

AN ASSESSMENT OF NIGERIA'S INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN DISASTER MANAGEMENT

Taiwo Adefisoye

Department of Political Science, Faculty of the Social Sciences, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria
taiwooladeji61@yahoo.com

Abstract- *In a bid to ensuring a virile emergency management practice, which would conform to global best practices, the Federal Government of Nigeria, through the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), in 2010, came up with the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF). The framework was designed among other reasons, to provide jurisdictional responsibilities, promote efficiency and build institutional capacity among the various stakeholders in the area of disaster management. However, since its introduction, the framework is yet to make significant progress in ensuring the provision of effective and efficient institutional capacity especially at the State and Local government levels. Using secondary data, this paper identified some of the reasons for such inadequacy. It argues that the framework lacks full backing of the law to punish non-compliance and non-conformity with its provisions. Also, it identifies poor funding and lack of awareness as other problems affecting the framework. The study concludes that the vision of Nigeria to become one of the top twenty nations of the world in no distant time, would be a mirage if relevant stakeholders do not wake up to their responsibilities and rise to the occasion to ensure the realization of a viable, dynamic, efficient and effective disaster management system. Also, the study advocates the imperative of mainstreaming disaster management education into the curriculum of secondary schools, as well as proper funding as viable strategies of overcoming these challenges.*

Index Terms- *Hazards/Disasters, Emergency/Disaster Management; Nigeria's Institutional Capacity*

I. INTRODUCTION

Calamities and disasters are indisputable facts of human existence (Omotoso, 2010:135), and they have plagued the human race through-out history. For instance in 2003, a total number of 28 major disasters ravaged the African continent, ranging from floods, droughts, cyclones, earthquakes, and food security emergencies (McEntire and Mathis (2004:5-6). Of these, however, eleven were complex emergencies. A complex emergency is often sparked by natural/or political, economic, or environmental stress, and they impede response and relief efforts (Minear and Weis, 1995:17). While Africa is overwhelmingly afflicted with complex emergencies, Asia declared only two in 2003 (McEntire and Mathis: 2004, 5-6). Asian nations more commonly face hydro-meteorological hazards. Floods have been the cause of disaster situations in Vietnam, Indonesia, China, and Sri Lanka. Typhoons have wreaked havoc in Korea, Fiji, and the Solomon Islands. In addition to flood and typhoons, earthquakes, drought and epidemics are also a common problem for Asian countries. In Europe, the Middle East, Latin and Northern America, terrorism, geological and hydrological disasters caused serious havocs. And recently, the Nepal Avalanche or snowstorm which killed 40 people, lends credence to the foregoing.

Consequently, hazards have had a negative effect on the human race, leading to loss of human lives and properties, apart from the huge financial burden they have posed on government spending. Ovosi (2012) observes that over 600,000 lives have been claimed by both natural and man induced hazards within the last decade. In the same vein, over 2.4 million people, the majority of them in developing countries like Nigeria have been directly affected. Broadly, between 1970 and 2010, an estimated 3.3 million people all over the world have died as a result of disaster occurrences (Arrow, 2012: 26). Besides the loss of lives and destruction of properties, disaster management has a negative effect on government spending. These include human, material, economic, social and political costs. The cost of hazards confronting mankind is greatly enormous. For instance McLoughlin (1985:165, cited in Agagu, 2010:156) reveals the enormity and impact of disaster in the U.S.A.. According to him:

In an average year in the United States, flood will cause \$2 billion to \$3 billion in damage. Tornadoes will leave over 100 people dead. Fires will kill more than 6,000. These emergencies occur regularly and others are waiting to happen. There are 9,000 high hazard dams in the country. Four billion tons of hazardous materials move through the transportation system each year, Thirty-nine states are at risk from earthquakes and 22 metropolitan states are at risk from earthquakes and 22 metropolitan areas from hurricanes. Stemming from the above, it becomes pertinent to state that, the inevitability of hazards and calamities as facts of human existence has thereby posed a compelling need to finding ways of managing them, thereby protecting the human race from possible extinction. This is no doubt, one of the fundamental purposes for the existence of the state and its machinery, the government. James Bryce (1883-1922), cited in Gauba (2007:421) lends credence to this, by stating thus:

The test of a government is the welfare of its people. Thus, the standard of merit of any government can be judged by the adequacy with which it performs the chief functions of government: the protection of its people from internal and external enemies (which also include natural and man-made disasters); the securing of justice; the efficient administration of common affairs, and bestowal of aid to individual citizens in their several occupations.

The first major step in management of disasters as opined by Sentra, is the formulation of public policy framework/legislations that would in turn establish an emergency/disaster management structures (2013:639). Similarly, Beard (Cited in Gaus, 1980:87) opined that:

The continuous and fairly efficient discharge of certain functions by government, central or local is a necessary condition for the existence of any great society. Beyond the issue of efficiency and effectiveness delivery of service is the issue of coping with catastrophes, hazards, and emergency management.

In the same vein Petak (1985 in Agagu, 2010:156) observed that:

Throughout history, public policy makers have sought to anticipate the unexpected in order to reduce the risk to human life and safety posed by intermittently occurring natural and man-made hazardous events.

Indeed, the government should take the lead in the management of disasters by establishing institutions and agencies that would be saddled with responsibilities of mitigating, preparing for, responding to and recovery from disaster occurrences. Guido Bertolaso, Head of the Italian Civil Protection Agency (2010), lends his voice to this by expressing that

Government should take the lead in implementing preventive actions both directly, by allocating efficiently public resources, and indirectly, by showing people how to protect themselves against disaster occurrences.

