

Thinking Policy Together

Public Affairs Index for Homa Bay County

Introduction

The Public Affairs Index (PAI) is a framework for monitoring achievements in the delivery of public services at the county level. The PAI helps to identify gaps in public service delivery, to bring out emerging issues for timely attention by stakeholders, and to guide in prioritizing and pinpoint targeting of policy actions. The work on the PAI demonstrates the role of KIPPRA, as a think tank and research intermediary, in strengthening frameworks and tools for coordinating key stakeholders in the research ecosystem in Kenya to dialogue, network and enhance research uptake to inform the implementation of the devolved system of Government. This policy brief provides detailed indicators for monitoring the performance of Homa Bay County in the delivery of public service, across the nine pillars, namely, Fiscal Management, Economic Performance, Human Capital Development, Essential Infrastructure, Environmental Management, Transparency and Accountability, Crime and Justice, Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), and Social Welfare. The policy brief also exemplifies the role of KIPPRA in promoting research take-up to support the devolved system of government in Kenya.

Devolution

The 2010 Constitution of Kenya created a two-tier system of Government: the National Government and 47 County Governments. The main objective of creating the new governance structures is spelt out in Article 174 of the Constitution, which is to devolve power and resources to attain optimal delivery of public services and allow citizens to effectively participate in governance. Also, devolution is aimed at enhancing equity, equality, efficiency, and prudence in the use of public resources to meet the needs of the citizens.

The fourth schedule of the Constitution outlines 14 functions now fully devolved to county Governments. Since 2013, about Ksh 2 trillion have been disbursed to the counties to facilitate delivery of public services. The equitable share allocation constitutes the main source of revenue for all the 47 counties, contributing about 90% of the total county revenue. Counties also receive conditional grants as part of the Equalization Fund articulated in Article 204 of the Constitution. County Governments are also authorized to impose taxes and fees, as stipulated in Chapter 12 of the Constitution, to mobilise revenue from own sources.

The County Government Act 2012, the Public Finance Management Act 2012, and the Public Finance Management Regulations 2015 provide a legal framework for devolution and guide fiscal decentralization. County Governments are mandated by the County Government Act 2012 to implement Integrated Development Planning. This involves developing 5-year County Integrated Development plans (CIDPs) to guide planning, budgeting, allocation of resources and to monitor progress of project implementation.

The Public Finance Management Act 2012 (PFM) requires counties to develop budgets based on programmes, projects and other expenditures contained in their Annual Development Plans (ADPs). Besides providing budget ceilings on expenditure, the PFM Act also requires counties to be compliant in keeping and consolidating financial records and statements and submitting financial reports to the Auditor General, National Treasury, and Office of Controller of Budget.

Figure 1: Homa Bay County demographics and output

1

- Total county population, 608599, 49% male, 50% female, 27.30 % youths
- County size, 2818 sq Km, population density 216 people/ square km, Annual county population growth rate 1.7%
- 4 sub-counties, 20 electoral wards


2

- Sectors driving county economic growth: agriculture (29.49%), wholesale and retail trade (7.48%) and manufacturing (3.18%).
- Overall poverty: 28.20%
- Multidimensional poverty: 44.27%

Public Affairs Index

The Public Affairs Index (PAI) is measured using 9 pillars namely: Fiscal Management; Economic Performance; Human Capital Development; Essential Infrastructure; Environmental Management; Transparency and Accountability; Crime and Justice; Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH); and Social Welfare. The scores range from zero to one, zero being the lowest, while one is the highest. Homa Bay County has an overall PAI score of 0.56. The highest scores are on Transparency and Accountability (0.73), Social Welfare (0.69), and Human Capital Development (0.69) pillars. The lowest scores are on WASH (0.29), Environmental Management (0.43), and Economic Performance (0.51) pillars. The demographics and output for Homa Bay County are reported in Figure 1, while the County Public Affairs Index pillar scores are reported in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Homa Bay County Public Affairs Index scores



Data Source: KIPPRAs Public Affairs Index report

Fiscal Management Pillar

This pillar has four sub-pillars namely,

1. Compliance to PFM regulations measured by development expenditure to total expenditure (benchmark is 30%) and personal emolument to total revenue (ceiling at 35%)
2. Commitment to settling pending bills measured by percentage of recurrent expenditure pending bills to total recurrent expenditure and percentage of development expenditure pending bills to total development expenditure

3. Budget execution measured by recurrent expenditure absorption rates and development expenditure absorption rates
4. Revenue mobilization measured by ratio of own source revenue to equitable share, achievement of own source revenue targets, own source revenue regulatory framework and revenue management

The Fiscal Management Index for the county is 0.62. The scores for the sub-pillars and indicators are given below.

