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ABSTRACT

This study aims to illustrate the intricate relationship and co-dependence between disaster risk management governance and policy implementation performance. Because the capacity of the disaster risk reduction officials significantly influences the inefficiency of policy implementation, this study will include an in-depth exploration of institutional capacity. This study uses the Bojanala Platinum District Municipality as a case study. Therefore, based on the findings of the BPDM’s 2005 research, this study attempts to examine the tendencies in the BPDM from 2010 until 2015. This study recognises that Disaster Risk Management is a burgeoning discipline in South Africa. Moreover, policy implementation is a complex phenomenon that is often overlooked and neglected in the policy formation process. Thus, this study evaluates how the BPDM deals with these challenges and attempts to assess its progress since the promulgation of the DMA and NDMF.

Among the four key performance areas identified in the NDMF, this study focuses on Key performance areas 1 and 2, this is because these KPAs deal directly with the DRM governance and policy implementation.

Previously, disaster management was very reactive whereas the aim of DRM is to manage the risks prior to having a disaster. The results presented in the third chapter of this research indicate that there is still significant emphasis of reactive DRM in BPDM. However, the exception is that the disaster management officials within the district pride themselves for the awareness efforts made towards disaster risk reduction throughout the community.

Utilizing a semi-structured interview process and completion of questionnaires, this study finds that the DRM governance has a direct impact on implementation performance. Consequently, if government provides the necessary platforms to improve institutional capacity within the district then policy performance should increase. Finally, this study concludes that the governing structures at both district and local municipal levels need to establish municipal specific DRM policies and performance management systems to improve policy implementation.

Key concepts: DRM governance, policy implementation, institutional capacity, DMA, NDMF, policy performance.
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CHAPTER 1: ORIENTATION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 Introduction and orientation

Disaster management is a burgeoning discipline in South Africa (Vermaak & Van Niekerk 2004:1). The severe floods that occurred in the Cape flats of Cape Town in June of 1994 prompted discussions about disaster management as well as the establishment of disaster management legislation by the South African government (South Africa, 2005). This led to the initiation of the field of disaster risk management working papers in 1998 with development of the Green Paper on Disaster Management.

The aim of the Green Paper at the time was to give a platform to reflect on the approaches to disaster management (Van der Waldt, 2007:241). Following the Green Paper, the White Paper on Disaster Management was conceptualized in 1999 to discuss the imperatives of preventing human loss as well as limiting economic and environmental degradation (Van der Waldt, 2009:241).

These papers further instigated the promulgation of Act 57 of 2002 known as the Disaster Management Act of South Africa (DMA) (South Africa, 2003:1). In the past, due to limited knowledge of and the failure to acknowledge the possibility of non-natural hazards, a reactive approach was implemented to the disaster management of natural hazards. However, the present Disaster Management Act makes provisions for disaster mitigation prior to, during, and after the occurrence of a hazardous event. The DMA also calls for the establishment of national, provincial and municipal disaster management centres (South Africa, 2003) as a core function of disaster risk management in South Africa. Just like all public policies, disaster risk management policies are set to improve the social dynamics of the country and these policies can have an impact on society whether or not they are implemented (Wissink, 2006:79). Academics such as Van Riet and Diedericks (2009:1), and Van Niekerk (2005:121) infer that the DMA has a holistic approach to effective disaster management at every sphere of government.

Historically, disaster management in South Africa referred to the actions taken in response to a disaster and this situation led to an increase in human and economic losses. The implication of this approach is that the precautions and measures that were taken by disaster management institutions and communities, was primarily designed to cope with the aftermath of disasters (Van Riet & Van Niekerk, 2010:556). Alternatively,
the concept of disaster risk reduction was established as a proactive approach to reduce the prevalence of disasters. This is to ensure the availability of adequate resources for disaster preparedness as well as during, and post-disaster relief efforts (Van Niekerk, 2006:100). According to the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (Cadri) institutional capacity is an essential factor for effective disaster management. Although the importance of capacity been discussed broadly in the various disaster management frameworks, capacity still seems to be lagging at local municipal level (Cadri, 2011:7). To develop the capacity it is imperative to provide and enabling environment whereby individuals are equipped with adequate knowledge to respond to disasters and for them to contribute toward a high level of institutional capacity. It is therefore that capacity can be divided into 3 levels which are 1) an enabling environment, 2) individual level and 3) organizational level. An enabling environment is important because it determines whether the conditions of are institution is favourable for the organization and its individual s to develop (Cadri, 2011: 9). The individual level pertains to any formal education or training that individuals has done in order to have a better understanding of doing what is requested of them in accordance with the policy of the institution. And lastly the organizational level of capacity is about the policies and strategies that outlines the mandate of the institution and ensures that goals and targets are reached(Cadri, 2011: 10).

In disaster preparedness and relief, thorough planning and effective implementation of disaster management policies and strategies are essential. The National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF) of 2005, in conjunction with the DMA (57/2002) and the Disaster Management Amended Act (15/2015) are the documents that provide the disaster management mandate of South Africa. This means that the basis of disaster preparedness, planning, and implementation of hazard relief are found in these disaster management documents (South Africa, 2005:3). Furthermore, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) has provided different frameworks that serve as guidelines for disaster risk reduction. In 1994, the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action was established, this was followed by the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) which was published in 2005. Ten years later in 2015, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction was also published. The contributions of these documents to this study is discussed in the problem statement and later discussed in depth in the second chapter.
In the NDMF, four Key Performance Areas (KPAs) are set out for the implementation of disaster risk management and preparedness. KPA 1 focuses on establishing institutional capacity for national, provincial, and municipal governance spheres to promote the effective implementation of disaster risk policy (South Africa, 2005:4). KPA 2 aims at addressing the need for disaster risk management monitoring with the aim of estimating the effectiveness of disaster risk management efforts that are implemented in the different spheres of governance (South Africa, 2005:4). In KPA 3, the focus is on development-oriented approaches to disaster risk management, while KPA 4 deals with rapid and effective response to post-disaster recovery. Each of the four KPAs also have Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that assist disaster risk governance officials in monitoring the progress made in their efforts towards disaster management. For the purpose of this study, the focus will be on KPA 1 and 2 because these KPAs both focus on effective implementation and the monitoring of the effectiveness of implementation.

Based on the aforementioned factors, the aim of this study is to explore whether DRM policies in accordance with the DMA and the NDMF are effectively implemented in Bojanala Platinum District Municipality (BPDM). The BPDM is situated in the North-West Province of South Africa and is home to 1,185,027 citizens (North-West Government, 2015). The BPDM has five local municipalities listed which Kgetleng River, Madibeng, Moretele, Moses Kotane and Rustenburg local municipalities (North-West Government, 2015). There is a paucity of existing academic research on the BPDM specifically with reference to the disaster risk management field (Morare, 2015). The most recent available research in this field was carried out by the African Centre for Disaster Studies at the North-West University in 2006 (Morare, 2015). This prevailing scarcity of knowledge prompted this study. A problem statement was established to emphasize the necessity for this research study.

1.2. Problem Statement

After the introduction of the White Paper on Disaster Management in South Africa, which set out major policies, one of the biggest challenges was to convert the policies into practical action plans because bringing about such a conversion is a complex process (Brynard & De Coning, 2006:181). For action plans to come to the fore, good governance plays a crucial role (De Coning & Cloete, 2006:31). Effective disaster risk governance and disaster management is crucial for effective implementation of disaster risk mitigation strategies. In the South African context, local government incapacity
directly hampers effective disaster risk policy implementation (Van Niekerk, 2006:101). The situation affirms the necessity for this study to illustrate how incapacity hampers policy implementation at municipal level, with particular focus on the BPDM.

The significance of governance and institutional capacity in DRM has been continually stressed through both the HFA (UNISDR, 2005:16) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2015:14). These frameworks are United Nations led international agreements between over 180 states that aim to improve Disaster Risk Management (DRM) strategies (Van Niekerk, 2014:861). The Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action 1994, (hereafter referred to as the Yokohama strategy), emphasizes the importance of governance in disaster management (UNISDR, 2000:14). It further indicates governance as one of the major gaps. Similarly, in the HFA five priorities were established among these, the first priority highlighted the issue of governance stating that it is essential to ensure that local and national disaster risk management is a priority with strong basis on institutional capacity (UNISDR, 2005:16). Another gap identified by the HFA that is linked to disaster risk governance is the monitoring and assessment of disaster risks (UNISDR, 2005:2).

Moreover, the Municipal Systems Act (32/2000) mandates municipalities to formulate performance management in an effective manner (South Africa, 2000). According to Chuta (2010:3), a large number of municipalities are not meeting the desired targets when it comes to disaster risk management policy implementation. In 2010, the African Centre for Disaster Studies at the North-West University compiled a report on Disaster Risk Management in district and metropolitan municipalities in South Africa. One of the key objectives of this report was to evaluate the gaps between the intended implementation of disaster risk management at local government levels and to estimate what the actual situation is (Botha et al., 2010:11). This report reveals that the North-West Province is one of the provinces that does not comply with legal disaster risk management requirements especially disaster prevention and mitigation (Botha et al., 2010:54).

Among the problems that were previously identified in the disaster risk management department of BPDM that contributes towards the hazard vulnerability in the municipality, is the issue of political factors. Factors such as political infighting and faction forming are amongst those that contribute to the poor state of disaster risk
management in the municipality (North-West Government, 2012). At the top of the political factors are poor prioritization of disaster risk management and the lack of political willingness to acknowledge the importance of disaster risk levels in the municipality (North-West Government, 2012). The fact that political proclivity directly determines the governance structures in any municipality, makes governance in disaster management a crucial aspect of this study. This study focuses on determining whether policies have been implemented in the disaster risk management centres and whether implementation rates have improved since the last research was conducted in the BDPM. This study further aims to investigate what role institutional capacity plays in ensuring effective implementation and wishes to explore specific indicators set by the BPDM to determine or examine the success of disaster management policy implementation.

