



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Role of local governments in disaster risk reduction

Malalgoda, CI, Amaratunga, RDG and Pathirage, CP

Title	Role of local governments in disaster risk reduction
Authors	Malalgoda, CI, Amaratunga, RDG and Pathirage, CP
Type	Conference or Workshop Item
URL	This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/9742/
Published Date	2010

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.



RICS

the mark of
property
professionalism
worldwide

DAUPHINE
UNIVERSITÉ PARIS

COBRA 2010

The Construction, Building and Real Estate Research Conference of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Held at Dauphine Université, Paris, 2-3 September 2010

ISBN 978-1-84219-619-9

© RICS

12 Great George Street
London SW1P 3AD
United Kingdom

www.rics.org/cobra

September 2010

The RICS COBRA Conference is held annually. The aim of COBRA is to provide a platform for the dissemination of original research and new developments within the specific disciplines, sub-disciplines or field of study of:

Management of the construction process

- Cost and value management
- Building technology
- Legal aspects of construction and procurement
- Public private partnerships
- Health and safety
- Procurement
- Risk management
- Project management

The built asset

- Property investment theory and practice
- Indirect property investment
- Property market forecasting
- Property pricing and appraisal
- Law of property, housing and land use planning
- Urban development
- Planning and property markets
- Financial analysis of the property market and property assets
- The dynamics of residential property markets
- Global comparative analysis of property markets
- Building occupation
- Sustainability and real estate
- Sustainability and environmental law
- Building performance

The property industry

- Information technology
- Innovation in education and training
- Human and organisational aspects of the industry
- Alternative dispute resolution and conflict management
- Professional education and training

Peer review process

All papers submitted to COBRA were subjected to a double-blind (peer review) refereeing process. Referees were drawn from an expert panel, representing respected academics from the construction and building research community. The conference organisers wish to extend their appreciation to the following members of the panel for their work, which is invaluable to the success of COBRA.

Rifat Akbiyikli	Sakarya University, Turkey
Rafid Al Khaddar	Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Ahmed Al Shamma'a	Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Tony Auchterlounie	University of Bolton, UK
Kwasi Gyau Baffour Awuah	University of Wolverhampton, UK
Kabir Bala	Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria
Juerg Bernet	Danube University Krems, Austria
John Boon	UNITEC, New Zealand
Douw Boshoff	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Richard Burt	Auburn University, USA
Judith Callanan	RMIT University, Australia
Kate Carter	Heriot-Watt University, UK
Keith Cattell	University of Cape Town, South Africa
Antoinette Charles	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK
Fiona Cheung	Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Sai On Cheung	City University of Hong Kong
Samuel Chikafalimani	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Ifte Choudhury	Texas A and M University, USA
Chris Cloete	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Alan Coday	Anglia Ruskin University, UK
Michael Coffey	Anglia Ruskin University, UK
Nigel Craig	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK
Ayirebi Dansoh	KNUST, Ghana
Peter Davis	Curtin University, Australia
Peter Defoe	Calford Seaden, UK
Grace Ding	University of Technology Sydney, Australia
Hemanta Doloi	University of Melbourne, Australia
John Dye	TPS Consult, UK
Peter Edwards	RMIT, Australia
Charles Egbu	University of Salford, UK
Ola Fagbenle	Covenant University, Nigeria
Ben Farrow	Auburn University, USA
Peter Fenn	University of Manchester, UK
Peter Fewings	University of the West of England, UK

Peter Fisher	University of Northumbria, UK
Chris Fortune	University of Salford, UK
Valerie Francis	University of Melbourne, Australia
Rod Gameson	University of Wolverhampton, UK
Abdulkadir Ganah	University of Central Lancashire, UK
Seung Hon Han	Yonsei University, South Korea
Anthony Hatfield	University of Wolverhampton, UK
Theo Haupt	Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa
Dries Hauptfleisch	University of the Free State, South Africa
Paul Holley	Auburn University, USA
Danie Hoffman	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Keith Hogg	University of Northumbria, UK
Alan Hore	Construction IT Alliance, Ireland
Bon-Gang Hwang	National University of Singapore
Joseph Igwe	University of Lagos, Nigeria
Adi Irfan	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia
Javier Irizarry	Georgia Institute of Technology, USA
Usman Isah	University of Manchester, UK
David Jenkins	University of Glamorgan, UK
Godfaurd John	University of Central Lancashire, UK
Keith Jones	University of Greenwich, UK
Dean Kashiwagi	Arizona State University, USA
Nthatisi Khatleli	University of Cape Town, South Africa
Mohammed Kishk	Robert Gordon's University, UK
Andrew Knight	Nottingham Trent University, UK
Scott Kramer	Auburn University, USA
Esra Kurul	Oxford Brookes University, UK
Richard Laing	Robert Gordon's University, UK
Terence Lam	Anglia Ruskin University, UK
Veerarak Likhitrungsilp	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
John Littlewood	University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, UK
Junshan Liu	Auburn University, USA
Champika Liyanage	University of Central Lancashire, UK
Greg Lloyd	University of Ulster, UK
S M Lo	City University of Hong Kong
Mok Ken Loong	Yonsei University, South Korea
Martin Loosemore	University of New South Wales, Australia
David Manase	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK
Donny Mangitung	Universitas Tadulako, Malaysia
Patrick Manu	University of Wolverhampton, UK
Tinus Maritz	University of Pretoria, South Africa
Hendrik Marx	University of the Free State, South Africa
Ludwig Martin	Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa
Wilfred Matipa	Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Steven McCabe	Birmingham City University, UK
Annie McCartney	University of Glamorgan, UK
Andrew McCoy	Virginia Tech, USA
Enda McKenna	Queen's University Belfast, UK
Kathy Michell	University of Cape Town, South Africa
Roy Morledge	Nottingham Trent University, UK