These, no doubt have occasioned an increased global cooperation in reducing the effects of disasters. Also, it has made governments at national levels to established agencies to take care of emergency-related issues/events. In the United State of America for instance, in respect to its federal status, there is the Federal Emergency Authority, National Response Framework, and National Incidence Management System (NIMS) are in place at different levels of government. In Australia, the body responsible for emergency management is Emergency Management Australia. Also, countries like Germany, India, Pakistan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, Canada, to mention but a few have corresponding emergency relief/management bodies.

Nigeria, a country that presents a veritable landscape for the study of hazards, calamities and catastrophes, especially the human-induced ones, is not exempted in disaster management. It is recorded that successive governments in Nigeria have made feeble efforts especially in the 1970s. However, in 1999, with the establishment of National Emergency management Agency (NEMA) under Act 24, the stage was set for the country to move away response/relief-giving centric that characterized emergency management before this period, to a more proactive mitigation/preparedness-centric approach. However, to achieve the huge task set before it, The Federal Government of Nigeria, through NEMA, came up with different strategies and programmes, and one of such was the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF), which is a comprehensive Disaster Management document. The NDMF was to serve as a foundation upon which all plans, policies, programmes and procedures for DM can be created, developed and sustained (NEMA, 2001:I).

The focus of this paper is to make an assessment on the NDMF in the area of institutional capacity and performance. To achieve this, the paper is divided into six parts: part one is the introduction; part two is the literature review and theoretical framework; part three is the history of DM in Nigeria; part four focuses on the various institutions of DM in Nigeria and their roles; part five is the discusses some problems of DM in Nigeria; and part six is the conclusion and recommendation.

II. Literature Review: Hazard/Disaster

Despite the universality of the occurrences of hazards/disasters, defining them has been so mystified, giving rise to intellectual uncertainty, analytical confusion, paradigmatic disorder and theoretical impotence. The major reasons are those of classification, data gathering and the varied intellectual persuasions and affiliations of scholars in the field. David McEntire captures this;

In emergency management, scholars are interested in accidents, crises, emergencies, disaster, catastrophes and calamities. However, these subjects are different due to the number of deaths produced, extent of geographical impact, degree of social disruption, etc.

McEntire (2004:2)

Besides this, there is a constant variation in disaster reporting and data presentation among the different disaster-monitoring bodies in the world like EM-DAT: an acronym for the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED); NatCat (a body controlled my Munich Reinsurance Company); and Sigma (which is maintained by Swiss Reinsurance Company). For instance, for

1988-2002, EM-DAT reports 756 million people, NatCat reports 277 million, and Sigma 19 million were affected world-wide by disasters (Guha-Sapir, 2002 in Arrow, K.J, Becker, G.S, Ostrom, E., Schelling, T.C, Sen, A., and Solow, R.M. (2010:26). All these impinge on disaster/hazard studies. However, so as to overcome this ambiguity, this work shall explore critically the market-place of knowledge in hazards/disasters management.

Studies have revealed that an intricate relationship exists between a hazard and a disaster. Resultantly, this relationship has affected directly by constituting a cog in the wheel of the conceptualization of the two as separate entities. Mohammed A. Al-Amin explains that:

Hazards and disasters are two sides of the same coin; neither can be fully understood or explained from the standpoint of either physical science or social science alone; and are inextricably linked to the ongoing environmental changes at global, regional and local levels.

(Al-Amin, 2013:13)

For instance, a disaster as defined by the online English Dictionary (2012) is “an ‘unexpected’ natural or man-made catastrophe of substantial extent causing significant physical damage or destruction, loss of life or sometimes permanent change to the natural environment. Also, according to the same source, it is “an ‘unforeseen’ event causing great loss, upset or unpleasantness of whatever kind”. The ‘unforeseen’ and ‘unexpected’ attributes that is ascribed have produced fascinating but contentious debates among the various disaster/hazard management scholars.

To lend credence to this, the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) in a slightly different way conceptualizes disaster as “a serious disruption of the functioning of the society causing widespread human, material or environmental losses, which exceed the capacity of the affected society to cope with using only its own resources. This, reveals that disaster occur when societies cannot provide adequate resistance against hazards which may be natural.

Similarly, Arrow, K.J, Becker, G.S, Ostrom, E., Schelling, T.C, Sen, A., and Solow, R.M. (2010:26) in a book titled Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters; provide an insightful and more distinguishing definition of disaster. According to them, disaster is “the hazard’s effect on society on society as a result of the combination of exposure (the people and property subject to hazard) and vulnerability (the characteristics that influence damage).” For them, hazard is a natural process or phenomenon (flood, storm, drought, earthquakes) with adverse effects on life, limb, or property. Also, hazards differ in severity, scale, and frequency and are often classified by cause (such as hydro-metrological or geological). A simple mathematical equivalence of the above conception, according to Akiode (2014) is : $D = H \times V \times E$, meaning; Disaster equals hazard multiplied by vulnerability and exposure.

In tandem with the above, Olorunfemi and Raheem (2013:194) unequivocally explained that:

Hazards in themselves do not constitute disasters. The magnitude of disaster is usually described in terms of the adverse effects which a disaster has had on lives, property and infrastructure; environmental damage; and the costs attached to post disaster recovery and rehabilitation

Simply put, therefore, disaster risk is the product of the combination of three elements – vulnerability, coping capacity and hazard (ISDR, 2004). This interaction is illustrated in the following formula. Disaster risk (R) = Vulnerability (V) x Hazard (H)

Capacity (C)

(Olorunfemi and Raheem, 2013:194)

Distinguishingly, the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) opines that:

A hazard can be defined as a potentially damaging physical event, phenomenon or human activity which may cause the loss or life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation. Hazards can include hidden conditions that may represent future threats and can have different origins. These include natural (geological, hydro-meteorological and biological) and/or induced by human processes (environmental degradation and technological hazards)

(ISDR 2002: 24)

It is important to add that hazards are increasingly dynamic and with highly varying potential impacts. A wide range of geographical, meteorological hydrological, environmental, technological, biological and socio political hazards can threaten livelihoods and sustainable development. Hazards can be classified into three broad categories: natural, technological and environmental degradation.