1.3. Research Objectives

The primary objective of the study is to determine whether and how disaster risk management policies in the BPDM Disaster Management Centre are implemented effectively. The secondary objectives are:

- To find how institutional capacity is enhanced so that the implementation of disaster management policies is enhanced;
- To find out which indicators exist to determine disaster risk governance implementation success;
- To identify a tendency in the efficacy of disaster risk governance in BPDM; and
- To provide recommendations and advice on effective implementation of disaster management policies.

1.4. Research Questions

The primary research question of this study is, what is the effectivity of the implementation of disaster risk management policies in the BPDM Disaster Management Centre? The secondary research questions of this study are:

- What role does institutional capacity play to ensure implementation of disaster management policies?
- Which indicators are used to predict and determine success of disaster management policy implementation in BPDM?
What tendency can be identified in the efficacy of disaster risk governance in BPDM?

What recommendations can be provided to the BPDM on implementation effectiveness regarding disaster management policies?

1.5 Central theoretic statement

Despite the widespread cognisance of the pertinence of policy implementation to every society, it remains largely disregarded due to its complexity (Brynhard & De Coning, 2006:181). The complex nature of policy implementation as a concept is further complicated by its inability to be measured (Brynhard & De Coning, 2006:182). Therefore, evaluating the performance of policy implementation or in this specific case, the effectiveness of policy implementation is a challenge. Nonetheless, this study utilizes the General Policy Outcome Indicator Guide as proposed by Cloete (2006:271) as a reference for measuring policy implementation, which states that a certain measurement objective should use specific indicator guides to determine the impact. For example, if the measurement objective is the achievement of national vision relevance and effectiveness of outcome, then, the General Policy Outcome Indicator Guides: (i) contribution to achievement of national vision and, (ii) goal achievement, or demand and supply at the end of the programme or project cycle will be the suggested indicator guides. Therefore, this guide is best suited to assist in measuring the effectiveness of the policy implementation for this research study.

1.6. Research methodology

A research methodology refers to the systematic way of solving an academic problem and essentially involves the exact procedure followed by a researcher to achieve their desired research goals (Rajasekar et al., 2013:5). For the purpose of this specific study, different online search engines such as JSTOR, Google Scholar, EBSCOhost, Sabinet, and SAePublications were consulted to provide a comprehensive background on policy implementation performance and DRR governance to contribute to the study. Furthermore, interviews were conducted with a specified sample of disaster risk governance officials in each local municipality within the BPDM and in the district municipality. Similarly, one-on-one interviews were conducted to obtain adequate and useful qualitative data for the research. To ensure the participation of all the
respondents, questionnaires were given to disaster risk governance officials who were unable to perform the interviews.

1.7. Literature review

The main purpose of a literature review is to provide the context to a research study and to justify the significance of the research (Boote & Beile, 2005:1). According to Webster and Watson (2002:8), an effective literature review produces a firm foundation for knowledge and facilitates good theory development. It involves identifying, analysing and locating relevant documentation that addresses the research problem. Therefore, a solid literature review needs to be established to elucidate the aims of the study and ensure the application of accurate research tools. In conducting this research, relevant literature and academic material was gathered from the research databases available at the Ferdinand Postma Library at the Potchefstroom campus of the North-West University.

1.8. Research design

To achieve its set objectives, this study utilizes a qualitative research design. Qualitative research is concerned with the interpretation of personal views that are not often obtainable from quantified data as in quantitative research. The choice of using qualitative research methods for this study is based on the fact that qualitative results provide particular findings based on the personal views and experiences of the respective disaster risk management officers of the local municipalities under BPDM, as well as those within the district municipality.

However, the disadvantage of following a qualitative research design is that it is often a lengthy process especially as it involves conducting interviews with all the respondents. Furthermore, because the data is based on personal experiences rather than on facts (Looi, 2014:102), and therefore it is cannot be considered objective. For the purpose of this study, the advantages of the qualitative research outweighs the disadvantages because this study is explorative on the working dynamics of the disaster risk governance officials within the BPDM.
1.9. Empirical investigation

Empirical research is a way of gaining knowledge through the means of direct and indirect observation or experience. In this specific case, exploratory and comparative empirical study methods were used. Exploratory research helps to provide rich quality research (Penwarden, 2014:1) to determine the aims of this study. A comparative study aims at illustrating both differences and similarities in a specific discipline (Azarian, 2011:114). For the purpose of this study, interviews were conducted with a specified sample of disaster risk governance officials from each local municipality in the BPDM, as well as officials in the district municipality. To obtain adequate and useful qualitative data for the present research, one-on-one interviews were held so that personal views of the participants could be interpreted and analysed (Malina et al., 2011).

1.9.1 Sampling

The sample size of this study is significantly small since the study focuses specifically on disaster risk governance. Therefore, the sample consists of disaster risk governance officials from each local municipality as well as officials that are situated at the district level within the BPDM. This necessitated the use of purposive judgement sampling to form the sample size. The main goal of purposive sampling is to focus on the particular characteristics of a population under study with the aim of answering the research questions.

1.9.2 Data collection techniques

Data collection is a way of gathering data using various means like participatory observation, interviews, and questionnaires. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data to gather the necessary information for the research data; this includes questionnaires and semi-structured interviews.

1.9.2.1 Questionnaires

Leung (2001) describes a questionnaire as a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents. According to Leedy (1993:189), a questionnaire is the most widely used technique for collecting primary data. The types of questions posed were designed to
attract an unlimited range of responses (closed questions) to unstructured questions, to which respondents were limited to answer more freely (open questions). The advantages of a questionnaire are that it is cheaper than other methods, it saves time, its anonymity facilitates the obtaining of honest responses, and it allows for the collection of large quantities of data in a short space of time. However, the disadvantage is that officials may refuse to provide important information. Furthermore, it is more efficient with literate respondents and sometimes the percentage returns are often low. Finally, the possibility of distortions in information is high because it includes different people. In addition to the disadvantages, the researcher has follow up on the questionnaires to ensure that every question is answered and to clarify the questions that the respondents may fail to understand.

1.9.2.2 Semi-structured interviews

According to Harrel and Bradley (2009:27), semi-structured interviews are often used in conducting policy research. In its research investigation, this study utilized semi-structured interviews on a purposefully selected group of interviewees.

1.10. Ethical considerations

According to Babbie and Mouton (2004:520), ethical considerations are required whenever conducting a research within an organisation. In that regard, the following ethical aspects were considered for the study:

- participants were assured of their privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality regarding information gathered during the study;
- participants were informed about the aims, purpose, and procedures of the study and were not deceived in any way;
- participants did not suffer any physical and/or psychological harm;
- no participant was forced to take part in the research and the participants were free to withdraw from the research at any moment in time;
- the research was conducted in a gender and culturally sensitive way;
- data analysis and reporting of data was done in an ethical manner;
- the research methods and techniques were clearly stated and the participants and sources consulted were acknowledged; and
all the relevant documentation, that is; consent forms and ethical clearance were completed.

1.11. Limitations of the study

The biggest limitation of this study is the fact that at the time of publication there was no existing model to work in accordance with when evaluating the effectiveness of disaster risk management especially as it is excessively challenging to use only performance indicators. However, this study uses a guide to determine the public policy implementation. Furthermore, because this study has a very distinct sample size, it is important to address the matter of rigour. The paucity of existing literature in the area of disaster management in BPDM is a major contributing factor to the seeming absence of a comprehensive background and survey of literature in this study. In spite of having contacted the disaster management centre, correspondence from the centre proved to be problematic. Moreover, the respondents may not always have been honest, due to the fear that their superiors may read the study and their candid responses may cost them their jobs.

1.12. Chapter layout

Chapter 1

This is the introductory chapter of the study. It introduces the study and consists of the problem statement, research questions, research objectives and the research methodology.

Chapter 2

This chapter includes an in-depth study of disaster management implementation, and an estimation of its effectiveness. This section is also the literature review and it elaborates the purpose of this study.

Chapter 3

This chapter discusses the results of the study including the empirical study.

Chapter 4
This is the conclusive chapter of this study. It provides a summative background and proposes recommendations for further study in the research area.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE STUDY

2.1 Introduction

This study explores the role of disaster governance on policy implementation in the Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, hereafter referred to as BPDM. The significance of this study stresses the priorities as set out in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. In 2015, the United Nations (UN) disaster framework was revised by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) committee which promulgated the formulation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2015). Although the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction was designed in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) of 2005, it aimed to close the numerous gaps identified in the HFA and to improve integrated disaster management. The newly adopted framework highlights four priorities for action that include:

1) Understanding disaster risk;

2) Strengthening disaster risk governance in order to manage disaster risk;

3) Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience; and

4) Building disaster preparedness so that a community can bounce back to an improved version of what it was prior to a disaster (UNISDR, 2015:14).

The second priority that deals with disaster risk governance resonates with the primary aim of this study, which is to analyse how effective disaster risk governance contributes to disaster risk policy implementation in BPDM.

In this chapter, the titles of the different sections are represented by the key concepts of the study to highlight the significance of each concept and to depict their interdependence on each other. These concepts are disaster risk policy, disaster governance, policy implementation, policy performance, and Bojanala Platinum District Municipality (BPDM). By using the key concepts as sub-titles, this study explores each concept individually, provides a definition of the key concepts, and builds on the background and orientation already provided in the first chapter. The intricate co-
dependence of these concepts will be further illustrated in the empirical findings (Chapter 3) of this study.