Michael Murray	University of Strathclyde, UK
Saka Najimu Stanley Njuangang	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK University of Central Lancashire, UK
Henry Odeyinka Ayodejo Ojo Michael Oladokun Alfred Olatunji Austin Otegbulu Beliz Ozorhon Obinna Ozumba	University of Ulster, UK Ministry of National Development, Seychelles University of Uyo, Nigeria Newcastle University, Australia Bogazici University, Turkey University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa
Robert Pearl Srinath Perera Joanna Poon Keith Potts Elena de la Poza Plaza Matthijs Prins Hendrik Prinsloo	University of KwaZulu, Natal, South Africa Northumbria University, UK Nottingham Trent University, UK University of Wolverhampton, UK Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands University of Pretoria, South Africa
Richard Reed Zhaomin Ren Herbert Robinson Kathryn Robson Simon Robson David Root Kathy Roper Steve Rowlinson Paul Royston Paul Ryall	Deakin University, Australia University of Glamorgan, UK London South Bank University, UK RMIT, Australia University of Northumbria, UK University of Cape Town, South Africa Georgia Institute of Technology, USA University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Nottingham Trent University, UK University of Glamorgan, UK
Amrit Sagoo Alfredo Serpell Winston Shakantu Yvonne Simpson John Smallwood Heather Smeaton-Webb Bruce Smith Melanie Smith Hedley Smyth John Spillane Suresh Subashini Kenneth Sullivan	Coventry University, UK Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa University of Greenwich, UK Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa MUJV Ltd. UK Auburn University, USA Leeds Metropolitan University, UK University College London, UK Queen's University Belfast, UK University of Wolverhampton, UK Arizona State University, USA
Joe Tah Derek Thomson Matthew Tucker	Oxford Brookes University, UK Heriot-Watt University, UK Liverpool John Moores University, UK
Chika Udeaja	Northumbria University, UK
Basie Verster Francois Viruly	University of the Free State, South Africa University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa
John Wall Sara Wilkinson Trefor Williams	Waterford Institute of Technology, Ireland Deakin University, Australia University of Glamorgan, UK

Bimbo Windapo	University of Cape Town, South Africa
Francis Wong	Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Ing Liang Wong	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK
Andrew Wright	De Montfort University, UK
Peter Wyatt	University of Reading, UK
Junli Yang	University of Westminster, UK
Wan Zahari Wan Yusoff	Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia
George Zillante	University of South Australia
Benita Zulch	University of the Free State, South Africa
Sam Zulu	Leeds Metropolitan University, UK

In addition to this, the following specialist panel of peer-review experts assessed papers for the COBRA session arranged by CIB W113

John Adriaanse	London South Bank University, UK
Julie Adshead	University of Salford, UK
Alison Ahearn	Imperial College London, UK
Rachelle Alterman	Technion, Israel
Deniz Artan Ilter	Istanbul Technical University, Turkey
Jane Ball	University of Sheffield, UK
Luke Bennett	Sheffield Hallam University, UK
Michael Brand	University of New South Wales, Australia
Penny Brooker	University of Wolverhampton, UK
Alice Christudason	National University of Singapore
Paul Chynoweth	University of Salford, UK
Sai On Cheung	City University of Hong Kong
Julie Cross	University of Salford, UK
Melissa Daigneault	Texas A&M University, USA
Steve Donohoe	University of Plymouth, UK
Ari Ekroos	University of Helsinki, Finland
Tilak Ginige	Bournemouth University, UK
Martin Green	Leeds Metropolitan University, UK
David Greenwood	Northumbria University, UK
Asanga Gunawansa	National University of Singapore
Jan-Bertram Hillig	University of Reading, UK
Rob Home	Anglia Ruskin University, UK
Peter Kennedy	Glasgow Caledonian University, UK
Anthony Lavers	Keating Chambers, UK
Wayne Lord	Loughborough University, UK
Sarah Lupton	Cardiff University
Tim McLernon	University of Ulster, UK
Frits Meijer	TU Delft, The Netherlands
Jim Mason	University of the West of England, UK
Brodie McAdam	University of Salford, UK
Tinus Maritz	University of Pretoria, South Africa

Francis Moor	University of Salford, UK
Issaka Ndekugri	University of Wolverhampton, UK
John Pointing	Kingston University, UK
Razani Abdul Rahim	Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia
Linda Thomas-Mobley	Georgia Tech, USA
Paul Tracey	University of Salford, UK
Yvonne Scannell	Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
Cathy Sherry	University of New South Wales, Australia
Julian Sidoli del Ceno	Birmingham City University, UK
Keren Tweeddale	London South Bank University, UK
Henk Visscher	TU Delft, The Netherlands
Peter Ward	University of Newcastle, Australia

Role of the local governments in disaster risk reduction

Chamindi Malalgoda
University of Salford, UK
C.I.Malalgoda@pgr.salford.ac.uk

Dilanthi Amaratunga
University of Salford, UK
R.D.G.Amaratunga@salford.ac.uk

Chaminda Pathirage
University of Salford, UK
C.P.Pathirage@salford.ac.uk

Abstract

The occurrence of the natural disasters has increased significantly in recent past and this has resulted in a high number of mortalities and economic and social losses worldwide. This necessitates the implementation of disaster risk reduction measures in order to achieve a disaster resilient environment. The risk reduction through improved resilience requires a multi-sectoral approach with the participation of various stake holders. As such, the local governments being the first responder and the one responsible for community development, has a key role to play in achieving society's resilience to disasters.

Therefore the purpose of this paper is to explore the nature and the potential role of the local government in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives in development of the society's resilience to natural disasters.

The literature review method has been used to address this potential role of the local governments in disaster risk reduction and the data and information has been gathered from research papers on electronic databases along with conference proceedings and reports published by various institutions.

The review of literature reveals that the local government has a significant role to play in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives. However several incidents have been reported on inadequate contribution of local governments in disaster risk reduction activities. This could mainly be attributed to inadequate financial, manpower and other resources available with local governments and their failure to make timely decisions due to lack of authority. This highlights the need for empowering local governments with improved governance structure.