Contributing to the fore-going, Niekerk (2002) in Olorunfemi and Raheem (2012: 191) asserts that hazards can be single, sequential or combined in their origin and effects. It is important to note that each hazard is characterized by its location, intensity and probability. Typical examples of hazards can be the absence of rain (leading to drought) or the abundance thereof (leading to flooding). Chemical manufacturing plants near settlements can also be seen as hazards. Similarly, incorrect agricultural techniques will in the long run lead to possible disasters such as loss of crops and famine.

Stemming from the above definitional expedition, it is important to clearly state that hazards, though are natural events, their effects on communities can be properly managed through predictive and preventive measures, thereby reducing casualties and massive death.

Additionally, a disaster, is a serious disruption of the functioning of a society, causing or threatens to cause, widespread human, material, or environmental losses which exceed the ability of affected community to cope using only its own resources (South Africa, 2002). Disasters can be sudden (flash floods) or progressive (drought). Disasters are caused due to the interaction of humans with their environment. A disaster is a function of the risk process. It results from the combination of hazards, conditions of vulnerability and insufficient capacity or measures to reduce the potential negative consequences of risk (ISDR, 2002: 25).

This definitional expedition is however not complete without considering an elaborate encompassing explanation of disaster by Dennis Mileti. Mileti stated that “in order to focus on the discussion, it is always necessary to sort out the various ways to define disaster.”

First according to him, is a conventional media definition, which centers on the destruction of human capital. According to him, one source suggests that:

From 1975 to 1994, natural hazards killed over 24,000 people and injured 100,000 in the United States and its Territories. About one quarter of the deaths and half the injuries resulted from events that society would label as disasters. (Mileti, 1999:4)

A second way to view disaster is to focus on the destruction of physical capital. Again, an estimate of those losses in the U.S. suggests:

A conservative estimate of the total dollar losses during the past 2 decades is \$500 billion. (In 1994 dollars) More than 80 percent of these costs stemmed from climatologically events which around 10 percent resulted from earthquakes and volcanoes. Only 17 percent were insured. (Mileti, 1999:4-5)

McLoughlin (1985:165) in Agagu (2010:156) validates the foregoing when he examined the enormity and veracity of disaster in the USA. According to him:

In an average year in the United States, flood will cause \$2 billion to \$3 billion in damage. Tornadoes will leave over 100 people dead. Fires will kill more than 6,000. These emergencies occur regularly and others are waiting to happen. There are 9,000 high hazard dams in the country. Four billion tons of hazardous materials move through the transportation system each year, Thirty-nine states are at risk from earthquakes and 22 metropolitan states are at risk from earthquakes and 22 metropolitan areas from hurricanes.

A third way to view disaster is to focus on social capital and to see disaster as a threat to existing capital. For example, the following definition reflects that emphasis:

A disaster is normatively defined situation in a community when extraordinary efforts are taken to protect and benefit some social resource whose existence is perceived as threatened.

(Mileti, 1994:4-5)

Summarizing Mileti’s explanation, Waeckerle (1991) in Oruonye (2012:2), suffice that “disasters are tragedies that overwhelm our communities, destroy our property and harm our population”. Indeed, the overwhelming effect of disasters on human lives, commercial and social activities in all ages cannot be overemphasized. It is estimated that average of 547 million people are affected

by disasters globally every year, with 80 to 90 percent of death are recorded in mostly the developing countries. 296 million people are affected by natural disasters yearly; 145 million by droughts; and 106 million by flood (Mairiga, 2013 in NEMA, 2013: 5)

Stemming from the above it is imperative to hazards, though naturally caused, their occurrence could be sparked by man's uncontrolled and most times illicit activities that are capable of causing serious impairments on the functioning of the environment. An example would illuminate more analysis. Climate change, which has been identified as the major cause of the massive flooding around the world, is been caused majorly by the emission of adverse gases into the atmosphere which in turn depletes the ozone layer. Besides, floods are caused when flood plains and water channels are blocked through the construction of buildings, poor town planning, indiscriminate waste disposal, bad governance among others. In the case of Nigeria, the 2012 flooding incidents that caused serious emergency situation in the country was early predicted by the Nigerian Metrological Agency (NIMET) in February of that year. Also, the authorities Lagdo Dam in neighbouring Cameroun had informed the country of its intention to release excess water from the dam which could in turn cause a serious incident of flood. However, this was apparently disdained.

More so, the degree of impact that a hazard would eventually have a community is determined by two factors: Vulnerabilities and Risk.

III. Disaster/Emergency Management

Disaster management is defined as those measures which are aimed at impeding the occurrence from having effects on communities (Omotoso, 2010:136). The above conception narrows emergency management down to the role of mitigation which is just a meager part of the entire activities associated with emergency management. However, the activities that surround the overall framework of emergency management extend beyond this. It is then important to say that emergency management includes a network or a body of policy or policies which regulates the operation of emergency management bodies. For example, as observed by Gabriel (2002:292), the Australian Emergency Agency (EMA) does not respond directly to emergencies. Rather, as an agency of the commonwealth, it provides resources, finances, training, and research. According to him, Australia delegates responsibility for emergency management to individual states and territories. It has only been recently that Australia has begun to focus on prevention and mitigation measures, thereby moving away from the relief-giving and response centric to mitigation and preparedness approach.