Scores

Areas of Concern

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compliance to PFM regulations: 0.36 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance to PFM regulations on development expenditure: 0.60 • Compliance to personal emolument to total revenue ceiling: 0.13 2. Commitment to settling pending bills 0.75 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolution of recurrent expenditure pending bills: 0.98 • Resolution of development expenditure pending bills: 0.52 3. Budget execution 0.80 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recurrent budget execution: 0.92 • Development budget execution: 0.67 4. Revenue mobilization 0.58 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Own source revenue to equitable share: 0.02 • Achievement of own source revenue targets: 0.83 • Own source revenue regulatory framework: 0.67 • Revenue management: 0.78 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low compliance to PFM regulations on personal emolument to total revenue ceiling of 35%, which could constrain revenue allocations to development programmes 2. High percentage of development expenditure pending bills that could weaken expansion of capacity for economic activities and affect public service delivery 3. Budget allocation to development expenditure is below the 30% allocation stipulated by PFM regulations 4. Low development expenditure budget absorption rate that could affect implementation of the CIDP. 5. High fiscal dependence on National Government Equitable Share |
|--|---|

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to enhance controls at the budget planning stage to ensure that a minimum of 30% of the total county budget is allocated to development expenditure
- The County Public Service Board to comply with SRC guidelines and implement an optimal staffing structure to reduce spending on emoluments
- The County Government Finance and Economic Planning Department to strengthen budget monitoring and evaluation framework to effectively monitor budget implementation and recommend timely corrective actions
- Inculcate a culture of public service among state officers to enhance political commitment in compliance with PFM regulations
- County Government to maintain comprehensive records of expenditure arrears including age and composition to effectively management of obligations
- County Government to have in place clear rules on transparency in reporting on budget implementation, including fully disclosure of arrears and contingent liabilities to enhance accountability and oversight that will help reduce accumulation of pending bills
- County Government to build capacity of county officials on revenue and expenditure forecasting to come up with realistic targets
- County Government to formalize mechanisms for recovering outstanding revenues amounts including empowering counties to legally seek redress for non-compliance through the courts
- County Government to automate revenue systems, update business registers, and establish systems to monitor revenue arrears

Economic Performance Pillar

This pillar is measured using six indicators namely growth of the economy (benchmark at 10% growth), diversity of the economy (manufacturing contribution to GCP at 15%), labour participation, enabling business environment, financing growth, and income equality. The score for Homa Bay County on this pillar is 0.48. The scores for the indicators are given below.

Scores	Areas of Concern
1. Growth of the economy: 0.55	1. Low level of economic diversity
2. Diversity of the economy: 0.07	2. Weak business enabling environment to propel private sector
3. Labour participation: 0.76	
4. Enabling business environment: 0.29	
5. Financing growth: 0.82	
6. Income equality: 0.58	

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to improve worksite related infrastructure such as electricity, water, and internet connectivity to support the MSEs, which are the bedrock for economic transformation
- County Government to support growth of manufacturing firms that use raw materials sourced in the county and encourage consumption and use of locally manufactured goods in promoting the Build Kenya, Buy Kenya initiative
- County Government to collaborate with the National Government in setting up Special Economic Zones and Industrial Parks by providing adequate land

Human Capital Development Pillar

This pillar is measured using three sub-pillars namely,

- Health, measured by percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel, percentage of children 12-23 months fully vaccinated and percentage of non-stunted children
- Education, measured by adult literacy rate and school enrolment rates
- Life expectancy at birth

The score for Homa Bay County on this pillar is 0.69. The scores for the sub-pillars and indicators are given below.