Keywords: Disasters, Disaster risk reduction, local governments

1. Introduction

Disasters cause a significant amount of damage and losses around the world every year (Ofori, 2001). There has been a distinct increase in the number and scale of natural disasters over the past few years, and the impact in terms of human, structural and economic losses has increased considerably. According to official statistics issued by the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) and the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UN/ISDR) in 2010, natural disasters have caused the death of more than 780,000 people over the past ten years and destroyed a minimum of US \$ 960 billion worth of property and infrastructure.

In recognition of the devastating and long term impacts of disasters the importance of disaster risk reduction has been widely recognized by the researchers and the policy makers all over the world. Enormous challenges are associated with implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives and therefore inter disciplinary strategies, tools and approaches are required to ensure proper management and resourcing of risk reduction efforts (Haigh & Amaratunga, 2010). Disaster mitigation and response is a multi agency and multi sectoral activity and most countries have established national disaster response agencies, which may be decentralised to regional, district and village levels (Osei, 2007). It has been identified that the local government is the first responder and the one responsible for community development and sustainable disaster risk reduction (ISDR, 2010). It has further recognized the need of empowering the local government as a key priority to encourage democratic decision-making involving the citizens and all key stakeholders at the local level in order to ensure effective implementation of disaster risk reduction measures (ISDR, 2010).

Even though there is a growing concern among researchers and practitioners on the role of local government in leading disaster risk reduction initiatives, several incidents have been reported on the inadequate contribution of local governments in taking the lead of disaster risk reduction initiatives. Pearce (2003) have identified that some of the local governments does not include or work with people and this has made it difficult to make decisions and reasonable solutions for disaster related problems. According to Manyena (2006) development of disaster resilience by local authorities are largely dependent on the capacity of local authorities of planning and managing the development activities and this emphasise the need of capacity development of local governments in order to implement proper disaster risk reduction initiatives. Therefore it is important to identify the challenges faced by local governments in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives and to research on how the local governments can be empowered and governance can be reformed to ensure successful implementation of disaster risk reduction initiatives at the local governmental level.

Therefore the main aim of this paper is to highlight the role of the local government in contributing to disaster risk reduction and to discuss the challenges faced by local governments in implementing disaster risk reduction. Firstly a brief explanation has been presented regarding the nature and impact of disasters and the importance of disaster risk reduction initiatives in the current context. Then a brief comparative study is done on the nature and structure of local governments in different countries. Finally a review of existing research study has been used to identify the role and the challenges faced by the local governments in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives. Literature review method has been used to review the role of the local governments in disaster risk reduction and the data and information has been gathered from research papers on various electronic databases along with conference proceedings and reports published by various institutions.

2. Concept of Disaster Risk Reduction

2.1 *Disasters and vulnerability to natural disasters*

There have been many attempts to define the term “disaster”. ISDR (2002) has defined disaster as a “serious disruption, of the functioning of a society, causing widespread human, material, or environmental losses, which exceed the ability of the affected society to cope using only its own resources”. Disasters can be categorized by their origin, natural or man-made. Most of the disasters investigated in the literature are natural disasters. The origin and the causes of disasters can be varied but the consequences to human society are frequently similar which includes, extensive loss of lives, particularly among vulnerable members of the community; economic losses, hindering development goals; destruction of the built and natural environment, increasing vulnerability; and widespread disruption to local institutions and livelihood and disempowering the local community (Haigh and Amaratunga, 2010)

Disasters are considered to be a major threat to the entire world and disaster scholars who have investigated the relationship between development and vulnerabilities have identified that the impact of disasters are likely to increase in the future (Aini & Fakhru-Razi, 2010). Disaster risk arises when hazards interact with physical, social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities (UNISDR, 2005). Vulnerability means characteristics of a person or group in terms of their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist, and recover from the impact of a natural hazard (Blaikie, 1994). It is identified that vulnerabilities related to changing demographic, technological and socio-economic conditions, unplanned urbanization, development within high-risk zones, under-development, environmental degradation, climate variability, climate change, geological hazards, competition for scarce resources, and the impact of epidemics such as HIV/AIDS are ever increasing and could result in a higher degree of disaster occurrence which could increasingly threaten the world’s economy, and its population and the sustainable development of developing countries (UNISDR, 2005). Vulnerability is also increasing

due to rising poverty, a growing global population, armed conflict and other underlying development issues (Hayles, 2010). Therefore it is important to manage these vulnerabilities in order to reduce the impact of disasters. As a result of this growing vulnerability, the disaster risk reduction has become one of the solutions to mitigate the impact of disasters in advance and for speedy recovery after a disaster (Palliyaguru and Amaratunga, 2008).

2.2 *Disaster Risk Reduction*

Disaster risk reduction (DRR) includes the systematic development and application of policies, strategies and practices to avoid (prevention) or limit (mitigation and preparedness) the adverse effects of hazards (ISDR, 2010). The impact of disasters can be reduced or prevented with the proper adoption of the disaster risk reduction strategies.

It has been identified that all individuals and communities are vulnerable to hazards in varying degrees and all have intrinsic capacities to reduce the vulnerability (Ginige et al, 2009). It has been identified that the consequences of a disaster is very less if it happen in a place where people are well protected and the consequences are very high if it happen in a poorly protected environment. As can be seen the disaster risk can be minimised by the elimination of the unsafe conditions, in terms of people, property and infrastructure (Pathirage et al, 2008). Furthermore, population expansion, urbanisation, inappropriate developments and global climate change has made the world increasingly unsafe and therefore it is essential to expand risk reduction measures to prevent or reduce the impact of future disasters.

Therefore disaster risk reduction should entail measures to curb disaster losses by addressing hazards and people's vulnerability to them, throughout the disaster management cycle (Palliyaguru and Amaratunga, 2008). Also, it is important to note that disaster risk reduction should be incorporated in all development strategies, policies, programmes and investments at national and local government levels (Secretary-General, 2006).