2.2 Analysis of disaster risk policy

The Disaster Management (DM) policy in South Africa is defined within the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF), Disaster Management Act (DMA) and the Disaster Management Amendment Act. In the NDMF, four Key Performance Areas (KPAs) proposed for the implementation of disaster risk management and preparedness strategies. These KPAs are formulated in accordance with the objectives of the DMA. KPA 1 focuses on establishing institutional capacity for national, provincial, and municipal governance spheres to promote the effective implementation of DRM policy (South Africa, 2005:4). KPA 2 aims at addressing the need for DRM monitoring to determine the effectiveness of DRM efforts as are implemented in the different spheres of governance (South Africa, 2005:4). In KPA 3, the focus is on the development-oriented approaches to DRM and lastly, KPA 4 targets rapid and effective response to post-disaster recovery.

This study focuses on KPAs 1 and 2 because these KPAs precisely indicate that disaster risk governance and effective implementation of DRM policies are important facets in the field of DRM in South Africa. The implication of the foregoing is that these specific KPAs contribute to two variables of the study namely disaster risk governance and policy implementation.

2.2.1 KPA 1: Establishing institutional capacity to promote effective implementation of disaster risk policy.

To facilitate the achievement of the requirements of KPA1, the DRM policy formation is one of the first mechanisms ought to be established. This indicates that policy formation is important in order to reach DM goals and targets. The guidelines for each KPA are given in the form of Key Performance indicators (KPI). KPIs assist disaster risk governance officials in monitoring the progress made in disaster management (South Africa, 2005:13). The KPI here is to determine whether mechanisms for developing and adopting DM policy have been established and put into practice (South Africa, 2005:8). This KPI can be confusing because it appears vague in terms of the following:
1) No elaboration is provided on what indicator(s) can be used to confirm that institutional capacity development is ensured.

2) Certainly, if implementation of policies is a facet of KPA 1, then a guide for monitoring the quality and progress of DRM efforts should be made available. So that governance officials can discern whether indeed policy implementation has taken place, and that the implementation was of good quality.

3) It has also been cited that a weak aspect of the framework is that there is limited guidance to local municipalities (Van Niekerk, 2014:870). This is a concerning factor because local municipalities are the primary responders to disasters.

However, the framework suggests the formation of various advisory forums with the aim to promote institutional capacity. These forums include the National, Provincial, and District Disaster Management Advisory Forums, (SA, 2005:16). Among these, the national, provincial, and municipal disaster management advisory forums, NDMAF, PDMAF, and DDMAF, are the most prominent because the local advisory forum is not compulsory. The NDMAF is primarily responsible for the provision of mechanisms that will promote DRM consultation between relevant role-players (South Africa, 2005:16). This forum is also responsible for the following tasks: (1) to draft DRM plans, (2) to develop information management and communication systems, and (3) advising and assisting wherever deemed necessary (South Africa, 2005:16). The DDMAF has a duty to implement a disaster response management system and acquire information regarding the capacity to respond to and manage disasters, (South Africa, 2005:17).

Based on the aforementioned discussions, it is evident that this KPA is relevant to the crux of this study because disaster governance is an essential aspect of DRM. Furthermore, accountability for DRM practices rests with government officials although the importance of community participation in DRM is reiterated (Chagutah, 2014; Hossain, 2013) throughout DRM literature. This indicates that disaster risk governance plays an essential role in facilitating the implementation of disaster policies (UNISDR, 2015:17). Therefore, it is important to describe the different facets of governance especially in the sphere of disaster risk management. The in-depth discussion of disaster governance follows the discussion of KPA 2 in section 2.3 of this study, and elaborates the significance of governance in DRM.
2.2.2 KPA 2: Determining the effectiveness of implemented disaster risk management efforts

Provincial and district disaster management centres are required by the DMA to submit annual reports that include all documented activities relating to the improvement of DRM. The aim of these reports is to monitor the effectiveness and to disseminate the results of the efforts of the disaster risk management of the centres (South Africa, 2005:50). The KPIs provided in the NDMF are not explicit in giving indicators against which the effectiveness could be evaluated. For example, one KPI for this particular KPA states that effective monitoring of efforts has occurred if documentation shows effectiveness. Another KPI states that the aims have been reached if effectiveness is being monitored (South Africa, 2005:50). This example confirms my assertion in section 2.2.1 of this chapter that KPIs are vague and do not provide efficient guidelines to obtain the KPAs objectives. According to the analysis of the researcher, the following statements prove the vagueness of the KPIs:

1) Reports can be prejudiced and subjective. If the governance official that compiles the report merely states that implementation is effective, does it mean that the KPI will accept that implementation is indeed effective?

2) A document should provide an indication of how effectiveness is be evaluated.

3) An indicator should be provided on how to ensure the efficient monitoring of effectiveness. Furthermore, one has to inquire whether the fact that performance monitoring as stated indicates that effective implementation is indeed taking place.

Critics of the disaster risk management policies in South Africa such as Van Niekerk (2014:866) aptly assert that the vagueness of the DRM policies impinges on the success of disaster risk management efforts. Furthermore, the DMA lists annual DRM reports as a way in which policy implementation can be monitored throughout the different disaster management centres in South Africa (South Africa, 2003:24). Both the DMA as well as the NDMF clearly indicate through these KPAs that disaster risk management is a governance issue. Therefore, this study examines disaster risk governance in South Africa and its effects on disaster risk management. It also explores
the policy and governance-related agreements within Africa as well as internationally to
illustrate their contributions to South Africa’s disaster risk governance.

2.3 Disaster risk governance

The South African government system can be divided into 3 spheres namely the
national, provincial, and local. On a national level, the cabinet is responsible for the
strategic planning of the country and ensuring policy implementation throughout all
spheres of government. The cabinet consists of the president, the deputy president, and
the various ministers of the country. There are 33 ministers in South Africa. DRM, and
National Disaster Management Centre form part of the Department of Cooperative
Governance and Traditional Affairs (South Africa, 2015:1).

In the provincial sphere, each of the nine provinces in South Africa has their own
legislature and function under the leadership of a premier. Municipalities report to the
provincial government and are regarded as the direct instruments for service delivery
and economic development (SA, 2011:20). South Africa has 278 municipalities of which
eight are metropolitan, 44 are district and 227 are local (South Africa, 2011:22). It is
important that DRM policy efforts translate from national government all the way through
to local government for it to be sustainable (Van Niekerk, 2014:866). The three spheres
of government are required by the law to have a disaster management centre to assist
with disaster risk governance within the sphere (South Africa, 2002:19). According to
Van Niekerk (2014:862), the protection of citizens from disasters is considerably a
constitutional human right. Hence, this increases the responsibility on the part of the
state to ensure the implementation of good disaster risk management practices.

In the following section, the international and continental arrangements will be tabulated
and discussed against the background of the South African governing system provided
above, as well as the South African DRM policy arrangements. The aim is to highlight
the inherent intertwining between these arrangements and those of the South African
government. Key aspects from the international arrangements such as the Yokohama
Strategy, Hyogo Framework for action and the Sendai Framework for DRR are essential
foci in illustrating the importance of DRR governance.
Table 1: International arrangements to assist with disaster risk governance (Adopted from Munzhelele, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event / arrangement</th>
<th>Aim of event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>Declared the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction.</td>
<td>Due to the increased impact of disasters a theme of 'Building a culture of Prevention' was initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Japan.</td>
<td>Mid-decade conference to discuss progress of the theme: 'Building a culture of Prevention'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Promulgation of the Yokohama Strategy for a safer world</td>
<td>To provide guidelines to countries for implementation of risk reduction practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction was formed</td>
<td>Established to find a midway between scientific knowledge on disaster and policy formation. Which highlights the role of vulnerable communities in risk reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The Inter-Agency secretariat and the Inter-Agency Task force is established</td>
<td>These forums serve as a mechanism for the effective implementation of the ISDR policies. The task force further established four working groups to address different elements of disaster management such as early warning, vulnerability and risk analysis to mention a few.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Promulgation of the Hyogo Framework for Action</td>
<td>To mainstream DRR into development and to strengthen local and national officials. This is done with the aim to improve resilience at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The second meeting held by the Global Platform for Disaster reduction</td>
<td>Forum held for stakeholders with the aim to increase the momentum of disaster risk reduction globally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Promulgation of the Sendai Framework for disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>Aims to reduce loss to people, their livelihoods, and health within communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Continental arrangements made to guide disaster risk governance (Adopted from Munzhelele, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Aim of event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>The constitutive Act of the African union commits to disaster risk reduction efforts.</td>
<td>The 53 heads of states that agreed on this commitment pledge to promote the objectives of DRR which are security, safety and sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>The New Partnership for Africa’s development (NEPAD) is established by the AU.</td>
<td>NEPAD formed the Africa Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction. This working group facilitates the integration of DRR into all phases of development in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>African Regional Strategy or Disaster risk reduction is developed.</td>
<td>The aim of this strategy is to increase political commitment and to improve the governance of disaster risk reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>African Advisory Group on DRR is established.</td>
<td>Advises the Africa Working Group on DRR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The first African Regional Platform for DRR was convened.</td>
<td>This platform is established to enhance regional commitment and promote co-operation and co-ordination between African countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>World Bank announces that 25 countries have established national disaster risk management.</td>
<td>Gives indication of growth and progress made throughout Africa in terms of DRR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World: Guidelines for Natural Disaster Prevention, Preparedness and Mitigation and its Plan of Action 1994, hereafter referred to as the Yokohama strategy, indicates that governance is one of the major shortfalls of disaster risk management. Similarly, the Hyogo Framework for Action (UNISDR, 2005:16) which post-dates the Yokohama strategy stresses the significance of governance and institutional capacity in DRM. In addition, the Sendai Framework (UNISDR, 2015:14) highlights issues of governance. These frameworks are United Nations led international agreements between over 180 states that aim to improve DRM strategies (Van Niekerk, 2014:861). For instance, the HFA identifies five priorities for DM. Among these five priorities, the first priority pinpoints governance as an issue of concern. This priority states that it is essential to ensure that local and national disaster risk management are prioritised with strong basis on institutional capacity (UNISDR, 2005:16). Another gap identified in the HFA that is linked to disaster risk governance is that of effective monitoring and assessment of disaster risks (UNISDR, 2005:2).
The Sendai Framework is the latest framework established by the UNISDR (UNISDR, 2015), and like the HFA, four priorities are presented in the Sendai Framework. Similarly, this framework postulates the strengthening of disaster risk governance as a priority. The Sendai Framework virtually imitates its predecessor by affirming that disaster risk governance is still not at the level it ought to be (UNISDR, 2015:10). The fact that governance is considered a priority throughout these frameworks indicates the pertinence of resolving the issue of governance. With regard to the aforementioned, the researcher will explore the following possible solutions to the issue of governance:

1) Since disaster risk governance has been identified as a recurrent issue from the Yokohama strategy until the Sendai framework, how can be rectified;

2) To ascertain whether disaster risk governance has been clearly defined; and

3) To ensure that the disaster risk management officials adequately understand the disaster management policies.

To provide the solutions stated above, there has to be an in-depth exploration of what disaster risk governance exactly entails in South Africa. From 2000 to 2015, significant developments have occurred in the field of DRM. Historically, disaster management in South Africa referred to the actions that were taken in response to a disaster. This means that all precautions and measures undertook by authorities/disaster management institutions and communities were aimed at coping with the aftermaths of hazards (Van Riet & Van Niekerk, 2010:556). Alternatively, the concept of disaster risk reduction (DRR) was introduced based on a proactive approach which aims to reduce the prevalence of a disaster occurring, especially those that are human induced (King, 2008:4980). The target of this approach is to ensure relief and disaster preparedness (Van Niekerk, 2006:100). In disaster preparedness and relief, thorough planning and effective implementation of disaster policies and strategies are essential. The DRR approach is a main priority for the various DRM governance structures in South Africa.

A governance structure is considered effective when it ensures the effective implementation of government policies (Ahrens & Rudolph, 2006:212). The four main aspects of good governance described by Ahrens and Meuren (2002:48) are accountability, participation, transparency and predictability. Accountability refers to the clear roles and responsibilities of officials to ensure that agreed standards of
governance are achieved. Accountability could work in two directions, either upwards to donors or higher authorities, or downwards towards the community. In disaster governance, accountability is more effective when directed downwards because the vulnerabilities in disaster-affected communities should be spearheaded and accounted for by governance officers (Ahrens & Rudolph, 2006:215). Transparency is directly linked to accountability in that transparency can assist the community to keep the policy makers accountable for policy implementation. Similarly, policy formulation and implementation are interlinked with predictability. Predictability refers to the ability of governance structures to anticipate future events and formulate flexible yet feasible policies to ensure that these policies are implemented (Ahrens & Rudolph, 2006:217). Lastly, communal participation contributes to good governance in disaster risk management because communities are the primary responders to disasters. Hence, members of the community ought to be adequately equipped with the necessary preventative and responsive knowledge to ensure effective management to disaster risks.

Furthermore, to define basic aspects of governance, the policies ought to elaborate certain characteristics. Firstly, policies need to be clear and concise, and ensure the understanding of evidence of policy by providing an induction course with an exam that follows the induction. Secondly, governing structures need to understand clearly the policies so that precise distinctions can be made between the effectiveness of implementation and the lack thereof (Ahrens & Rudolph, 2006:212). These two points refer specifically to the solutions mentioned earlier in this section. The complexity of answering question one further illustrates the aims of this study and the necessity for it. Van Niekerk (2014:870) suggests that the top possible five reasons for unsuccessful disaster governance in South Africa are (1) lack of policy understanding, (2) lack of funding, (3) poor co-operation between different governmental departments, (4) lack of political will, and (5) lack of human resource capacity. Among these top five reasons, four exemplify the correlation between sound disaster management governance practices and effective policy implementation. Based on these facts, this study defines disaster risk governance as the:

*State-headed, accountable, and transparent entity that ensures the implementation of disaster risk policies with a strong focus on policy implementation performance.*
2.4 Policy implementation

Despite the significance of policy implementation, it is often overlooked (Wissink, 2006:181). Policy implementation is the most critical aspect of the policy management process and its success indicates that policies are well accomplished (Cloete et al., 2007:128). Policy implementation is the combination of goals and actions that are set in order to achieve these goals (Paudel, 2009:36). Mthethwa (2014:1) describes policy implementation as a process that requires physical, financial, and human resources that can translate into achievable and actionable plans. In a similar vein, Makinde (2005:63) states that the key elements of policy implementation include communication, resources, attitudes of policy implementers, and bureaucratic structure. From the foregoing views about what governance entails, the accepted definition for policy implementation in this study is:

The government-led process of achieving set policy objectives through ensuring the availability of all required resources.

According to Chuta (2010:13), governance structures are increasingly imposed with the responsibility for effective policy implementation ensuring service delivery. However, Davids (2009:228) argues that policy implementation cannot solely rely on local governance for it to take place. He bases his argument on the fact that local government is dependent on community participation that contributes to positive socio-economic dynamics in the community (Davids, 2009:217). He further elaborates that all spheres of government play an active role in ensuring that local governance have the required capacity to ensure policy implementation (Davids, 2009:229).

Part of the blame of poor policy implementation is attributable to the fact that policy learning is still a vague concept. Policy learning refers to the trial-and-error lessons that are learnt throughout the policy-making and implementation process (Brynard, 2009:15). Policy learning can be either instrumental or social. Instrumental policy learning involves a process of better understanding new aspects of policy intervention and implementation plans. This means that the focus is to improve on implementation plans to achieve existing goals. The result of instrumental policy learning is that better intelligence in terms of implementation is achieved (Brynard, 2009:15). Social policy learning involves a new social construction of policy which entails the rethinking the fundamental aspects of the policy. The focus of social policy learning is to adjust or
change the goals and scope of policy due to various reasons such as budget cuts or a symbolic undertaking designed to expand political constituencies (Brynard, 2009:16). Social policy and instrumental policy learning are not mutually exclusive terms. These terms are brought together through policy failure that can be used as a tool for policy learning. Policy failure can provide a stimulus that prompts the research of alternative ways to operate (Brynard, 2009:16). It relates to instrumental policy learning in that it provides a way to create new intelligence about existent policies that were not previously considered. Similarly, policy fundamentals can completely be altered based on lessons learnt from policy failure. Policy failure can lead to major policy gaps such as the ones developing countries are plagued with (Makinde, 2005: 63).

Policymakers pay little attention to the practical implementation of policies (Wissink, 2006). The shortfall of policymakers to ensure the implementation of policies results in a policy gap. A policy gap occurs when the difference between policy goals and actual policy application grows wider apart. A characteristic of the policy gap is when the rich of a country become richer and the poor, poorer (Makinde, 2005:65). Based on a case study of Nigeria, several reasons exist for a policy gap. The first is the lack of continuity. For instance, when changes occur in government positions, delegation from the previous office bearer to the next is rarely a focal point. This means that the new incumbent is inadequately informed about the progress made by the predecessor to set objectives that build on this progress. The next reason can be attributed to the lack of funding. The definition of implementation itself emphasizes the need for resources and is therefore not surprising that due to the lack of funding, implementation is an obstacle to national growth in developing countries. The lack of funding combined with the lack of institutional capacity heightens the reason for policy gaps. Institutional capacity refers to the combination of strengths skills, and resources within an organization that are used to obtain agreed goals (Capri, 2011: 9). Another reason for an increased policy gap is corruption. Governance officials siphon the funds allocated for certain projects and this heightens the lack of funds for the implementation of relevant policies (Makinde, 2005:65). Lastly, social, political, and economic variables are neglected in the policy formation process and it results in the setting of unrealistic and non-practical goals (Makinde, 2005:66). The reasons for policy gaps as highlighted above are all governance related, and this further corroborates the view of this study that policy implementation is dependent on governance. In addition to the role of governance in
policy implementation as already discussed, this study observes that the onus of policy performance management is automatically placed on governing structures.

2.5 Policy performance

Policy performance management could have a beneficial role on policy implementation if governing bodies take an active role in the performance management process. In this study, a combination from Du Plessis’ (2005:4) and Chuta (2010:9) is used for the definition of performance management. This definition states that:

Performance management is a process that comprises of specific activities that are measured against set targets over a set period. This process can be used to improve municipal service delivery and ensure accountability for efficient and effective use of municipal resources.

2.5.1 Elements of performance

The Department of Public Service and Administration emphasizes that performance management must entail regular planning, continuous monitoring and measuring, and review (South Africa, 2007:17). Therefore, a municipality needs a performance management system that is flexible and can adjust to the necessary changes that are identified throughout the monitoring and review stages. This process consists of performance planning, monitoring, measurement and review, and lastly, feedback (Chuta, 2010: 10).