Scores	Areas of Concern
1. Health: 0.75 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel: 0.67 Percentage of children 12-23 months fully vaccinated: 0.64 Percentage of non-stunted children: 0.95 	1. Low life expectancy, which can potentially affect labour productivity and county's economic growth
2. Education: 0.83 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adult literacy rate: 0.86 School enrolment rates: 0.80 	
3. Life expectancy at birth: 0.48	

Essential Infrastructure Pillar

This pillar comprises of seven indicators namely access to work, transport affordability, housing quality, internet connectivity, percentage of schools with ICT connectivity, mobile money subscription and Percentage of household with access to electricity. The score for Homa Bay County is 0.53. The scores for the indicators are given below.

Scores

1. Access to work: 0.89
2. Transport affordability: 0.87
3. Housing quality: 0.31
4. Internet connectivity: 0.14
5. percentage of schools with ICT connectivity: 0.69
6. Mobile money subscription: 0.65
7. Percentage of households with access to electricity: 0.18

Areas of Concern

1. Low internet connectivity.
2. Limited access to electricity by households
3. High percentage of households with low housing quality

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to expand ICT infrastructure by fast-tracking implementation of County Connectivity Project Phase III.
- County Government to fast-track access to electricity through the rural electrification programme.

Environmental Management Pillar

This pillar has four sub-pillars, namely:

1. Clean energy use, measured by percentage of households with access to clean cooking energy
2. Forest management measured by forest management best practices and forest management regulatory and institutional frameworks
3. Climate change management measured by climate change regulatory framework and climate change management best practices
4. Solid waste management measured by solid waste management regulatory framework and solid waste management best practices

The score for Homa Bay County on this pillar is 0.43. The scores for the sub-pillars and indicators are given below.

Scores

1. Clean energy use: 0.11
2. Forest management: 0.60
 - Forest management best practices: 1.00
 - Forest management regulatory and institutional frameworks: 0.20
3. Climate change management 0.65
 - Climate change regulatory and institutional framework: 0.57
 - Climate change best practices: 0.73
4. Solid waste management 0.36
 - Solid waste management regulatory framework: 0.25
 - Solid waste management best practices: 0.47

Areas of Concern

1. Limited use of clean energy
2. Weak forest management regulatory and institutional frameworks
3. Weak solid waste management regulatory frameworks
4. Weak climate change management regulatory and institutional frameworks
5. Inadequate applications of solid waste management best practices

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to promote and encourage use of clean energy by household including use of local cooking technologies such as improved jikos, biogas, briquettes, smokeless jikos and supplementing with reduced cost for accessing LPG and electricity
- County Government to develop forest management policies to guide implementation of the 15 forest functions that are fully devolved
- County Government to work with development partners to strengthen their climate change regulatory framework
- County Government to strengthen solid waste management frameworks by developing policies and legislations
- County Government to embrace Public Private Partnership to improve solid waste management practices

Transparency and Accountability Pillar

This pillar has two sub-pillars namely control of corruption measured by corruption and economic crimes incidences and quality of public participation measured by public participation best practices and public participation regulatory and institutional frameworks. Homa Bay county has a score of 0.73. The scores for the indicators are given below.

Scores

1. Control of corruption: 0.85
2. Quality of public participation 0.50
 - Public participation best practices: 1.00
 - Public participation regulatory and institutional frameworks: 0.00

Areas of Concern

1. Weak public participation regulatory and institutional frameworks

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to develop policy and legislative frameworks to appropriately guide the process of public participation
- County Government to undertake continuous civic education by partnering with development partners and non-governmental organization that conduct civic education for effective public participation
- County Government to establish and provide public participation directorates with adequate budgets to facilitate public participation activities
- The County Executives and County Assembly to work together to ensure systematic engagement of the public, citizens' opinions and priorities are incorporated in decision making and the process of public participation is not overshadowed by political interests

Crime and Justice Pillar

This pillar is measured using incidences of GBV crimes and all offences. Homa Bay County has a score of 0.58 on this pillar. The scores for the indicators are given below.