The disaster risk reduction measures can be categorised in several ways and they are policy and planning measures, physical preventative measures, physical coping and/or adaptive measures and community capacity building measures (DFID, 2005). Policy and planning measures are implemented at the national or regional level and help to integrate DRR into the policy framework. Physical preventive measures are designed to reduce the vulnerability and exposure of infrastructure to natural hazards. Physical coping and adaptive measures includes coping and adaptive infrastructure which are capable to withstand in case of a disaster. Community capacity building measures are designed and

implemented at the community level, particularly the strengthening of communities to better respond and cope to a disaster event through training and capacity building.

McEntire et al (2010) have identified four schools of thoughts for vulnerability reduction which in turn can be used for disaster risk reduction. The physical science school is about living in safe areas and focuses on exposure to hazards and risk reduction. The engineering school concentrates on the built environment and ways to increase resistance through construction practices and methods of fabrication. The structural school concentrates on traditional notions of vulnerability more than the other three, and it stresses susceptibility based on socioeconomic factors and demographic characteristics including race, ethnicity, gender, age, and other factors. The organizational school stresses resilience or the effectiveness of response and recovery operations concentrating on the importance of preparedness, leadership, management, and the ability to adapt, improvise, and be creative.

3. Introduction to Local Government

Local governments has been identified as one of the key stakeholder in disaster risk reduction process as they are in charge of critical development functions to reduce disaster risks, such as land use planning, urban development planning, public works, construction safety and licensing, social services and responding to the need of the poor and the under privileged and implementation and strengthening of the decentralization process (UNISDR, 2010). Due to this significant role of the local government in disaster risk reduction, the UNISDR has specifically addressed the 2010-2011 campaign to local governments under the theme of “Building resilient cities”. Before examining this potential role of the local governments in disaster risk reduction, it is important to understand the structure and the composition of local government.

The term local government encompasses urban and rural communities of different size and levels which includes regional, provincial, metropolitan, city, municipality, township and village councils (The Incheon Declaration, 2009). Usually countries distribute functional responsibilities between the central government and sub national governments along various dimensions including fiscal, administrative and political (Col, 2007). It is noted that the duties, structure, composition and the terminology of local governments may vary across the world. In India, there are two types of local governments in operation: Panchayats in rural areas and Municipalities in urban areas (Johnson, 2003) while in United Kingdom, the local government is organised, depending on the location, which includes country and district councils, unitary authorities including borough council, city council, county council or district council and town and parish councils (Wilson, 1996). In the United States, states are sovereign jurisdictions with specific and reserved responsibilities established in the United States constitution and the functions of sub state levels of government depends entirely on each state's

constitution with responsibilities differing among states (Col, 2007). In contrast China has five levels of governments below the national governmental level namely; provinces, prefectures, counties, townships and villages and the county can be identified as the real local level of government (Col, 2007).

Local Government is a huge service provider to the local community. Some local governments provide services to the general public directly or may arrange to do so by third parties. Local governments are responsible for providing a vast range of services in accordance with both the wishes of the community it serves and the requirements of central government either on a statutory or discretionary basis (Yorke, 2007). Usually the powers of the local government are derived from legislation and by Acts of Parliament (SPICe Briefing, 2002). Some powers are 'mandatory' while others are 'voluntary' allowing authority to provide services if it desires.

4. Local Government's Role in Disaster Risk Reduction

Disaster management require a multidisciplinary approach which involves partnerships of various organizations and community groups (Haigh & Amaratunga, 2010). Government agencies need to play a critical role during the time of a disaster. In many developing countries, national disaster management authority or the ministry handles disaster management affairs. The activities and functional responsibilities of such institutions are not often decentralized, or authority of such institutions not adequately delegated to lower levels of the government machinery (APDC, 2007). In most countries, the central government retains authority over disaster management programs with centralized decision making and resources, which often focus on developing response capabilities rather than proactive mitigation, and the local government action for disaster management is often given a lower priority (Bendimerad, 2003). Therefore after a major disaster, decision making tends to be a centralized process, possibly due to media pressure or the inevitable high political profile of such events (Blaikie, 1994). This has to be viewed as a hindrance for achieving the disaster resilience at community and local levels (APDC, 2007). As a result there is a strong need for decentralization of disaster management with adequate powers to local governments in order to facilitate building safer communities and to support sustainable development.

4.1 Concept of Decentralization of Disaster Management

The term 'decentralization' is mainly associated with the local government and disaster risk reduction literature which is an important factor in developing comprehensive plans for disaster risk management (UNVolunteers, 2005). Modern disaster management practice recognizes the importance of a strong and well-structured local disaster management capacity, and the need for decentralized authority to achieve effective response and mitigation (Bendimerad, 2003). According to the World

Bank (2010) decentralization includes the transfer of authority and responsibility of public functions from the central government to subordinate or quasi-independent government organizations and/or the private sector which is a complex multifaceted concept. In other words it can be defined as transfer of decision making authority from central to local government. It should be noted that there are different types of decentralization which distinguished based on characteristics, policy implications, and conditions for success (World Bank, 2010).

Decentralization, devolution and transparency enhance disaster mitigation because they facilitate access (APDC, 2004) and the local government units can be identified as the most responsive units of implementing disaster risk reduction within a decentralized system of administration. It should be noted that even though the central government should hold the ultimate responsibility of disaster risk reduction within the country, the importance of delegating the responsibility of risk reduction to local governments cannot be overlooked as they are rooted at the local level where disasters occur and are more close to the local community which will enable them to involve local community in the risk reduction initiatives. Ahrens & Rudolph (2006) have identified the requirement of a decentralized and efficient politico-administrative structure which supports local participation in order to be responsive to the local population including marginalized groups. UNISDR (2004) too has identified the importance of institutionalizing risk reduction at the local level which emphasizes decentralized and coordinated partnerships between disaster management agencies and the people, based on the principle of self-consent.

In Colombia, the decentralization of decision-making power represents a turning-point in the country, providing more autonomy to local authorities to make progress on disaster risk reduction (Pulido, 2008). It is important to note that the reduction of vulnerability and the capacity to respond to disasters is directly related to the degree of decentralized access to information, communication and decision making and the control of resources (Bollin, 2003) and therefore it is important to encourage governments to accelerate the decentralization of disaster risk reduction mechanisms, particularly at the local-level risk management interventions (UNISDR, 2004).

