The Audit revealed that the IPPD payroll has the highest number of employees, followed by the CHVs while volunteer nurses had the least.

Officers on Salary stoppage

It was noted that a total of sixty three (63) officers are on salary stoppage majorly because of absence from duty and non-compliance. Forty one (41) of the salary stoppages period range between one year (1) to eight (8) years and 22 of them are between 12 days to 8 months.

It was noted that out of the sixty three (63) officers on salary stoppage only eight (8) officers turned up for headcount. This small number of officers on disciplinary raises doubt on their status as employees. The cases on salary stoppage has been analyzed.

Officers on Salary stoppage

| S.No | Reason for Salary stoppage | No. of Officers |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Absence from Duty | 38 |
| 2 | Non-Compliance | 25 |
| Total | | 63 |

Staff whose details failed to map

It was noted that two hundred and twenty-two (222) staff details did not map using data from the payrolls and physical headcount. It is therefore recommended that the employment status of these officers should be established.

Wage-Bill comparison for the month of August and September 2022

The Taskforce noted that there was a significant drop of the salaries paid between the August and September 2022 amounting to Ksh. **8,261,892.40**. This drop was attributed to:

- i. Exit of officers whose contract was tied to the term of the previous Governor;
- ii. Salary stoppages that were effected immediately the staff audit commenced; and
- iii. Natural attrition

Issues

The Taskforce while analyzing payroll records for the County identified the following issues:

i. IPPD Payroll

- Officers who had retired and were yet to be marked for deletion;
- Officers whose salary had been stopped for more 5 years and were still appearing in the IPPD payroll;
- An officer with a TSC number in the IPPD system since 2019, and was yet to be integrated;
- An analysis on the staff register indicated a total of 132 Officers who had attained the mandatory retirement age of 60 years. These officers have been marked for deletion in the system though their payroll numbers were still active; and
- Fifteen officers engaged on Contract basis after attainment of mandatory retirement age.
- Audit queries previously raised on IPPD payroll as per the annexed lists. The queries raised were as follows:
 - 24 officers sharing bank accounts
 - 8 officers having doubtful arrears of Kshs. 12,758,238.20
 - 12 officers with duplicated arrears of Kshs. 14,034,375.00
 - 18 officers with multiple arrears of Kshs. 34,425,795.30
 - 3 officers with irregular gross of Kshs. 449,093.75
 - 16 officers earning a special salary of Kshs. 2,800,505.00
 - 313 officers earning rental house allowance of Kshs.40,297,122.90 while at the same time earning a house allowance of Kshs 71,474,723.20
 - 1462 officers with undeducted tax on arrears of Kshs. 84,806,098.50
 - 5 non-HR Editors who performed payroll transactions between 2016 and 2019

ii. Manual Payroll

Key issues identified included;

- There were officers awaiting payroll numbers while others who had payroll numbers were still being paid through the manual payroll;
- Officers who were hired e.g five (5) years back are still being paid in the Manual payroll; and
- Some officers in the manual payroll did not have their dates of birth indicated making it difficult to ascertain when they were due for mandatory retirement;

iii. Casual Workers Payroll

Key issues identified included;

- Some of the officers appearing in the Casual workers' payroll had no date of birth and the date when they were hired making it difficult to ascertain when they were due for mandatory retirement; and
- The period of engagement was not specified.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Specific Recommendations

- i. Establish a committee to ascertain if the officers who did not participate in the headcount and those whose details did not map were genuine employees of the County.
- ii. The County should urgently undertake a workload analysis to determine optimal staffing levels.
- iii. The County should undertake a skills audit for all categories of staff to address rightful placement of officers.
- iv. The case of the fifteen (15) employees serving beyond the mandatory retirement age should be reviewed in accordance with the laid down regulations.
- v. The case of the forty-two (42) volunteer nurses who have already retired from the Public Service should be reviewed in line with the service regulations.
- vi. A proper mechanism for follow-up of disciplinary actions be put in place.
- vii. Directorate of Human Resource Management to respond to the payroll audit queries with consequent actions on irregular payments.
- viii. Develop a costed implementation matrix to provide a roadmap for implementation of the recommendations in this report.