Contributing to this foregoing, Agagu (2010:156) stated that "emergency management requires ability to anticipate, preparedness skills in acting with dispatch and effective skills in coordinating the efforts of the various institutions, professionals, actors and stakeholders" These no doubt are the major features of a modern emergency management system. Firstly, the advancement in technology has made it possible to predict, and determine the gravity of natural disasters like earth quake, thereby giving room for effective evacuation of residents of such area.. Secondly, since the task of managing disaster occurrences has gone beyond the responsibilities of a constituted emergency management authority/agencies, but require concerted efforts by all stake-holders including the 'social capital' of such area, there is the need for effective coordination of such activities so as to fully maximize such.

Kasperson (1985:8) describes emergency management as "the purposeful activity which society informs itself about hazards, decides what to do about them, and implements measures to control them, or mitigate their consequences" This activities is said to have two major functions namely intelligence and control. While intelligence provides the information needed to determine whether a problem exists and to defines choices and to determine whether success has been achieved, the control function on the other hand has to do with the design and implementation of measures aimed at preventing, reducing and redistributing the hazard, and/or mitigating its consequences. Oruonye (2012:2) affirms that "disaster management is the process of addressing an event that has the potential to seriously disrupt the functioning of a society. He adds that

Disaster management is similar to disaster mitigation; however it implies a whole of government approach to using community resources to fight the effects of an event and assumes the community will be self sufficient for periods of time until the situation can be stabilized. Disaster management can help minimize the risks of flood disaster through early warning, provide developmental plans for recuperation from the disaster, generate communication and medical resources, and aid in rehabilitation and post disaster reconstruction.

According to the United Nations Development Programme (2005), Disaster management is the body of policy, administrative decisions and operational activities required to prepare for, mitigate, respond to, and repair the effects of natural or man-made disasters. Indeed, disaster management has to do with a full range of activities that are done in security and natural hazard events.

Also, disaster management is the coordination and integration of all activities necessary to build, sustain, and improve the capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, and recover from threatening or actual natural or human-induced disasters (NDMF, 2010:2). It is a multi- jurisdictional, multi-sectional, multi-disciplinary, and multi- service initiative.

Commenting on the overall role of an emergency management agency/organization, Oruonye (op.cit), opines that:

The role of any disaster management authority all over the world is to regulate, coordinate, develop systems and train technical manpower for disaster management.

It is as a result of this that the federal government of Nigeria for example established National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) under Degree 12, with the broad mandate of coordinate the management of disasters in the country.

Likewise, in Russia, during the Cold War, the country had a strong emphasis on civil protection because of the threat of nuclear attack from the U.S. Nuclear fall-out shelters and evacuation procedures were emphasized because of the immediate crisis and threat of mutual destruction (Porfiriev, 1999b: 1). As Cold War hostilities dissipated, Russia began to produce legislation to revamp emergency management. This is in total realization by the Russian government realized that effective emergency management required a structured, developed system. Russia is now integrating additional mitigation and preparedness measures into their programs, thus becoming more pro-active than reactive in their strategies (Porfiriev, *ibid*).

W.J Petak (1985) in Agagu (2010:158), within the context of the various statutes, regulations, and ordinances, emergency management can be defined as the process of developing and implementing policies that are concern with:

Mitigation – Deciding what to do, where a risk to the health, safety, and welfare of society has been determine to exist; and implementing a risk reduction program; Preparedness – Developing a response plan and training first response to save lives and reduce disaster manager, including the identification of critical resources among responding agencies, both within the jurisdiction and with other jurisdiction, Response – Providing emergency aid and assistance, reducing the probability of secondary damage, and minimizing problems for recovery operations; and Recovery – Providing immediate support during the early recovery period necessary to return vital life support to minimum operation levels, and continuing to normal.

In his view, Omotoso opines that disaster management encompasses a body of policies, regulations and operational activities undertaken to deal with disasters (2010:236). He stressed that disaster management involves the classical management functions of planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling. According to him:

Planning, in this wise, refers to the idea of out in the broad outline the things that have to be done concerning the control and prevention of disaster. It also concerns the methods to be employed for doing them in order to achieve set objectives with the greatest efficiency. Organizing has to do with the setting out of the formal structure of authority and flow of people in such a way that the task is carefully arranged, clearly defined and effectively coordinated to accomplish the goal desired. Staffing has to do with devising an efficient and effective system through which the staff that will do the job will be recruited, trained and well taken care of to give in their best towards achieving the goals of effectively managing disaster. Directing or leading refers to the continuous task of making decisions, embodying them in specific and general instructions and setting the pace by the leadership. Controlling simply refers to ways of coordinating the activities to ensure smooth and harmonious working relationship which can guarantee efficiency and effective disaster management.

(Omotoso, 2012: 136).

It is important to state that disaster management aims at motivating societies at risk to be more involved in the conscious management of risk and reduction of vulnerability in various communities. As a cross cutting issue, it demands substantial commitment from public authorities/ Civil society and a greater inter-sectoral and policy coordination at all levels.

IV. Theoretical Framework: Goal Theory

The goal theory is adopted as one of the theoretical umbrella for this discourse. The development of this theory is linked with Max Weber and Robert Michels in their separate works on bureaucracy. However, Talcott Parsons popularized the theory by elevating goals of organization to central position as the *raison d'être* of all organization (Okoli and Okoli 1990: 196). This theory contends that all organizational activities are oriented and directed toward the achievement of set goals. Goals are regarded as value premises, which serve as the inputs to decisions. Goals are essential elements of organization. To be effective, an organization must clearly spell out its goals, objectives and strategies (Mullins 1996: 292).