Even though there is a wide spread agreement among literature on the necessity of decentralization of disaster risk reduction, it is important to have a clear distinguish between what actions to be decentralized and what need to be managed centrally. According to APDC (2004), the national governments are organized along sectoral lines and can provide broad guidelines and solution to critical issues. The local governments are necessary cross sectorally.

The necessity (Who should undertake this task?) and performance capability (Who is best suited to undertake this task?) are two basic aspects which need to be considered when designing a

decentralized system of administration and also it is important to consider the following when designing a decentralized system of administration (Bollin, 2003);

- Decentralized system must ensure that the measures of the various actors complement each other and should facilitate mutual consultation.
- In addition to the powers it is important to provide personnel, sectoral and financial resources to local actors.
- When allocating new powers and resources it is also important to set up suitable mechanisms for their control and use.

Therefore it is the responsibility of the central government to facilitate support in terms of technical, and more importantly the financial incentives for investing in risk reduction (Pulido, 2008).

4.2 Why Local Government?

There is a wide spread agreement within the literature that local governments have a vital role in disaster risk reduction initiatives. Manyena (2006) has identified local authorities as the vehicles through which the disaster risk agenda could be championed as they are rooted in the local communities where disasters happen. It has also asserted the requirement of incorporating public participation at the local decision making level in order to implement successful mitigation strategies (Pearce, 2003). Furthermore, the disaster risk reduction and urban sustainability are more likely to be addressed by local rather than central governments since local governments typically have more authority over urban planning and construction supervision (Bendimerad, 2003).

The role of the local or municipal level in disaster risk reduction is being increasingly recognized and stressed in international discussions. The role of local government in dealing with disaster risk reduction has been recognized as a key factor to build resilient communities and therefore the UNISDR has specifically addressed the 2010-2011 world disaster risk reduction campaign to local governments under the theme of “Building resilient cities”. Therefore it is well understood that local governments have a significant role to play in contributing to the building of disaster resilient cities to avoid or limit the adverse impacts of disasters. According to (Bollin, 2003) there are several reasons behind the need of local governments to play a major role in disaster risk reduction. They are;

- Disasters are often local events and therefore the local knowledge and measures are required which are tailored to local hazards and vulnerabilities.
- National disaster management authorities in most developing countries are centrally organized and unable to provide effective help in an emergency, particularly to rural populations and therefore the endangered areas must rely on their own capabilities to protect their populations.

- Also quite often it is the society which increases the disaster risk by way of soil degradation through deforestation, unsafe settlements on dangerous slopes etc. and therefore it should be made more aware of the dangers and made accountable for disaster risk management.

4.3 *How the Local Government can contribute in Disaster Risk Reduction*

Though all levels of governments are generally involved in disaster management, the role and actions of local government in disaster risk reduction are predominantly critical (Col, 2007). Local governments can play a key role in implementing disaster risk reduction as they are rooted at the local level where disasters happen and can contribute to disaster risk reduction in numerous ways. According to UNISDR (2010) there are three major roles of local governments in implementing disaster risk reduction which includes,

- To play a central role in coordinating and sustaining a multi level, multi stake holder platform to promote DRR in the region or for a specific hazard

Local governments are in a better position to engage and coordinate the stake holders who are involved in disaster risk reduction efforts. Therefore the local governments are expected to lead the stake holders and to facilitate them with required support and assistance in order to successfully engage in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives.

- To effectively engage local communities and citizens to disaster risk reduction activities and link their concerns with government priorities

Local government can be identified as one of the closest political authority to the local community and therefore they are in a better position to effectively engage local community to disaster risk reduction activities and address their concerns efficiently and effectively. According to the ten step checklist developed by UNISDR (2010) local governments could organize education programmes on disaster risk reduction in schools and local communities in order to educate and involve local communities to risk reduction activities.

- To strengthen their own institutional capacities and implement practical DRR actions by themselves

The local governments are required to strengthen their institutional capacity in order to effectively engage in practical disaster risk reduction actions in order to avoid or limit the adverse impacts of disasters to the local community. Local government can be identified as the unit where land use practices can be regulated and safer construction methodologies can be promoted and enforced (APDC, 2004). According to the ten step checklist developed by UNISDR (2010) the local government need to play a major role in making the disaster risk a priority by way of putting in place a organization to deal with disaster risk within the local government in coordination with all sectors, based on participation of citizen groups and civil society, assigning a budget for disaster risk reduction with incentives for preventive actions to

reduce risks in housing and environment and identifying safe land for low income citizens in urban development plans. In addition the local government can contribute in maintaining updated data on hazards and vulnerabilities, prepare risk assessment and use these as basis for urban development plans and decisions, and make them easily available for the public, investing in and maintain risk reducing infrastructure such as flood drainage, applying risk compliant building regulations and land use planning norms appropriate to the needs and within reach of low income citizens, assessing the safety of all schools and health facilities and upgrade as necessary, project ecosystems and natural buffers to mitigate floods, storm surges and other hazards, adapting to climate change building on risk reduction practices and installing early warning systems and emergency management capacities with regular public drills.

- To devise and implement innovative tools and techniques for disaster risk reduction, which can be replicated elsewhere or scaled up nationwide

The local governments are in a better position to organize, develop and experiment new tools and technologies for disaster risk reduction such as early warning systems etc. and making them policy priorities.

In addition, APDC (2003) has highlighted the contribution of local government in disaster management and emphasized importance of local government in following activities.