General Recommendations

- i. Prior to any recruitment the following measures must be put in place:
 - a. A request to fill vacant positions should be tabled to the County Executive Committee through the respective CEC Member,
 - b. Confirmation of funding to fill the vacant positions should be formally done and communicated by the CECM, Finance,
 - c. Approval by the CEC should be communicated to the CPSB by the County Secretary,
 - d. The Board should discuss the approved request in consultation with the Director - Human Resource.
- ii. The County Executive Committee should develop a County staff establishment through a consultative process and the same should be approved by the CPSB. The approved County staff establishment should be the basis of filling all vacant positions, staff recruitment, promotions and re-designations.
- iii. No advertisement should be used repeatedly unless express authority is given by the CECM in writing within the stipulated duration.
- iv. Advertisements should be specific to vacant positions being filled and should indicate the closing dates and time. The recruitment procedure documented in the HR Policy and Procedures Manual should be adhered to.
- v. Upon recruitment, successful candidates should be given offer letters. Upon acceptance, they should be issued with appointment letters. The date of assumption of office should be considered as the date of first appointment. Where appointed on probationary terms, officers should get confirmation of appointment after six months of successful probationary period.
- vi. The County requires to review/develop policy guidelines on recruitment and management of casuals within the existing legal and policy framework. Care should

be taken not to have casuals serving on permanent basis. Core functions within the County should be performed by substantively appointed employees.

- vii. The County should adhere to the Public Service Regulations governing appointments on acting capacity or special duty. Employees should not be appointed to act in positions they are not qualified to hold. Specifically, officers should not be appointed to perform special duties in a position that is more than two job-groups higher than their substantive position. The appointment should not exceed six (6) months.
- viii. The County requires to develop policy guidelines on engagement and management of volunteers. Engagement of volunteers should be on a need basis and be controlled and regulated by the CPSB.
- ix. Retirement of employees in the County should be dealt with in accordance with the PSC Act. However, retention of employees beyond the mandatory retirement age should only be done in cases of rare and scarce skills not evidently available in the County Public Service. Such must be fully justified and authority granted. Departments should ensure they have appropriate Human Resource plans and succession management plans to ensure continuity of services when officers retire.
- x. Variation and Backdated terms of service; Cases where terms of service were varied upon re-engagement by County Government for staff who transferred from TSC, defunct Local Authorities and the National Government resulting in overpayment of gratuity be recovered of the sums involved.
- xi. The County should review the engagement of contracted security guards who could be undertaking tasks that would be performed by the enforcement officers. Such tasks include manning government premises, ushering visitors and providing security.
- xii. Departments should prepare Training Needs Assessment and projections to guide on the trainings to be undertaken.
- xiii. The County should ensure adherence to the Public Service training policy on deduction of training levy and bonding.
- xiv. To address employee's stagnation in the County, the head of Human Resource in liaison with Chief Officers should ensure they have appropriate Human Resource plans, succession management plans and career progression guidelines.
- xv. The CPSB need to develop/review Career Progression guidelines for all cadres in the County.
- xvi. Cases of officers from the defunct local authority with requisite qualifications should be considered for harmonization to provide for career growth.
- xvii. The County should embrace performance management in accordance with Public Service guidelines. This should include:
 - a. Performance contracting cascaded down from the Governor to the CECMs
 - b. Staff Performance Appraisal from the HoDs to individual staffs
- xviii. All discipline cases should be concluded within six (6) months in accordance with the PSC Act, 2017 and Fair Administrative Action Act, 2015.
- xix. Payroll cleansing need to be done for the IPPD system before generating the monthly payroll or on a quarterly basis.

- xx. County should ensure that all officers are paid through the IPPD payroll system. The Human Resource Department should initiate request for personal numbers upon appointment of newly recruited officers.
- xxi. The County should stop generating manual payroll and the same should be closed in line with Circular issued by Controller of Budget office in July 2022
- xxii. There is need for continuous comprehensive payroll audit to be undertaken on an annual basis.
- xxiii. Management of leave to be undertaken in accordance with the existing regulations. This will ensure that the County does not incur unnecessary cost on commutation of leave for cash for those officers who do not take their leave in accordance with the law.
- xxiv. The County should encourage Persons with Disabilities to apply for positions as and when advertised to ensure adherence to constitutional requirement (5%) governing recruitment of PWDs.
- xxv. The County should embrace diversity in its staff recruitment and selection processes and strive to meet the legal requirement of having 30% of the employees to be from outside the dominant community.
- xxvi. Progressively achieve 30% technical officers from the current 25% and reduce support staff to 70% from the current 75%
- xxvii. All skilled casual workers to be employed on permanent terms in a phased approach based on availability of vacancies and funding.

CONCLUSION

The County Staff audit revealed pertinent issues relating to the management of human resource in the County Government. The County Government is required to develop an implementation matrix that will provide a roadmap for implementing the recommendations contained in this report.