This theory possesses several appealing values. One of such striking values of the theory is that it provides the basis for standard performance and for passing judgment on the effectiveness of organization (Ikelegbe and Osumah, 2007: 192). Also it provides guidelines for decision-making and justification for actions taken. It also helps to develop commitment of individuals and groups to the activities of the organization. As a result attention is directed on purposeful behaviour and basis for motivation and reward systems. It is the basis for objectives and policies of the organization.

Furthermore, it gives indication of what the organization is really like, its true nature and character both for members and for people outside the organization (Mullins 1996: 292). Contributing to the foregoing, Agagu (2010), points out that “goals must clearly be defined in order to stimulate and enhance performance”. He then added the characteristics and importance of a goal, which are:

Goals narrow attention and direct efforts to goals relevant activities, and away from perceived undesirable and goal-irrelevant actions;

Goals can lead to more effort. This propels a worker to work more intensely to attain benchmark especially when incentives, promotion or even deadline are attached to such attainment; and

Goals influences persistence in that one is inclined to work through set backs or work harder if pursuing a goal.

The theoretical framework is however not without its own flaws. The goal theory is a stereotyped and straight-jacketed framework. It pays little or no attention to the ecology at which an organization operates, which directly and indirectly impinges on the operation, effectiveness and outputs of such organization. Similarly, paying little attention to the impact of unforeseen contingencies, and bureaucratic bottle-necks is a limitation of the goal theory. Nevertheless, the theory is suitable to analyze and assess the performance of NEMA. .

In the light of this work, the goal theory is essential to evaluate and assess the performance of NEMA, and other stake holders in the management of emergency-related cases as against some of their goals and objectives.

History of Disaster Management in Nigeria

The antecedent of organized DM in Nigeria predates independence, with the establishment of the Fire Brigade in 1906. The agency was merely saddled with the responsibility of saving lives and properties, and providing humanitarian services during emergencies. However, in 1960s and 1970s, it was replaced with ad hoc arrangements domiciled in the office of the Head of State and State Governors. During this period, disaster responses were considered as mere security issues. Events however took a turn with the devastating effects of the 1972/73 drought. The drought had serious effects on lives, properties and the economy. Consequent upon this, the National Emergency Relief Agency (NERA) was created with the overall mandate of administering reliefs materials to disaster victims. In order to address natural disaster reduction strategies in line with the UN International Decade for Disaster Reduction (IDNDR), and at the same time address the limited scope of NERA, the Federal Government in 1990 set up an Inter-Ministerial body. Resultantly and to meet the demands of managing disasters, the FGN in 1993 decided to raised the status and expand the scope of NERA as an agency under the Presidency.

In 1997, the management of NERA organized a National Workshop that involved major stake holders in DM in Nigeria to deliberate on critical factors for an effective disaster management system in Nigeria, and noted the need to:

i) expand the functions of NERA, amend the decree setting up NERA and change its name to National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA).

ii) structure the new Agency by putting into consideration appropriate policies and strategies: Search and Rescue mobilization capacities; Information; Education; and Preventive strategies; Administrative; Finance and Logistics systems; Relief and Rehabilitation capacities; Research and Planning.

iii) provide appropriate budgetary allocation for the operation of the agency.

(NDMF, 2001:6-7)

The acceptance of these recommendations by the FGN led to the establishment of NEMA in March 1999 under Act 12 under Act 12 of 1999 as amended by Act 50 of 1999 to manage disaster in all forms and ramification (NEMA, 199:1)

In fulfilling its mandate, NEMA developed several plans and guidelines, ONE OF SUCH ID THE NDMF.

The Institution Capacity for Disaster Management under the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF)

Designed to form the bedrock for the overall DM activities in Nigeria, the the principle of shared responsibility and the need to ensure proper integration and collaboration among stake holders. (NDMF, 2001: 8). Other articles of the framework include:

- There shall be National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) at the Federal level, State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) at the state level, and Local Emergency Management Agency (LEMA) at the local government level. This to a large extent shall strengthen the capacities of the Federal, State and Local Government to reduce the likelihood and severity of disasters.
- Every tier of government shall build the capacity of their agencies to prepare for, prevent against, response to and recover from disaster events.
- Federal, State and Local government, Departments and Agencies (MDAS), the military, police, para-military and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) shall develop their capacities in disaster management capabilities as first responders, and Emergency Management Volunteers (EMVs) shall be established to compliment the organized structures. Disaster Management Units (DRUs) shall be established in different military formations across the country to provide assistance to civil authority during emergencies.

The NDMF also specifies the responsibilities of each stake holder in DM in Nigeria. They are:

- A) The Federal Government through the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) shall by this policy perform the following disaster management functions:
- i. Formulate policy on all activities relating to disaster management in Nigeria and coordinate the plans and programmes for efficient and effective response to disasters at national level.
 - ii. Monitor the state of preparedness of all organizations or agencies which may contribute to disaster management in Nigeria.
 - iii. Collate data from relevant agencies so as to enhance forecasting, planning and field operations of disaster management.
 - iv. Educate and inform the public on disaster prevention and control measures.
 - v. Coordinate and facilitate the provision of necessary resources for Search and Rescue and other types of disaster curtailment activities in response to distress calls.
 - vi. Coordinate the activities of all voluntary organizations engaged in emergency relief operations in any part of the Federation.
 - vi. Receive financial and technical aid from international organizations and non-governmental agencies for the purpose of disaster management in the country.
 - vii. Collect emergency relief supply from local and foreign sources and from international and nongovernmental agencies
- (NEMA,1999:4)

The Roles of the State Government

The NDMF stipulates that all states in the Federation shall ensure the establishment of a body to be known as State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) backed up by State Legislation. The legislation, shall include provisions that will ensure that local Governments in the State also establish authority with similar functions.