- Local institutions could build up experiences from previous disasters and refine locally sustainable disaster management systems.
- Local institutions could make creative use of cost effective local resources.
- Local institutions could create and sustain an inclusive participatory institutional system for effective disaster management including establishment of specialized task forces to carry out warning, communication, transport, rescue, evacuation, supply, relief, medical, fire damage assistance, security and over all damage control at the local level under the overall coordination of local government.
- The local institutions could mediate with national agencies to bring in locally relevant scientific advancements for effective disaster management
- The local institutions could establish a system to respond highly localized but locally devastating disasters which national level institutions ignore.
- The informal social networks could provide mechanisms to take care of most vulnerable households
- Local institutions could promote establishing a mechanism for contingency funding for speedy reconstruction and recovery activities with participation of communities.

- Local institutions could mediate between local communities and National governments for policy changes to take care of locally relevant development measures.

It is therefore clear that local government can contribute to disaster risk reduction in numerous ways. The disaster risk reduction has to be mainly achieved through proactive measures of implementing mitigatory measures with the participation of the community groups and other stake holders.

4.4 Challenges faced by Local Government in Disaster Risk Reduction

Even though the role of the local governments in disaster risk reduction has been widely recognized in the literature several authors and researchers have identified that number of gaps do exist in the actual contribution made by the local governments in disaster risk reduction endeavours. According to Manyena (2006), in Zimbabwe, rural district councils are experiencing number of challenges such as, inadequate financial and human resources, unstable political system and problems related to decentralization. At a time of a disaster, local governments are immediately confronted with the responsibility of providing relief to victims but often do not have the resources and adequate legislative authority (Bendimerad, 2003). In the context of Hurricane Katrina of 2005 in the gulf coast of USA, defining what was in the best interest of the affected people became very difficult due to multi layered governance and similarly in Asian Tsunami of 2004, repercussions have been observed in Indonesia and Sri Lanka due to prior internal conflicts and inherent administrative weaknesses (Osei, 2007). According to Sabri & Jaber (2007) major concerns faced by Palestinian local government are, controlling methods, relationship issues with the central government, organization issues, electronic services and transparency and community contributions. Pearce (2003) too have argued that some of the local governments does not include or work with people and this has made it difficult to make decisions regarding the provision of reasonable solutions for disaster related problems. Local government are experiencing competing priorities along with limited resources, and therefore local governments not often allocate financial resources to disaster management programs and this will affect the proactive decision-making process related to mitigation and preparedness activities (Bendimerad, 2003).

UN/ISDR (2010) have identified five challenges and opportunities faced by local governments in implementing successful disaster risk reduction strategies which includes, lack of interest and capacities especially the funding mechanisms for risk reduction projects; understanding local risk and vulnerabilities where local government sometimes lack knowledge about disaster risks and vulnerabilities; maintaining and upgrading critical infrastructure; managing long term process as disaster risk reduction initiatives often suffer from staff changes and uneven interest among staff and long term political commitment and learning from disasters where focused on short term recovery

works after the onset of a disaster. In summary, the main challenges faced by local government can be categorised under two headings namely, the internal factors and external factors. Internal factors include, lack of knowledge on disaster risk reduction initiatives, lack of interest on the subject, human resource issues, lack of financial capabilities, internal organizational and administrative weaknesses and competing priorities. The external factors include, lack of authority, multi layered governance arrangements, unstable political systems and the relationship issues with the central government. Therefore it is important to address the challenges faced by local governments in implementing disaster risk reduction initiatives in a holistic manner to ensure effective disaster risk reduction. However it should be noted that contribution and challenges of local government vary from one country to another based on culture, administrative procedures and governance.

The capacity development and improving governance of the local governments has been given a very high priority in the current context in order to empower the local governments to take a leading role in disaster risk reduction and as a way of addressing the aforesaid challenges. UNISDR (2004) have identified the need of improved political commitment and improved governance of disaster risk reduction institutions as two key strategies to be implemented in Africa. Several other authors too have supported the argument of the importance of good governance in disaster risk reduction. Political will and effective governance (e.g. legislation, policies, planning, legal frameworks, etc) are key element of successful disaster risk reduction initiative (APDC, 2004; WMO, 2010). Therefore it is important to understand what is meant by good governance. According to WMO (2010) good governance includes “adoption and promotion of robust and sound policies, legislation, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks, and the creation of an enabling environment that is characterized by appropriate decision making processes to allow effective participation of stakeholders, complemented by the appropriate allocation of resources” while Ahrens & Rudolph (2006) identified accountability, participation, predictability and transparency as the key features of a governance structure that encourage development and supports risk reduction.

Collins and Kapucu (2008) have identified that effective system requires early warning and risk reduction be mainstreamed in to a policy process and that governmental agencies should have the capacity to be able to design and implement effective policy. Manyena (2006) further identified that development of disaster resilience by local authorities are largely dependent on the capacity of local authorities of planning and managing the development activities. Institutional capacities at national to local levels, supplemented by effective information and knowledge sharing mechanisms among different stakeholders are key to effective disaster risk reduction (WMO, 2010). Therefore the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 considers that both communities and local authorities should be empowered to manage and reduce disaster risk by having access to the necessary information, resources and authority to implement actions (UNISDR, 2010). The authority can be identified as the

most important factor in empowering local governments, as lack of authority in disaster management at local government level would further aggravate vulnerability, as the risk reduction efforts are closely linked to land use planning, urban settlement and construction control (Bendimerad, 2003). Therefore it is of utmost important to build capacity and empowering local governments to help them acquire knowledge and resources and to provide them with appropriate decision making authority in order to ensure effective contribution in disaster resilience.

5. Conclusions

The amount and the severity of natural disasters have increased in recent decades with serious implications to the entire world. This has increased the degree of uncertainty faced by governments and policy makers with the existing system and recognized the need of proactive strategies for disaster risk reduction in order to increase the community's resilience. Disaster risk reduction needs to be achieved through a combined effort of various stake holders and community groups with a proper coordination and leadership. A review of the literature reveals that the local governments have a key role to play in disaster risk reduction initiatives as they are rooted at the ground level where disasters occur and are more close to the local community.