2.5.1.1 Performance planning

Performance planning is the process in which the strategic direction is defined and objectives are set (Tseole, 2013:21). In this stage, the expectations need to be clearly defined, an evaluation system needs to be identified and an implementable plan of action needs to be designed. This plan of action should also outline the roles and responsibilities of all the stakeholders (Chuta, 2010:12). The municipality needs to ensure that its policies and regulations are thoroughly considered throughout the planning stage to avoid a clash of resources between all its projects, (Armstrong, 2006:507).
2.5.1.2 Performance monitoring

The aim of the monitoring stage is to supervise performance so that performance problems can be pre-empted and duly adjusted (Tseole, 2013:21). For performance to be efficient, the attitudes of the leaders and the employees need to be positive (Van der Waldt, 2006:133). Mentoring employees can assist with the monitoring process, where the supervisor focuses on future possibilities instead of emphasizing past failures (Chuta, 2010:12). This motivates the employer to increase performance and reach the required outputs.

2.5.1.3 Performance measurement and review

Performance measurement is performed to measure resources, costs, and time that were used to generate the outputs in accordance with the input indicators. These indicators can consist of efficiency, effectiveness, and impact. The performance of workers needs to be measured so that the inputs of the staff do not exceed the outputs that are generated (Bouckaert & Halligan, 2008:71). Performance measurement and review could assist with transparency, learning, and sanctioning where deemed necessary (Van der Waldt, 2004:13).

2.5.1.4 Performance feedback

It is important to provide feedback to all stakeholders to steer the performance process towards the desired outcomes. Feedback could be in the form of a written report, or a verbal session. If the feedback is transparent, enough it creates a sound environment for the improvement of performance by both supervisors and subordinates. Feedback could also present different challenges. Supervisors often have a busy schedule and do not find time to give feedback. The reception of the feedback by subordinates can be challenging especially when the feedback is negative (Chuta, 2010:14).

Subsequently, this next section discusses the case study, Bojanala Platinum District Municipality.

2.6 Disaster management in Bojanala Platinum District Municipality

Bojanala Platinum District Municipality (BPDM) is situated in the North-West Province of South Africa and is home to 1 185 027 citizens (North-West Government, 2015). The BPDM has five local municipalities listed under it. These include Kgetleng River,
Madibeng, Moretele, Moses Kotane and Rustenburg Local Municipalities (North-West Government, 2015).

The Municipal Systems Act (32/2000) mandates municipalities to formulate performance management in a manner which ensures effective service delivery (South Africa, 2000). According to Chuta (2010:3), a large number of municipalities are not meeting the desired targets with regard to disaster risk management policy implementation. In 2010, the African Centre for Disaster Studies at the North-West University compiled a report on Disaster Risk Management in district and metropolitan municipalities in South Africa. One of the key objectives of this report was to evaluate the gaps between the intended implementation of disaster risk management at local government levels and to estimate what the actual situation is (Botha et al., 2010:11). This report reveals that the North-West Province is one of the provinces that does not comply with legal disaster risk management requirements especially that of disaster prevention and mitigation (Botha et al., 2010:54).

Factors such as political infighting and faction forming are amongst those that contribute to the poor state of disaster risk management in the municipality (North-West Government, 2012). Among the problems that have been identified in the disaster risk management department of BPDM which contribute towards the vulnerability in the district is the issue of political factors. The most prominent of these political factors include poor prioritization of disaster risk management, and the lack of political willingness to acknowledge the importance of disaster risk levels in the municipality (North-West Government, 2012).

2.7 Conclusion

In this chapter the different variables of the study were used as discussion points. Firstly, disaster risk policy in South Africa was discussed. Two KPAs from the NDMF that are directly linked to the aims of the study were used to demonstrate that policy implementation and DRM governance are important facets in the Disaster Management field. This chapter illustrates that the DMA and the NDMF provide limited guidance to local municipalities especially when it comes to practical implementation. Furthermore, the role that disaster risk governance plays in ensuring the DRM efforts has to be essential for policy implementation. The other reason why policy implementation is considered ineffective is that the concept of policy learning is still a vague concept.
Given the fact that DRM is a burgeoning field, one can sympathize with the limited progress made in policy implementation. However, it is imperative to detect errors in both implementation processes and identify the stakeholders that need to fix the errors. This chapter establishes exactly what policy performance is. Policy performance comprises of various elements. These elements include performance planning, monitoring, measurement and review, and feedback, and all these elements are key aspects to consider in rectifying any possible implementation errors.

This chapter also identifies with the several problems of the implementation of DRM identified in the previous chapter which resonate in the North-West Province and in BPDM. Therefore, it is pertinent to compare existing academic literature on DRM with the practices in order for solutions to be found. This chapter uses literature to emphasize the significance of this study as well as its key concepts. The next chapter presents the empirical findings of this study using qualitative research methods. Afterwards, an analysis of these findings will follow.
CHAPTER 3: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction

Policy implementation is complex and due to the inherent difficulties associated with measuring it, it remains one aspect of governance that is often ignored throughout the policy formulation process. According to the three latest disaster risk management frameworks formed by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), policy implementation is considered a priority in disaster risk management. These frameworks include the 1994 Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a safer world, the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action, and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, promulgated in 2016. The Sendai Framework provides guidance to over 180 countries on how to implement Disaster Risk Reduction and Management. Furthermore, the policy for disaster management in South Africa fundamentally consists of the Disaster Management Act (DMA), the Disaster Management Amendment Act and the National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF). Although the DMA focuses on the establishment of local, provincial, and national disaster centres, the duties of the relevant roles, it however contains limited guidance on policy implementation. On the other hand, the NDMF acknowledges the significance of policy implementation and lists policy implementation as one of its four key performing areas. One KPA from the NDMF that is particularly relevant to this study is KPA 1 because it deals with the provision of adequate institutional capacity to ensure effective disaster management policy implementation.

On the basis of the importance of policy implementation, this study examined the implementation disaster management policy at the Bojanala Platinum District Municipality (BPDM). The previous chapter (Chapter 2) engaged in a comprehensive literature review to provide a theoretical overview of the South African disaster management policy and the role the DRM governance structures play in the quality of policy implementation. As identified in chapter two, there are issues of vagueness in the DMA and the NDMF and these documents provide limited assistance to local municipalities in terms of disaster management implementation (Van Niekerk, 2014:866). Therefore, this study evaluates how the BPDM implements DRM policy despite the challenge of vagueness regarding policy implementation. Furthermore,
research is conducted on the district municipality to answer the following research questions:

1) What is the effectivity of the implementation of disaster risk management policies in the BPDM Disaster Management Centre?

2) What role does institutional capacity play to ensure implementation of disaster management policies?

3) Which indicators are used to predict and determine success of disaster management policy implementation in the BPDM?

4) What tendency can be identified in the efficacy of disaster risk governance in the BPDM?

Based on these questions, this chapter provides the background of how the research was conducted. The research methodology will further explain why the specific research approach was used to obtain the objectives of the study and to highlight the significance of the study. The research methodology is followed by the ethical code that the researcher considered throughout the process of the data collection (see Chapter 1). The data is presented and analysed after the discussion of the ethical considerations.

**3.2 Research methodology: qualitative research**

The qualitative aspect of this study focuses on the personal views and experiences of the respective disaster risk management officers of the local municipalities under BPDM. The aim of conducting qualitative research is to understand and interpret social dynamics.

The qualitative sampling methods used in this study were questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the disaster risk officials of the local municipalities in a fashion whereby the aim of the study was clearly stated and discussed to provide the respondents with a background of the study entails. Similarly, the anonymity and confidentiality of all participants was ensured. Questionnaires were sent electronically to officials who preferred the electronic correspondence. Moreover, electronic communication was preferable because most of the officials had busy schedules due to the impending 2016 local government elections.
Follow-up questions concerning uncertainties in the reports were communicated by electronic mail. The empirical findings are presented in the ensuing section.

3.3 Empirical findings

The data is presented under the 3 main facets of the study’s objectives. These facets are (1) the role of institutional capacity to ensure that DRM policies are effectively implemented; (2) evaluating policy implementation and implementation performance; and (3) the role that governance structures have on policy implementation performance. This data tackles the first three objectives of this study. It also addresses the challenges that all the DRM centres in the district experience. An analysis of all this data reflects research objective 4 which is to identify any tendencies that might impede the effectiveness of policy implementation.

Ten respondents were used in this study, each of five these respondents represented the different local municipalities in BPDM while the other 5 were representatives from the district DRM office. The age range of the population group for this study is between 29 and 50 years old. Half of the respondents were junior disaster management officials while the other half were senior or management level officers. The selection of respondents was diversified to ensure a holistic representation of the district and the capturing of rich data from both working spectra in the BPDM DRM workplace. Each local municipality is presented as Municipality A, B, C, D and E to provide municipal specific data without exposing the identity of each. The five officials from the district will subsequently be represented as District A, B, C, D, and E. This ensures anonymity for each respondent.

3.3.1. The role of institutional capacity

In this section of the empirical findings, graphs will be used to show how each of the respondents rate different aspects of institutional capacity. To rate these aspects, a Likert-scale from one to five was used where 1 is not at all, 2 is partly, 3 is unsure, 4 adequately, and 5 represents fully. The role of institutional capacity is divided into two segments which discuss how policy understanding is ensured and the influence of resources to ensure policy implementation.
3.3.1.1 Ensuring policy understanding

In municipalities A and D, orientation workshops are presented for newly appointed staff. The other local DM officials are unaware of the orientation programs that are presented at the centre. These municipal officials indicate that they have never attended any orientation. At the time this research was conducted, none of the officials in the municipalities had a formal Disaster management qualification, however, a significant number of them were working towards attaining either a disaster management or fire response related certificate. Although the officials in Municipalities B and C know about the DMA and the NDMF their knowledge of the concepts was mostly sketchy. However, in municipality A the officials demonstrated an in-depth understanding and knowledge of both the policy documents. The officials in Municipalities C and E did not use these documents on a day to day basis for implementation guidelines because according to them the documents are more relevant to national and provincial disaster management than to the local.