The State Government through the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) shall by this policy perform the following disaster management functions:

- i. Formulate policy on activities relating to disaster management in the state;
- ii. Co-ordinate plans and programmes for efficient and effective response to disaster management;
- iii. Monitor and provide feedback to NEMA on the state of preparedness of all organizations and agencies which may contribute to disaster management within the State;
- iv. Educate the public on disaster and control measures within the state;
- v. Work closely to LEMA for distribution of relief materials to disaster victims;
- vi. Co-ordinate and facilitate the provision of necessary resources for search and rescue operations and other types of disaster curtailing activities within the state.

The Roles of the Local Government

The NDMF stipulates that the Local Government shall put in place a legislation establishing a disaster management body to be known as Local Emergency Management Authority (LEMA). Under framework LEMA shall perform the following functions:

- i. Coordinate disaster management activities and response to disaster events in local government area.
- ii. Monitor and provide feedback to SEMA on the status of preparedness of all organizations and agencies which may contribute to disaster management within the Local Government Area.
- iii. Collect and collate data on disaster and disaster risk areas in their respective Local Governments, and share same with SEMA.
- iv. Mobilize support and resources from the SEMA when damages and need assessments are considered beyond the capacity of the Local Government to respond.
- v. Establish and development Disaster Management capacity of community structures.

Other stake holders include Neighbourhood associations, schools, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), Faith Based Organizations (FBOs) and Disaster Reduction Groups (DRUs). The overall function of these groups is to provide support for emergency management activities at the grass root level.

Problems of Disaster/Emergency Management in Nigeria

The first identified problem of this study is the lack of proper coordination of disaster/flood management activities in the country. Disaster management is the coordination and integration of all activities necessary to build, sustain, and improve the capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, and recover from threatening or actual natural or human-induced disasters (NDMF, 2010:2). It is a multi- jurisdictional, multi-sectoral, multi-disciplinary, and multi- service initiative. Therefore, it is vital for agency like NEMA, SEMAs and LEMAs, at the federal, state and local level, whose primary objectives are to coordinate other relevant stake-holders to wake up to their responsibility. Also coordinating as a management function involves the pulling together of an organization's physical and human resources towards the attainment of organizational goals (Olaoye, 2005:39). As a co-coordinator, management is seen as a form of liaison officer amongst the various departments, divisions and units. Emergency management is a complex, tasking and comprehensive endeavour which requires clear vision and fore-sight, careful planning, unwavering commitment, discipline, proper and balanced coordination, and good technical know-how. Also involved in emergency management are the core phases of mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery which must be taken care of, with each of these phases having its own required approach. In particular, emergency response which is regarded as the most difficult phase requires that preparations must be made for primary, secondary and tertiary levels of response, depending on the nature and gravity of emergency. All these make it expedient to ensure proper coordination and a holistic approach to disaster management.

Degree No. 12 of 1999, which established NEMA, saddled the agency with the broad mandate to coordinate the management of disasters in the country. NEMA is meant to coordinate the activities of other related bodies like Nigerian Civil Defense; Federal and State Fire Service; State and Local Government emergency management bodies (SEMA and LEMA); the Engineering unit of the Nigerian Armed Forces, the Civil Society, and other stake holder. However, the poor response to the various emergency events in Nigeria, especially those of the 2011 and 2012 flood incidents are evidences of poor coordination.

Another observed problem of this study is the insincerity on the part of the government to provide functional emergency services especially at state and local government levels. Studies, (Dynes 2006, and Bob 2008) have shown that "decentralization of emergency activities bring about better and a more efficient service-delivery" Similarly, Andrew S. Mener, of the University of Pennsylvania, Department of political science in a scholarly paper, stated that disaster management in U.S.A is backed up by several legislations which respect the federal structure of the country. This also is true about countries like Switzerland, Canada, New Zealand, and Germany. However, in Nigeria, there is an obvious absence of functional emergency management in most of the 36 states and the 774 local Councils. It is important to note that in 2012, June 12th when the 50-years old Abakpa-Nile Bridge in Enugu State collapsed under the heavy weight of rainfall: an incident that made commuters to remained stranded for several hours before the Enugu State Government mobilized a private company to the site (Onwubiko, 2012: 3).

In the Southwest region of the country, apart from Lagos Emergency Management Agency (LASEMA) which is highly rated in terms of organizational effectiveness and others like Ekiti, Osun and Oyo which in recent times have made tremendous efforts to ensuring a viable disaster management, other governments (Ondo and Ogun) appeared to have gone to sleep. It is worrisome to note that states like Edo, Cross Rivers, Rivers and Kano, are yet to have statutorily recognized SEMAs (NEMA: 2013). In fact, most of the states with SEMAs are yet to assume optimal operation, since they came into existence, after the 2012 flood deluge.

The problem of disaster management and response initiative in country is worst at the local government level. The 774 LGAs have become dysfunctional majorly because of the undemocratic tendencies of state governors that have largely failed to respect section 7 of the 1999 constitution by ensuring that democratic structures are institutionalized in the grass root level (Onwubiko, 2012:3). A

close look at how the inhabitants of New Orleans in the United States of America were tremendously assisted by all levels of government beginning from the local council whereby the Mayor excelled exceedingly to the federal level, before, during and immediately after the deluge. The Hurricane Katrina of August 2005, shows that disaster management is everybody's business. It is commendable that about 80 to 90 percent of the residents were evacuated safely. This is however not so in Nigeria. Despite the fact that both the states and local government benefit from the ecological account, they still look up to NEMA for all disasters in their areas of jurisdiction even when the disasters are within their coping capacities (Hallah, 2012: 2) It is then important to note at this juncture, it is important to note that the lack of the full backing by the law has definitely added to the non-conformity and non-compliance of its provisions especially at the local government level.