Even though there is a growing concern among researchers and practitioners on the role of local government in leading disaster risk reduction initiatives, several incidents have been reported on the inadequate contribution of local governments in taking the lead of disaster risk reduction initiatives. The local governments are facing number of challenges in implementing disaster risk reduction at local level. The successfulness of the local government strategies in disaster risk reduction is directly linked to the capacity of the local governments in implementing the disaster risk reduction strategies. Therefore in order to implement successful disaster risk reduction it is important to address the challenges faced by local governments and to empower the local government with necessary financial and other required resources with proper level of authority in making decisions which require reformation of the existing governance structure.

References

ADAMS, J. AND WISNER, B. (2003). *Environmental health in emergencies and disasters: a practical guide* [online]. World Health Organization. Available from: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/hygiene/emergencies/emergencies_2002/en/ [Accessed 19 May 2006].

AHRENS, J. AND RUDOLPH, P.M. (2006) "The importance of governance in risk reduction and disaster management", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol 14 No. 4, pp. 207-220.

AINI, M.S. AND FAKHRUL-RAZI, A. (2010 in press) "Development of socio-technical disaster model", *Safety Science*.

AMARASINGHE, M.K.D.W., PATHMASIRI, H.T.K. AND SISIRAKUMARA, M.H.A., (2006). The Public Sector Role in a Disaster Situation: An Empirical Analysis based on Tsunami Disaster on 26th December 2004. *ICBM – 2006, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka*, 372-379.

APDC. (2003). *The role of local institutions in reducing vulnerability to recurrent natural disasters and in sustainable livelihood developments in high risk areas* [online]. Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre. Available from <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/nonfao/ad695e/ad695e00.pdf> [Accessed 29 May 2006].

APDC. (2004). *Building disaster risk reduction in Asia: A way forward* [online]. Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre. Available from: <http://www.adpc.net/infores/kobe.pdf> [Accessed 29 May 2006].

APDC. (2007). *Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into local governance* [online]. Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre. Available from: http://www.adpc.net/v2007/Programs/UDRM/PROMISE/PROGRAM%20COMPONENTS/Component2/Course/2010/MDRRG_brochure.pdf [Accessed 29 May 2010].

BARAKAT, S. (2003). *Housing Reconstruction after Conflict and Disaster* [online]. London, Overseas Development Institute. Available from: <http://www.odihpn.org/documents/networkpaper043.pdf> [Accessed 29 May 2006].

BENDIMERAD, S. (2003). *Disaster risk reduction and sustainable development* [online]. Available from: [http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/114715/istanbul03/docs/istanbul03/05bendimerad3-n\[1\].pdf](http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/114715/istanbul03/docs/istanbul03/05bendimerad3-n[1].pdf) [Accessed 29 May 2010].

BLAIKIE, P. CANNON, T. DAVIS, I. & WISNER, B., 1994. *At Risk - natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters*. 1st ed. London and New York: Routledge.

BOLLIN, C. (2003). *Community based disaster risk management approach* [online]. Eschborn,. Available from: <http://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/en-community-based-drm.pdf> [Accessed 29 July 2010].

CENTRAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ORGANIZATION. (2004). *Disaster Management for Students, Managing Disasters* [online]. Barbados, Central Emergency Relief Organization. Available from: <http://cero.gov.bb/pages/students.html> [Accessed 13 May 2006].

COL, J. (2007) "Managing disasters: the role of local government", *Public administration review*, pp. 114-124.

COLLINS, M.L. AND KAPUCU, N. (2008) "Early warning system and disaster preparedness and response in local government", *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Vol 5 No. 5, pp. 587-600.

DFID (2005), "Natural disasters and disaster risk reduction measures", A Desk Review of Costs and Benefits – Draft Final Report, DFID, London.

GINIGE, K., AMARATUNGA, D. AND HAIGH, R. (2009) "Mainstreaming gender in disaster reduction: why and how?", *Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol 18 No. 1, pp. 23-34.*

HAIGH, R. AND AMARATUNGA, D. (2010) "An integrative review of the built environment discipline's role in the development of society's resilience to disasters", *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment, Vol 1 No. 1, pp. 11-24.*

HAYLES, C. (2010) "An examination of decision making in post disaster housing reconstruction", *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment, Vol 1 No. 1, pp. 103-122.*

ISDR. (2002). *World Disaster Reduction Campaign Disaster Reduction for Sustainable Mountain Development* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: http://www.unisdr.org/eng/public_aware/world_camp/2002/pa-camp02-announc-eng.htm [Accessed 1 April 2006].

ISDR. (2004). *Africa regional strategy for disaster risk reduction* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/africa/af-hfa/docs/africa-regional-strategy.pdf> [Accessed 1 April 2010].

ISDR. (2005). *Hyogo framework for action 2005-2010: building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/hfa/hfa.htm> [Accessed 1 April 2010].

ISDR. (2010). *Earthquakes caused the deadliest disasters in the past decade* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/news/v.php?id=12470> [Accessed 28 Feb 2010].

ISDR. (2010). *Local governments and disaster risk reduction* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: http://www.unisdr.org/preventionweb/files/13627_LocalGovernmentsandDisasterRiskRedu.pdf [Accessed 28 April 2010].

ISDR. (2010). *Strategy outline for the 2010-2011 ISDR world disaster reduction campaign on building resilient cities, addressing urban risk* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: www.unisdr.org/.../campaigns/campaign20102011/.../230_CampaignStrategy.doc [Accessed 28 Feb 2010].

ISDR. (2010). *Terminology: basic terms of disaster risk reduction* [online]. International Strategy for Disaster Reduction – ISDR. Available from: <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/library/lib-terminology-eng%20home.htm> [Accessed 28 Feb 2010].

JOHNSON, C. (2003). *Decentralization in India* [online]. London, Overseas Development Institute. Available from: <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1767.pdf> [Accessed 25 February 2010].

KAWATA, Y. (2001). *Disaster mitigation due to next Nankai earthquake tsunamis occurring in around 2035* [online]. Kyoto, Kyoto University. Available from: http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/its2001/Separate_Papers/1-08_Kawata.pdf [Accessed 25 February 2006].