Scores

1. Prevalence of GBV crimes: 0.51
2. Prevalence of all offences: 0.65

Areas of Concern

1. High GBV crime rates per 100,000 population
2. High all offences crime rates per 100,000 population

Policy Recommendations

- Implementation of national and county Government security initiatives
- County Government to increase access to quality and comprehensive support services to GBV victims and survivors
- County Government to strengthen the capacity of institutions and service providers handling GBV across the health and the criminal justice system
- County Government to protect vulnerable persons by implementing a witness protection programme for GBV victims and survivors
- County Government to Fast-track implementation of GBV offenders' rehabilitation and reintegration into the community
- County Government to eliminate harmful cultural practices such as early child marriages, forced marriages amongst others are practices, which contributes to GBV

Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Pillar

The pillar comprises of two indicators namely, Access to improved sanitation and Access to improved water. The score for Homa Bay County on this pillar is 0.29

The scores for the indicators are given below

Scores

1. Access to improved sanitation: 0.25
2. Access to improved water: 0.34

Areas of Concern

1. Significant percentage of households with limited access to safe and clean drinking water
2. High percentage of households with limited access improved sanitation this could affect the control of communicable diseases and health outcomes

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to support County Water and Sewerage Service Companies to implement pro-poor tariffs to increase access to WASH services
- County Government to scale up implementation of physical plans by investing in sanitation infrastructure to adequately enhance access to sanitation services by the unserved and underserved populations
- County Government to establish a coordination framework to enhance collaboration among players in WASH sector at both the County and National level as well as development partners
- County Government to increase investments in water harvesting, digging wells, and create awareness on home water-treatment to increase access to improved water

Social Welfare Pillar

This pillar has four sub-pillars, namely:

1. Poverty measured by percentage of non-food poor households and percentage of non-multidimensional poor households
2. Health sector budgeting measured by health budget execution, attainment of Abuja declaration on health budgeting, attainment of pre-devolution health budget target
3. Social sector budgeting measured by ECDE budget execution and social welfare budget execution
4. Female labour participation and female literacy rates

Homa Bay County has a score of 0.69 on this pillar. The scores for the sub-pillars, and indicators are given below.

Scores

1. Poverty 0.49
 - Percentage of non-food poor households: 0.77
 - Percentage of non-multidimensional poor households: 0.21
2. Health sector budgeting 0.92
 - Budget execution: 0.86
 - Attainment of Abuja Declaration: 1.00
 - Attainment of pre-devolution health budget: 0.90
3. Social Sector Budgeting 0.69
 - ECDE budget execution: 0.96
 - Social welfare budget execution: 0.43
4. Female empowerment 0.65
 - Female labour participation: 0.48
 - Female literacy: 0.81

Areas of Concern

1. High percentage of households are deprived of essential services
2. Low absorption rates of the budget allocated to social welfare programmes
3. Low female empowerment characterized by low female labour participation rates

Policy Recommendations

- County Government to consider developing county specific social protection cash transfer programmes to supplement the national Government programmes to increase reach to vulnerable population
- County Government to identify and address causes of low absorption of social welfare budgets and have in place mechanisms to map out the vulnerable members of the society
- County Government to promote programmes that directly and indirectly reduce food poverty such as kitchen garden initiatives, nutrition programmes and other empowerment programmes
- County Government to consider partnering with private sector and development partners to initiate programs that build skills in self-employment and employability in youths with a particular focus on females to increase their labour participation

Acknowledgement

KIPPRA wishes to acknowledge funding of the Public Affairs Index work by the Research and Innovation Systems for Africa (RISA) Fund, a multi-country project funded by the U.K. Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) focusing on strengthening research and innovation systems in target countries, combining the fund manager requirements of two funds under the RISA umbrella: Strengthening Research Institutions in Africa (SRIA) and African Technology and Innovation Partnerships (ATIP). KIPPRA also thanks the RISA Fund team as well as the FCDO team who worked closely with KIPPRA colleagues and the research stakeholders in Kenya – the collaboration made it possible to deliver a high quality project on time.

About KIPPRA Policy Briefs

KIPPRA Policy Briefs are aimed at a wide dissemination of the Institute's policy research findings. The findings are expected to stimulate discussion and also build capacity in the public policy making process in Kenya.

KIPPRA acknowledges generous support from the Government of Kenya, and development partners who have continued to support the Institute's activities over the years.
Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis

For More Information Contact:

Bishops Road, Bishops Garden Towers
P.O. Box 56445-00200, Nairobi
Tel: 2719933/4
Cell: 0736712724, 0724256078
Email: admin@kippra.or.ke
Website: <http://www.kippra.org>
Twitter: @kipprakenya