With regards to induction, district A reveals that each new employee is responsible for their acquisition of the knowledge and understanding of the policy documents through personal learning. District A further states that various workshops are presented to assist new members of staff with an understanding of policy documents. The respondents from districts B, C, D and E all suggest that in house inductions should be provide at local DMCs.

Each official rates their knowledge and understanding of DM policies in Figure 1 below. The ratings of municipality A and B are consistent with their verbal responses. Municipality A demonstrates a vivid understanding of DM policy and also rated their understanding on the rating level 5. Municipality B stated that they did not completely understand the DM policies and this translated into their rating level of 2. It is rather worrisome that in the other local municipalities as already indicated where the officials have not received induction and only have vague knowledge of the DM policies rated their knowledge on level 4. The district officials rated their understanding of DM policies very high with the exception of district E.
Figure 1: The rating of DRM knowledge per official in BPDM.
3.3.1.2 Ensuring availability of resources

Resources make up a significant part of institutional capacity. All DM officials in the local municipalities highlight the lack of resources as a reason that hampers effective DM policy practices. In Municipality A, the most sought after resource is a fully-fledged disaster management centre. Currently, the local disaster centre is run from the fire department offices. This means that the majority of the staff at the centre are employed under the fire department flag. This results in the understaffing of DM section, consequently causing the fire department to have to respond to reported incidents. This challenge is worsened by the fact that there is a lack of dedicated staff, which is especially a problem in Municipality D. The officials in municipality D further indicate that getting volunteers to help would make a huge difference especially in the areas of response and relief. According to the officials from Municipality B, the policy does not provide any guidance in terms of the establishment of the volunteer unit. This is an indication that these officials are not adequately informed about the DRM policies because the DMA gives guidance regarding the establishment of volunteer units in Chapter 7 of the DMA.
For municipality B, non-existent communication and dissemination platforms constitutes a major obstacle because the DM official cannot communicate with the community in times of crisis. District A officials agree that inappropriate placements of personnel is a recurring challenge. This is also as a result of the lack of qualified DM practitioners according to District C. Furthermore, Municipality A and C the need for emergency food parcels to provide relief for affected communities, and highlight the fact that it is an aspect of DM that often overlooked. Similarly, the unavailability of emergency response vehicles for disaster relief officials to attend to affected areas poses a challenge and consequently results in the officials relying extensively on the assistance of the fire department in emergency situations. District D affirms that the district experiences a lack of cooperation from the various local municipalities which limits the impact of DM efforts. Another major problem experienced by all district officials within the BPDM is that of unfavourable political climate. This is because the officials often experience political interference and since politicians do not prioritize DM in policy formulation, it hampers effective implementation. In Figure 2 the results of the Likert scale questions where the officials rated whether sufficient resources had been made available to ensure effective policy implementation, is represented.
3.3.1.3 The resources required to ensure policy implementation and DM practices

The follow-up questions in terms of resources were designed to explore the correlation of the rating of sufficient resources presented above per district and local official. The tables that follow below show the candid responses of the officials in their own words.

Table 3: The resources that are required to ensure effective DM policy implementation according to the local municipal officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Resources required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality A</td>
<td>Fully fledged DMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solid Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support from district municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality B</td>
<td>Communication mediums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster response vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food parcels to assist affected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality C</td>
<td>More staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality D</td>
<td>Fully equipped disaster management satellite centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment from politicians to disaster management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality E</td>
<td>Stakeholder commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More stuff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 above provides an illustration of the resources required at the local municipalities in the BPDM according to the local DM officials. The resources tabulated above are direct quotes from the officials. The two most desired resources are financial and human resources. Municipality A, C, and E highlighted insufficient financial resources as the major impediment to policy implementation. Municipality C, D, and E indicated the necessity for more personnel to help ease the work load within the centre. The officials in municipality D and E also pinpointed the need for politicians and other stakeholder to be more proactive. The fact that the resources listed in the table are all essential to DRM practices, shows that the tabulated responses contradicts the ratings provided by the officials in figure 2.

Consequently, the resources that are needed according to the district municipal officials are tabulated below. The district officials’ response correlates with that of the local DM officials but is in contradiction to their ratings which indicates an adequate availability of resources in the district.

Table 4: The resources that are required to ensure effective DM policy implementation according to the district municipal officials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District official</th>
<th>Resources required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District A</td>
<td>Appointing highly competent and suitable staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure adequate funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District B</td>
<td>Sufficient Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District C</td>
<td>Skilled human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District D</td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District E</td>
<td>Capacity building programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that the officials at district level require financial and human resources the most. District official A and C requested that more skilled officials should be hired. However, the need for financial resources remains the most commonly sought resource highlighted by all the officials. This corroborates the view of district A officials regarding that inappropriate allocation of funds within the district municipality.

3.3.2 The role of policy implementation and policy performance

In this section, the data relating to policy implementation is presented. The findings are discussed under the following headings: (1) frequency of policy implementation evaluation, (2) the use of indicators as means to determine policy performance and lastly, (3) addressing policy errors and methods used to conduct policy performance.

3.3.2.1 The frequency with which policy implementation evaluation is done

In municipality A, the submission of implementation reports are required on a provided monthly basis. The report has to be comprehensive and include evidence such as photographs of the areas that were attended to and the register of the DRM officials that were part of the response and relief team. These reports are submitted to the director of the safety department to be incorporated into their monthly reports. The director compiles an inclusive report that consists of reports from the fire department. This allows the director to estimate whether the set objectives for policy implementation have been achieved. Subsequently, the director uses a scorecard to evaluate the implementation performance. According to municipality B, policy evaluation is only done twice annually. In both municipalities C, D and E, the DRM officials had no knowledge about the performance of policy implementation evaluation. They attested to the possibility of such an evaluation happening at the district level and acknowledged the probability of their exclusion from such a process if at all it was performed. However, all the district officials confirmed that the municipality reviews the municipal policies biannually. They further stated that the onus of the implementation process falls within the responsibilities of the local municipal officials as they are primary responders to hazardous events.
3.3.2.2 Ensuring policy implementation through the use of indicators

The monthly reports submitted in municipality A provide evidence about the affected areas attended to. The use of a scorecard makes it easy for the director to determine whether indeed the right procedures were used and if the efforts of the DM officials were successful. According to a DM official of municipality B, some aspects of the DM policy are ignored by the governing structures in the municipality, which limits the ability of the officials to implement the policies efficiently. Therefore, there is no clear system used to indicate that policy implementation has been ensured. In municipality C, the DM official only performs a coordinating function and not line functions. This means that the officials are not the primary responders to a hazardous event or a disaster. These officials depend on firefighters to respond to disasters because the firefighters are available 24 hours of the day. Therefore, the primary task of the official is to take a risk assessment of the situation and provide feedback to firefighters. Consequently, this risk assessment is used as an indicator that the DM officials in municipality C have completed their main task. In municipality D, the officials are not aware of any indicators that are used to perform implementation evaluation. In municipality E, the Municipal Service Delivery Budget and Implementation plan is used to evaluate the implementation success of various departments within the municipality. This plan is evaluated quarterly to ensure that all officials are on course with the intended aims of the plan.

The DM officials in municipality C do not have contingency plans for disasters because different stakeholders and portfolios of government have their own contingency plans. For example, housing related disasters are attended to by the housing department, the same applies to the different departments such as environment, infrastructure and social development. Therefore, these departments work together to ensure effective response to affected areas. In municipality B, they use indicators to ensure that policy implementation occurs. The hazard mostly faced by this municipality is drought. So the indicators they use to estimate process in implementation is the adequate provision of water to drought-prone areas. Another indicator that indicates success in contingency plans to lessen the effects of drought in the municipality is the availability of fully operational and accessible boreholes in drought-prone areas. Municipality D on the other hand is prone to veld fires and uses the decline in prevalence of veld fires as an indicator appraise policy implementation. The acknowledgment of the efforts of the DM
officials in creating awareness among community members subsequently lead to the decline in hazard occurrences.

According to District A satisfaction surveys are completed by the community annually. Necessary adjustments are made upon the analysis of the surveys gathered within the district. This district asserts that other indicators of policy implementation revolve around measuring the amount of services against the amount of beneficiaries of these services. District B adds that regular meetings are held with the district advisory forum which consists of DM academics that evaluate whether policies have been implemented. Furthermore, performance appraisals and awards are given to officials that demonstrate true dedication towards disaster management this motivates other officials to work harder to ensure sound DM practises. District C and D both state that public awareness and communication is the most essential indicator for policy implementation. This is due to the emphasis placed on the importance of public participation for effective disaster management. District E combines advisory forum meetings and community-based risk assessments as important factors to ensure policy implementation.

3.3.2.3 Evaluating implementation performance and addressing implementation errors

Mostly, the DM officials are not sure whether they are responsible for initiating processes for the provision of feedback to analyse possible implementation errors and invent methods for improvement. Municipality A relies on the Directorate of Monitoring and Evaluation in the office of the Executive Mayor to perform evaluations on the response and relief efforts made by DM officials. The Directorate of monitoring and evaluation is also expected to evaluate the performance of policy implementation. Municipality C states that it is challenging to undertake any form of evaluation when they have no clear guidelines to follow. The fact that the local DMC does not have a forum to assist in policy formation has led to the abandonment of policy implementation and monitoring altogether. Officials from municipality B, C, D, and E, have indicated that they are not aware of platforms that are used to address policy implementation errors.

District A further states that in the history of BPDM no errors have been made with regard to policy implementation. District officials C and D suggest that it is necessary to conduct post disaster assessments to ensure that the assistance provided by the responders were according to policy. While districts B and E state that the advisory
forum plays an essential role in providing solutions to errors found in the post disaster assessment.