MANYENA, S.B. (2006) "Rural local authorities and disaster resilience in Zimbabwe", *Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol 15 No. 5, pp. 810-820.*

MCENTIRE, D., CROCKER, C. AND PETERS, E. (2010) "An Addressing vulnerability through an integrative approach", *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment, Vol 1 No. 1, pp. 50-64.*

METRI, B.A. (2006) "Disaster mitigation framework for India using quality circle approach", *Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol 15 No. 4, pp. 621-635.*

NEIL, B. (1986) "Developing an understanding of disaster", *Journal of Sociology, Vol 22 No. 2, pp. 254-271.*

OFORI, G. (2001). *Construction in Disaster Management* [online]. National University of Singapore. Available from: <http://buildnet.csir.co.za/cdcproc/docs/3rd/ofori02.pdf> [Accessed 29 February 2006].

OSEI, P.D. (2007) "Policy responses, institutional networks management and post hurricane Ivan reconstruction in Jamaica", *Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol 16 No. 2, pp. 217-234.*

PALLIYAGURU, R. AND AMARATUNGA, D. (2008) "Managing disaster risks through quality infrastructure and vice versa: post disaster infrastructure reconstruction practices", *Journal of Structural Survey, Vol 26 No. 5, pp. 426-434.*

PARKER, D. (1992) "The mismanagement of hazards – hazard management and emergency planning: perspective of Britain", *James & James, London.*

PATHIRAGE, C., AMARATUNGA, D., HAIGH, R. AND BALDRY, D. (2008) "Lessons learned from Asian tsunami disaster", *BEAR Conference 2008, 11-15 February, Heritence Kandalama, Sri Lanka.*

PEARCE, L. (2003) "Disaster management and community planning and public participation: how to achieve sustainable hazard mitigation", *Natural Hazards, Vol 28 No. 2-3, pp. 211-228.*

PULIDO, L. (2008). *Colombia: Integrating disaster risk reduction at the local level* [online]. Colombia, DPAD. Available from: http://www.eird.org/wikien/images/Colombia_NP_Good_practice_-_02_07_08.pdf [Accessed 25 February 2010].

QUARANTELLI, E.L. AND PERRY, R.W. (2005), "A social science research agenda for the disasters of the 21st century: theoretical, methodological and empirical issues and their professional implementation", *What is a Disaster? New Answers to Old Questions*, Xlibris, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, pp. 325-96.

SABRI, N.R. AND JABER, R.Y (2007) "Managerial performance of Palestinian local authorities", *Transforming government: people, process and policy, Vol 1 No. 4, pp. 350-363.*

SECRETARY-GENERAL (2006), Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction: Report of the Secretary-General to the United Nations General Assembly, available at: http://www.unisdr.org/eng/about_isdr/basic_docs/SG-report/SG-report-61-229-eng.pdf (accessed 15 March 2010).

SHALUF, I.M., AHMADUN, F. AND SAID, A.M. (2003) "A review of disaster and crisis", *Disaster Prevention and Management, Vol 12 No. 1, pp. 24-32.*

SHAW, R., (2009), Role of local actors in community based disaster risk reduction, available at: <http://www.iedm.ges.kyotou.ac.jp/publication/papers/2009/1.%2020%2009.pdf> (accessed 03 April 2010).

SMITH, K., 2001. *Environmental Hazards*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

SONGER, T. (1999). *Epidemiology of Disasters* [online]. University of Pittsburgh. Available from: <http://www.pitt.edu/AFShome/e/p/epi2170/public/html/lecture15/index.htm> [Accessed 25 April 2006].

SPICE BRIEFING. (2002) *Local government in Scotland Bill: power of well-being* [online]. Scotland, The Scottish Parliament. Available from: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/research/pdf_res_brief/sb02-69.pdf [Accessed 01 April 2010].

SRINIVAS, H. *Disaster Management: A Role for the Private Sector* [online]. Kobe, The Global Development Research Center. Available from: <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/disasters/dm-privatesector.html> [Accessed 15 April 2006].

THE INCHEON DECLARATION. (2010). *Building local government alliance for disaster risk reduction* [online]. Summary from 11-13 August conference, Incheon. Available from: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/10962_IncheonDeclarationFinal28Aug09.pdf [Accessed 04 April 2010].

THOMPSON, P. (1995). *Disaster Response* [online]. Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin. Available from: <http://dmc.engr.wisc.edu/courses/response/BB08-03.html> [Accessed 10 March 2006].

UNDP. (2004). *Reducing Disaster Risks* [online]. New York, UNDP. Available from: <http://www.undp.org/bcpr/disred/rdr.htm#contents> [Accessed 22 February 2006].

UNITED NATIONS, (1991). *Mitigating Natural Disasters*. New York: United Nations Publication, (UNDRO/ MIND/ 1990 Manual).

UNITED NATIONS. (2006). *Exploring key changes and developments in post-disaster settlement, shelter and housing, 1982 – 2006* [online]. United Nations. Available from: <http://ochaonline.un.org/GetBin.asp?DocID=4550> [Accessed 22 June 2006].

UN VOLUNTEERS. (2005). *Disaster Risk Reduction, Governance and Volunteeris*. [online]. UN Volunteers. Available from: [http://unvolunteers.org/infobase /events/WCDR /Governance.pdf](http://unvolunteers.org/infobase/events/WCDR/Governance.pdf) [Accessed 22 April 2010].

WILSON, D.J. (1996). "The local government commission: examining the consultative process", *Public Administration, Vol 74 Summer, pp. 199-219*.

WMO. (2010). *A framework for disaster risk management derived from HFA* [online]. World Metrological Organization. Available from: http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/drr/DrmFramework_en.htm [Accessed 01 April 2010].

WORLD BANK. (2010). *What is decentralization* [online]. World Bank. Available from: http://www.ciesin.columbia.edu/decentralization/English/General/Different_forms.html [Accessed 01 April 2010].

YORKE, D.A. (2007). "The local government in England and Wales", *European Journal of Marketing, Vol 18 No. 2, pp. 10-16*.