Good, prompt and adequate funding are essential factors that would determine the effectiveness and efficiency of any organization. More so, for an emergency management agency, a huge financial support is needed for the acquisition of up-to-date equipment and technologies to predict detect and mitigate disasters especially natural ones. Also, for the building human capacity, good funding is needed. But in Nigeria, it is rather unfortunate that the government does not place premium on these. In the case of NEMA, poor funding has been a major cog in the wheel of progress, and has hindered its performance is poor funding. For instance, in 2012, the budgetary allocation for the agencies was 1, 463, 138, 127 naira, which was the highest in 12 years (2000-2012) (FGN, Budget, 2012:11). This figure cuts across the length and breadth of capital, re-occurring, and emergency response expeditions. At the States and Local levels, the situation is worse.

Aside the structure dimensions to Nigeria's problem in DM, the poor attitudinal disposition of Nigerian's towards emergency situations is another serious problem. The general attitudinal dispositions of nonchalance, despondency, cynicism, mistrust and despair by Nigerians towards the government establishments, and in particular, emergency situations are worrisome. Majority of the people at emergency sites/scenes only go there to catch a glimpse of the event and even in some cases, they go there to loot and take advantage of the helpless victims. And many times, emergency managers, and other rescue workers have been at the receiving ends of hostilities at emergency scenes especially in the face of poor performance and inefficiency in service-delivery, even when these inefficiencies are apparently unavoidable due to inadequate man-power, skills and materials. The Dana plane crash of June 3rd, 2012 is a very recent example. This perhaps is a reflection of the general decay in societal values.

Also, such attitudes reflect the degree of ignorance of emergency mitigation and response on the part of Nigerians. Due to extreme cultural beliefs and primordial sentiments, disaster occurrences are perceived as "the wrath of the gods" especially in the face of a perceived forceful and unjust possession of lands, corruption, injustice, sacrilege, and taboo. This is unlike the case in advanced countries like the United States and other developed countries where emergency response is often and adequately done by the concerted efforts of the people who are resident at such emergency locations even before the arrival of emergency authorities/agencies. This, they see such as an opportunity to for patriotism and genuine nationalism, and also, an avenue to contribute their quota to the advancement of their country. Russell Dynes captures a holistic community response to the 1995 Oklahoma City bomb explosion in his work "Social Capital: Dealing with Community Response"

The problem of poor attitudinal disposition can be directly linked to the absence of disaster management training platforms for Nigerians to acquire the necessary knowledge that would aid emergency responses, is another identified problem. The effective management of disaster is not solely the function of government and its agencies which are assigned to undertake such task. This perhaps has made government especially in developed countries to institute programmes so as to develop the know-how of emergency management in the populace. In the U.S alone, there are over 180 schools with emergency management related programmes (Bob, 2008:11-15). Beside this, there are other short time training programmes.

In the case of India, there is an emergency training institute, Aniruddha's Academy of Disaster Management (AADM), a Non-Profit Organization located in Mumbai, India with 'Disaster Management' as its principal objective. The basic aim of AADM is to save lives and properties in the event of a disaster, be it natural or man-made. It has successfully trained 60,000 citizens, the Disaster Management Volunteers (DMVs) to handle various disasters and disaster situations effectively (Times of India, Aug.2010) Also, the AADM has built up a volunteer base that assists the Government authorities during the disaster relief and rehabilitation work. Also, DM education has been mainstreamed into the curriculum of secondary schools (Gupta, 2009:1). With this, the frontiers of knowledge in DM in India, has been expanded.

Although there has been a paradigm shift from a government-centered approach to decentralized community participation in many countries, Nigeria is yet to attain this in her emergency response and management. The country has only been able to take the first tentative steps towards building a commitment to a robust emergency management by licensing six federal universities to undertake postgraduate courses in disaster management. These include Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria; Federal University of Technology, Minna; and the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Others are Universities of Ibadan, Port Harcourt and Maiduguri (Musa Ilallah, 2012: 2). However, they are yet to find their footings and at best, are at the early stages of their programmes.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

The vision of Nigeria to be among the first top twenty nations with leading economy by the year 2020 may be an illusion that will be pursued but not attained, if all the relevant stake holders will not rise to the occasion of providing functional, effective and efficient DM structures and well trained personnel. With the increase spate of disasters occurrences especially hydrological (floods and ocean surges); man-induced (building collapse, road accidents and terrorism) and technological (plane crashes), the Nigeria state is threatened and may give-in totally. It is the position of this paper that Nigeria still lacks that needed organization capacity to drive the needed impetus towards achieving an enviable DM. It is on this note that the following recommendations are made:

One, government at all levels should be more committed towards providing the needed avenue and platform for the existence and functioning of DM agencies. Coupled with this, there is the need for legislations that would back the activities of these agencies in discharging their duties. It is imperative at this juncture to mention that the NEMA as the leading should empowered by the law to punish any erring SEMA and LEMA, and other stake holder who defaults in its functions as provided by the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF). This would propel all agencies in DM in Nigeria to rise up to their duties.

Two, NEMA should be more proactive in its activities, especially in the areas coordination, mobilization and sensitization.

Three, all the agencies involved in DM in the federal, state and local government levels should be adequately funded in order to ensure capacity building, manpower training and prompt and effective service-delivery.

Four, since the problems that are associated with hazards and disasters cannot be solved in isolation, there is the need to partner with other private bodies and agencies like NGOs, Civil Society Organizations (CSOS), Health Management Boards, Donor Organizations, Corporate Bodies and private individuals, in ensuring cross fertilization of ideas, funding, provision of DM training programme and execution of disaster management plans. This is the hallmark of Public-Private-Partnership.