3.3.3 The role of governance structures

The first question posed to the respondents was what their opinion was on the role of governance structures and municipal councillors to ensure effective policy implementation. The highest common role mentioned by the junior DM officials was leadership. The DM officials from municipality B stated that a lack of leadership from governing structures has led to uncertainty amongst junior officials and therefore results in poor policy implementation practices. Another alarming factor that was established from 4 of the 5 local municipalities was the fact that government structures do not ensure that officers with the proper disaster-related skills are employed in the relevant positions. Municipality A however insists that governing structures assist and encourage DM officials to pursue tertiary qualifications in disaster management.

Officials in municipality B went as far as to describe the role of the governing body as critical to sustainable disaster management. According to these officials, some aspects of the DMA are not adopted by the local government officials and this causes confusion for junior officials in terms of which aspects to or which not to follow. The fact that local municipalities do not have disaster specific policies is a limiting factor for the municipal officers in Municipality C. These officials feel that they have been let down by municipal leaders and that they have failed to provide a Disaster Management policy for the local municipality. Essentially, the DM officials want councillors to seriously consider the concept of disaster risk management and provide necessary support. For municipality D, the five year-term of office stipulated for councillors is considerably short. This is because by the time a councillor eventually agrees to invest in DM, their term ends and with the induction of a new councillor, the process needs to be repeated. This is usually challenging because if the newly elected councillor does not prioritise disaster management it aggravates the situation. The fact that South Africa is historically not a disaster prone country coupled with the limited availability of knowledge about disasters (Botha et al, 2010:4), results in the undermining of disaster management by governing structures. For instance, DM is seldom the incumbent mayor’s priority as socio-economic issues such as poverty and unemployment are mostly prioritized. The DM officials regard the provision of adequate resources as the major responsibility of the governing structures. They also feel the governing structures have failed because
inadequate resources are at the top of the list when it comes to the challenges that all DM officials face.

District A states that the role of governance is to monitor whether the policies are being implemented and ensure that DM services reach the most deserving communities. Furthermore, the governing structures are primarily responsible to lead the implementation process. District B official reiterates the fact that the governance role is critical because governing structures have the power to ensure coordination between the various stakeholders and their consistent adherence to DM processes. District official C adds that the role of governance is to specifically ensure that the DM policy is understood by stakeholders. District D and E share the sentiment that governing officials have to facilitate a platform for coherence between the municipality and the community.

3.3.3.3 The role of the Councillors

When asked what councillors could do to improve the current disaster management practices, the officials had much to say. Firstly, they indicated that counsellors could assist by providing proper orientation and induction programmes. Officials from municipality B, D and E stated that they require maximum guidance in terms of policy formation and implementation. The officials in Municipality A, B and C are limited by the lack of basic resources such as emergency response vehicles to attend to affected areas. Furthermore, even though the officials at the local level are immediate responders to disasters they are limited by the perception that they have less implementation power than the district disaster management centre. Officials B and D share the sentiment that counsellors should assist officials to overcome these obstacles to ensure sound and effective DM practices. The officials from the district municipality agree with the opinion of Municipality officials B, D and C that the major role expected of councillors is a supportive one. District C emphasizes that councillors should be disaster prevention enthusiasts and custodians of the disaster management policies.

3.4 Data analysis

In this section the researcher utilizes background knowledge of disaster management practices as stipulated in the DMA and NDMF to analyse the findings above. As with the empirical findings section of this chapter, the findings will be discussed under key
themes which include the role of institutional capacity, policy implementation and governance on DRR.

3.4.1 Institutional capacity

Institutional capacity training is not universally ensured across all the local municipalities. It is evident from the data that the officials within the municipalities are not inducted as is the case of Municipality B, C and D. Rather, in municipality A emphasis is laid on ensuring that incoming staff are oriented on the necessary policies as well as their job descriptions. The reason for this could be due to the fact that municipality A has more human resources than the other local municipalities. Moreover, this could be a result of the non-prioritization of DM by senior officials in some local municipalities such as B, whereas, in municipality A DM is prioritised. This implies that there is a large communication gap within the local municipalities of the district. The lack of communication could be the reason why the officials from the local municipalities indicated that they are not supported by other officials within the district. Consequently, it results in a cause-effect divide as officials from both the local and district municipalities have admitted that there is a lack of cooperation between them. The leadership of the district municipality as well as each local municipality are tasked by the DMA with the responsibility (South Africa, 2005:42) to have an integrated and uniform approach to DM in the district.

The fact that neither a tertiary qualification in DM nor a DM-related qualification is presently a requirement for becoming a DM official is disconcerting and is indicative of how low the DM is regarded within the BPDM. As provided in chapter 1 of the DMA, the assurance of safety from hazards can be considered as a human right. This implies that DM is a very serious field and hence the officials responsible for the safe-keeping of disaster prone communities should be adequately trained and efficiently equipped. The BPDM is not doing enough to ensure that its junior staff are sufficiently equipped with a knowledge of policies. If the DM officials in a single local municipality do not have DM knowledge on tertiary level, nor receives any form of induction, then it is safe to say that there is no disaster response or prevention capacity in that particular municipality. This means that not all the officials within the BPDM are qualified to be responsible for something as serious as DM. Most of the local municipalities have based on their understanding highlighted institutional capacity as the main responsibility of governing structures. Therefore, the governing structures have failed these officials. The DMA
(South Africa, 2005:44) confirms that it is indeed the role of the municipal governing structures to ensure and promote capacity building.

The fact that government does not provide enough resources has been detrimental to the institutional capacity and policy implementation within the BPDM. The officials have highlighted the major lack of resources. The fact that there is such a vast range of resource shortages across all the local municipalities implies that the governing officials should have a heightened awareness with regard to the inappropriate allocation and mismanagement of DM funds. The reiteration thereof, and even irritation that some respondents have shown due to the lack of resources is a concern. It is increasingly alarming that the officials at district level concurred on the issue of resource shortage at local level and yet restrained from voicing their concerns in this regard. Most of these problems could be attributed to the unfavourable political environment as highlighted by majority of the respondents from district level.

South African politics at the time of the research had very interesting dynamics. The ruling party, namely the African National Congress (ANC) under the leadership of President Jacob Zuma who was first elected in 2009 have experienced extreme backlash and criticism. At the time of this study, President Zuma had been charged for more than 700 crimes which he has not been prosecuted for until date. Since Zuma’s inauguration the country has experienced its highest corruption levels and lowest levels of effective delivery of essential services (Quintal, 2016:1). The Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA) has seen two different ministers within one year under the Zuma rule. This uncertainty in terms of leadership regarding DM seems to have a negative effect in DM throughout South Africa as DM falls directly under CoGTA.

This is the political climate under which the officials used for this study had to respond in. According to the senior respondents, the DM resources are excruciatingly limited because leaders on the political front are not appropriately allocating funds to DM sectors. This could ultimately be the biggest obstacle for any DM centre. Arguably, it is impossible to have any form of impactful implementation effort without adequate resources. Therefore, it is essential that leaders invest into the idea of DM and ensure that the country has extensive and implementable contingency plans. The DM officials from both local and district level in BPDM shared the same sentiment about the need of governance to take a serious stance in the strengthening of DM efforts.
3.4.2 Role of governance

The junior officials indicated that they experience an extensive lack of leadership from governing structures. The lack of leadership causes all the different facets of DM to crumble and makes it easy for the officials to fail. The fact that these officials do not get the necessary support from the government is quite worrisome. From the literature provided in Chapter 2 of this study, which highlights that governing bodies have to spearhead the DM process, the most disturbing factor is the importance of governance and the need for an improvement of the quality thereof. This very crucial point has been emphasized and reiterated by all the Disaster reduction frameworks operating within South Africa (UNISDR, 2000), (NISDR, 2005) (UNISDR 2015). Yet, as the interpretation of the data by the respondents from the local municipalities shows, leadership remains one aspect that is the most lacking in BPDM. The policies have to translate from the national sphere of government through to provincial as well as local spheres (Van Niekerk, 2014:866). This suggests that the lack of governance is not only within the BPDM, but could be a result of DM governance from the national sphere down to provincial and equally to the district. If this is the case, then the DM in South Africa could be in trouble and an evident indication that the monitoring and evaluation aspect of DM is also largely ineffective.

Another challenge on the other side of the spectrum is that other socio economic factors such as poverty and health care services in the country are prioritized over disaster management. The eradicating of extreme poverty as well as the provision of health care has been identified as one of the eight millennium development goals (UNISDR, 2000:4). The governance structures could be giving more attention than is actually needed to the development goals and consequently side-lining DM. The focus on other developmental factors other than DM could also be because the prevalence of disasters in South Africa such as droughts and flooding is not the same scale of magnitude as tsunamis and hurricanes.

South Africa was applauded by the World Bank for reducing poverty levels (Nelson, 2015) which indicates that the improvement of governing structures on that front. However, the success of governing structures and organs of state at improving poverty level in the country shows that if DM is taken as much seriously from national government then the DM officials could record more positive outcomes in DM practices. It is rather unnerving that the officials from local and district within BPDM identified the
lack of cooperation as a challenge, as this is an indication of poor leadership within the district municipality, especially because the leadership heads of both the local and district municipalities are mandated by the DMA (2005:5529). That is why both municipality leaders should be responsible for finding ways in which cooperation within the two spheres can be maintained.

3.4.3 Policy implementation

The challenges that were highlighted within sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 above shows that policy implementation is co-dependent on institutional capacity, governance and management of resources. Apparently, implementation is absolutely dependent on the governance of the policies and the capacity of those employed to implement them. The biggest challenges of evaluating policy implementation is that fact that there is no specific evaluating system being used in the BPDM that could be highlighted by the respondents. This is rather dissatisfying because with the exception of Municipality A, all local respondents were unconfident in their responses when it came to evaluating policy performance. Among the local municipalities no basis was evident of fixing implementation problems.

Another challenge with attempting to evaluate the policy implementation of the DM officials is that it is almost impossible since the fire department directly responds to disaster and not the DM officials, this creates an illusion that the DM officials are merely administrative workers who report on the incidents and not practical field officials.

Furthermore, the nonexistence of set up policies within the local municipalities and the use of the national frameworks does not only pose a challenge to the officials, it could also be a reason for the difficulty in policy implementation on their part.

3.5 Key findings and conclusion

The key findings that can be summarised from the empirical findings found above are:

1) Most officials from the local municipalities indicated that they do not have adequate knowledge about the DRM policies while the officials at district level demonstrated a reasonable understanding of the policies. The uneven spread of policy understanding among the DM officials in the local municipalities is
detrimental to ensuring the holistic policy implementation performance throughout the district.

2) DM officials from both local and district municipalities indicated that they have experienced a lack of cooperation from either sphere.

3) Each of the local municipalities are faced with different needs and hazards therefore, rather than using a one-size fits all approach to DRM they each require municipal specific policies. The non-existent district DM Framework as prescribed by the DMA is a precursor for each local municipalities not having their own DM Framework. This further hampers DM policy implementation.

4) The officials pride themselves on the emphasis to enhance community engagement and awareness campaigns. This study reveals that this remains the strongest aspect of the DRM governance within the BPDM.

5) The most debilitating factor for the governance has been the negative influence of a hostile political environment. This has had a direct influence on the appropriate allocation of resources to the district. This results in the lack of adequate resources within the local municipalities to capacitate policy implementation.

These findings formed the crux of this chapter. Based on these key findings, the next chapter attempts to propose practical recommendations that could be a guide to solving some of the issues identified in this chapter. Furthermore, the next chapter will provide some recommendations for possible future research in this area of study.
CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher uses knowledge gathered throughout this study to provide implementable recommendations to the DMC of the Bojanala Platinum District Municipality. In the previous chapter, the empirical findings were presented and analysed. The key findings summarised, in chapter 2 were:

1. the uneven spread of policy understanding among the DM officials in the local municipalities;
2. the lack of cooperation between the district and local officials;
3. the non-existent district DM Framework as prescribed by the DMA;
4. the strong emphasis on community engagement and awareness campaigns; and
5. the negative influence of a hostile political environment.

These key findings will be at the centre of the recommendations discussed in this chapter. This section will use each of the objectives of this study as themes to discuss the recommendations.

4.2. The role of institutional capacity to ensure policy implementation

The level of understanding of DM policies from the officials in the local municipalities is quite low. The reason this study took an in-depth look at the capacity at local municipalities in the BPDM was because local municipalities are the spheres of government that are closest to the risk communities. This in turn implies that, the communities look up to the local municipalities for guidance in times of disaster. The community together with the local municipality are the first respondents to disasters. Therefore, it is imperative that the capacity at the local level is highly regarded and prioritized. The DMA allows flexibility for each metropolitan or district to implement its own ways of enhancing capacity building.

Firstly, stricter requirements should be stipulated for intending DM practitioners. Entry level disaster practitioners should have induction programmes that are presented by the
district for all new members in all local municipalities. This would rectify the issue of certain municipalities having more knowledge and understanding of policies than other municipalities. The district should invest more and investigate better options to present DM short courses to DM officials in cases where there are insufficient funds available to subsidise a formal qualification in DRM.

Since all the municipalities in BPDM are located at the respective fire departments, the officials should also undergo response and recovery training with the fire-fighters. It is worrisome that the DM officials at local level are not equipped to respond to disasters especially due to the lack of adequate staff and other resources.

The severity of the issue of lack of resources in this district municipality is daunting, it is so severe that most of the officials cannot access the internet for information and communication purposes. A recommendation is that the municipality looks into getting volunteer programmes to assist with DM efforts and awareness campaigns. The political leaders within the district need to stand up and be adamant about the appropriate allocation of funds. To prioritize DM within the bigger political and governing sphere, leaders need to have awareness rallies at big gatherings and schools especially to instil in scholars the culture of disaster risk prevention and reduction. An international disaster prevention campaign could be launched through the means of a Disaster awareness month. The UN has declared 13th of October as the international Disaster reduction day, this day should be used as a platform for DM sensitization and information dissemination in South Africa as well. If the campaign is ushered internationally, it could influence politicians to prioritize DRM. Ultimately, if sufficient awareness is created about DM more investors will be attracted to the concept and organs of state and governing structures will be expected/ forced to take cognizance of DRM.

4.3 Governance structures

The leadership with regard to the guidance of junior staff needs to be drastically improved so that better implementation outputs can be achieved. From the discussions in chapter 3 of this study it is evident that the role of DRM governance directly influences the DRM policy implementation outputs. Similarly, the cogent steps have to be taken towards improving the cooperation between the officials from district and local municipalities. The leaders from both the local and district sphere should provide
interactive platforms for these officials to groom team building sessions between them. These platforms can be used to clarify uncertainties such as expectations between the officials as well as their expectations from the governing structures and vice versa. Such platforms are also ideal to discuss ways by which the district could work around the challenge of the limited resources. The most pressing role the BPDM governing structures should act towards is addressing their concerns in terms of the allocation of funds to the provincial and when necessary to the national government.

4.4 Policy implementation

The difficulty with evaluating policy implementation performance within the district is heightened by the fact that other than the guidelines from the DMA and NDMF, there are no implementable policies for the district to use. Therefore, governance structures should work towards establishing district and municipal specific policies as prescribed by the DMA (South Africa, 2005:42). These policies would assist in clarifying the roles of each official. This will further assist the DM officials in differentiating between their roles and the roles of the fire-fighters. These roles then need to be universally applied through the district and local municipalities. Furthermore, the district should also invent a Performance Management system with measurable indicators, by doing so, the DM officials would be able to evaluate in house efforts themselves and not rely on the evaluation of the municipal monitoring and evaluation.

4.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, the research aims and questions of this study were discussed based on the empirical findings. The primary aim of the study was to determine whether DRM policies are implemented effectively in the BPDM.

This study concludes that the policies are not effectively implemented in the BPDM. The empirical findings indicated that the DM officials at the local municipalities do not have an adequate understanding of the national policies. This lack of effective implementation is aggravated by the fact that the district municipality does not have district-specific policies.

The first secondary aim of the study was to determine how institutional capacity is enhanced to improve policy implementation. According to the findings, most of the local DM officials indicated that they did not have adequate DRM knowledge to implement
policies. However, the officials indicated that the senior DM officials encourage junior members of staff to pursue disaster management related qualifications to improve their institutional capacity. In this regard, this study concludes that specific capacity enhancing platforms should be presented to DM staff.

The BPDM has failed to show measurable indicators that could be used to evaluate policy implementation. With the exception of the decrease in home fires reported, community awareness have proved to be successful. This problem can be elevated by setting of municipal specific policies as mentioned previously.

Tendencies noted in the BPDM is that the officials struggle to receive funds appropriately allocated to disaster risk governance this situation has in turn restricted implementation efforts. Presently, a non-cooperative environment exists between the local and district municipal officers and this further impedes successful outcomes within the district. Unfortunately, the common negative denominator pinpointed across the board is bad governance. DRM policy implementation is very dependent on the governance of resources and skills. The study uses state-headed, accountable and transparent entity that ensures disaster risk policies are implemented and has a strong focus on policy implementation performance as a the definition for governance. Judging from this definition, the DRM governance has failed to comply with its duty to govern the BPDM effectively by ensuring the implementation of policies and focusing on implementation performance.
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ADDENDUM A - QUESTIONNAIRE

The researcher is a student currently pursuing studies for a Master's degree in Development and Management in the Department of Public Management at the North-West University. The purpose of the study is to evaluate the role of disaster governance in policy implementation in BPDM. The analysis would entail the identification of the challenges, their evaluation and then suggesting possible solutions to those challenges.

Based on these findings, recommendations will be made to improve the implementation of the DRM policies in South African Municipalities.

Kindly take note that the information obtained will be used only for research purposes and no names or any identifying data regarding the participant will be revealed. Furthermore, participation is voluntary.

Please answer the following questions based on the five point Lickert scale. If you completely agree with the statement completely you can rate it at 5 and if you do not agree at all you can rate it at 1.

1. Do you fully understand the Disaster Risk Management policy fully?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Adequately</td>
<td>Fully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do senior DRM officials guide you through the policy implementation process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Adequately</td>
<td>Fully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you have sufficient resources to implement policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Adequately</td>
<td>Fully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do you think major disaster officials have enough knowledge of the disaster policy in case a disaster was to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Adequately</td>
<td>Fully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open-ended questions

1. What is the role of governance in policy implementation?

2. How is policy understanding ensured for junior or new staff?

3. How often is policy evaluation done in the municipality?
4. How is policy implementation achieved?

5. What indicators are used to determine whether policy implementation has occurred?

6. What indicators are set to determine the effectiveness of the implementation strategy?

7. What are the major challenges in achieving policy implementation goals?
8. How do you view the roles Councillors played in the effort to implement the DRM policies?

9. How are policy implementation errors addressed? If any mistakes occurred when responding to a disaster is made, how are the mistakes addressed?

10. What system is used to determine policy performance?

11. Which recurring problems/ challenges is persistent in BPDM?
12. Describe what resources are required to ensure effective DRM policy implementation.
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