Five, disaster education should be mainstreamed in the curriculum of secondary schools across the country. Also, there is the need to embrace the informal sector of the society that makes the social capital in the effort of ensuring community participation in DM. This would increase awareness and equip knowledge of DM.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agagu, A.A, 2010. Emergency Management and Public Administration in Agagu, A.A and Omotoso, F 2010 (ed): "Selected Issues in Public Administration". Gray's Essex RM 1768 SU. Centre for Policy and Development Limited.
- [2] Agagu, A.A, 2010. Emergency Management in Nigeria and the Challenges for Fire Officers" in Agagu, A.A and Omotoso, F 2010 (ed). "Selected Issues in Public Administration". Gray's Essex RM 1768 SU; Centre for Policy and Development Limited.
- [3] Al-Amin, M.A. 2013. An Assessment of Nigeria's Preparedness to Environmental Disasters From Its Commitment to International Environmental Treaties: European Scientific Journal November 2013 edition vol.9, No.32 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431
- [4] Akiode, S.A.O. 2014. An interview with the South west sub-regional coordinator on the activities of NEMA in managing emergency related occurrences in Nigeria.
- [5] Arrow, K.J., Becker, G.S., Ostrom, E, Schelling, T.C, Sen, A., and Solow, R.M, 2010. Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters. Washington, World Bank.
- [6] Bertilaso., G 2010, in Arrow, K.J, Becker, G.S, Ostrom, E, Schelling, T.C, Sen, A., and Solow, R.M. 2010. Natural Hazards, Unnatural Disasters: Washington, World Bank.
- [7] CRED 2013. "EM-DAT: The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database". <http://www.md.vcl.ac.be/cred/>.
- [8] Federal Republic of Nigeria Budget 2013. : www.fgnbudget.com.ng
- [9] Federal Republic of Nigeria Budget 2001. National Disaster Management Framework
- [10] Gabriel, Paul. 2002. "The development to municipal emergency management planning in Victoria, Australia." International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters 20 (3)
- [11] Gupta, Kailash 2009. Disaster Management and India: Responding Internally and Simultaneously in Neighbouring Countries. www.Colorado.edu/.../gupta_2009.pdf: retrieved on Friday, November 28, 2014
- [12] Ilallah, M 2012. "Transformation Agenda Of Disaster Management In Nigeria: www.google.com/emergency+management+in+nigeria:http://saharareporters.com/article/transformation-agenda-disaster-management-nigeria-musa-ilallah
- [13] International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) 2002."Background Paper No.5 for WSSD." United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, No.1.

- [14] Kasperson, R.E. 1985. "Societal Responses to Hazards and Major Hazard Events: Comparing National and Technological Hazards" Public Administration Review. Special Issue.
- [15] Mullins, L.J 1996. Management and Organizational Behaviour. London: Pitman Publishing.
- [16] Niekerk D. (2002). "Disasters and Sustainable Development". African Center for Disaster Studies. Potchefstroom :University, South Africa.
- [17] Okoli, E.F, Okoli FC 1990. Foundations of Government and Politics. Onitsha: Africana Publishers Limited Book House Trust.
- [18] McEntire, D and Marthis, S 2006. Comparative Politics and Disaster: "Assessing Substantive and Methodological Contributions". University of North Texas; Emergency Administration and Planning Department of Public Administration.
- [19] National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) 1999. Establishment Act.
- [20] Olaoye, E.O 2004. "Public Management in Nigeria" (2nd edition): Akure, Adeyemo Publishing House.
- [21] Omotoso, F 2010. Emergency/Disaster Management, Alertness and Readiness for Effective Fire Service Delivery in Agagu, A.A and Omotoso, F 2010 (ed): Selected Issues in Public Administration: Gray's Essex RM 1768 SU; Centre for Policy and Development Limited.
- [22] Onwabiko, E 2012. Head, Human Rights Writers Association of Nigeria www.huriwa.blogspot.com
- [23] Osumah, O and Ikelegbe, A 2009 The Peoples Democratic Party and Governance in Nigeria, 1999- 2007 Journal of Soc Science.
- [24] Oxford Dictionary 2012 Edition.
- [25] Ovosi, S 2012. Preventing Disaster in Nigeria: [www.google.com/emergency +management in nigeria/http://www.lagos state gov.ng/entities php?k=134](http://www.google.com/emergency+management+in+nigeria/http://www.lagosstate.gov.ng/entities.php?k=134)
- [26] Petak, W.J 1985. "Emergency Management: A Challenge for Public Administration" Public Administration in Special Issue
- [27] Porfrieu, Boris. 1996. "Social Aftermath and Organizational Response to a Major Disaster. The Case of the 1995 Sakhalin Earthquake in Russia." Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management. 4(4): 218-227.
- [28] Seeley, J in Gauba, O.P 2007 (4th edition): An Introduction to Political Theory(4th): India, Mcmillan.
- [29] Santra, S.C 2013. Environmental Science: Kolkata; New Central Book Agency Ltd.
- [30] Times of India 2010. Disaster Mitigation: A Must for every Indian". 12-August. Retrieved 24 September 2012.
- [31] United Nations Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery(2005) ;Reducing Disaster Risk: A Challenge for Development. Accessed at <http://www.undp.org/bcpr/disaster>. on Sept. 21
- [32] United Nations ISDR 2005. Mission and Objectives. Accessed at <http://www.unisdr.org/unisdr/eng/about-isdr/isdr-mision-objectives>.
- [33] United Nations, ISDR 2001. "Disaster Occurrence. Accessed at <http://www.inisdr.org/disaster-statistics/occurrence-trend-century.htm> on Sept, 21.
- [34] UN-ISDR 2005. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015; Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. Hyogo: UN-ISDR.