International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)
ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714
www.ijhssi.org ||Volume 13 Issue 10|| October 2024 || PP. 14-21

Disaster Risk Redunction Measures In Nigeria: Issues, Trends and Dynamics-2015-2020

Suleiman Mohammed Basheer, Ph.D
Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Baze University Abuja-Nigeria.

Abbas Garba Idriss, Ph.D
Federal Capital Territory Emergency Management Agency, FEMA Abuja, Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria

Abstract
This paper seeks to analyses Nigeria's disaster risk reduction measures with a view to coming up with result-oriented approach aimed at enhancing efficient disaster risk reduction measures system in Nigeria. Citizens in Nigeria particularly that resides in flood prone areas often experience one form of disaster or the other. The commonest in this part of the word is flood with attendant human ecocatastrophe. The Nigerian Governments have in past years set up a national plan of action to mitigate the consequences of disaster. Despite the humongous resources expended, the outcomes have left so much to be desired. In a bid to achieve the above objective, the paper adopted the system theory model as a theoretical framework in an attempt to encourage the development and implementation of an all-round disaster risk reduction system. Also, the study adopted the secondary sources of data collection for the research methodology through the use of text books, journals, bulleting, reports and government archrivals. On the whole, the research findings indicate that there is huge gap between the objectives of disaster risk reduction measures and outcomes despite the Nigerian government commitments. Therefore, the paper recommended a total review of the disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria with a view to reversing the ugly trends and prevailing realities in mitigating the devastating effect of disaster on the citizenry.

Keywords: *Disaster, Risk, Reduction, Measures, Flood, Erosion, Violent Clashes*

Date of Submission: 20-09-2024 Date of acceptance: 05-10-2024

I. Introduction

Nigeria, like many other countries over the years has in place disaster risk reduction measures. This is done in order to mitigate the natural and man-made disaster and hazard that affect the citizenry. With hindsight, prior to 1906 according to Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017) there were no formal organization or institutionally recognized disaster risk measures. Rather, what was obtainable at that period was interventions to disaster were largely and exclusively carried out by private individuals and group in communities. However, the colonial authority in 1906 established the first Fire Brigade Unit that was saddled with minimal response to disaster in Nigeria Olasunkanmi 2019; Davidson, Emily and Solomon 2017).

According to Obeta (2014) cited in UNECA, (2015), as a matter of fact, disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria can be attributed to Federal Government of Nigeria first, second and third development plans of 1962-68, 1970-74 and 1975-80 respectively. The thinking of the Nigerian government at that time, shortly after independence as well as the thirty months civil war was the need to usher in development. Conversely, the impact of severe drought between 1972-1973 that resulted in the death of many Nigerians is also a consequent that informed disaster risk reduction measures at that stage. Nevertheless, the year 1976 was a watershed in disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria with the Federal Government during the military regime of General Murtala Muhammad which established the National Emergency Relief Agency (NERA). Meanwhile, NERA as it is known was saddled with the mandate of distributing relief material to disaster victims as means to cushion the effect of post disaster period Olasunkanmi 2019;UNECA, 2015).

Interestingly, a recent disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria can be attributed to the call by the United Nations International Decade for Disaster Reduction (IDNDR). This came on the hills of global rate and incidences of disasters and its consequent loss of lives as well as huge loss in social and economic assets, due to extreme climate change and the interaction between humans and the environment (Olasunkanmi 2019; Davidson, Emily and Solomon 2017; UNECA, 2015;). Thus, the urgent need to address global, regional and national disasters across the world necessitates nations to take pragmatic steps in disaster risk reduction measures and Nigeria was not left out in this awakening.

For instance, to be on the same page with global thinking that is in line with IDNDR of the United Nations. The government of Nigeria re-modified the scope and mandate NERA from just sharing relief materials to victims of disasters. NERA was re-strategies with disaster risk reduction Measures as well as a changed in name from NERA to National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) through an Act of parliament in 1999. Yet still, the NEMA was much more in line with IDNDR with the mandate to formulate policies and coordinate the implementation of plans programmes and activities relating to Disaster Risk Reduction Measures and Management System for efficient and effective response to disasters in Nigeria (Olasunkanmi 2019).

However, due to nature of the Nigeria political system, sub-national government also established disaster risk reduction measures at the state level known as State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA). With limited coordination and deployment of Disaster Risk Reduction Measures at state. On the other , say local government level there is what is called Local Government Emergency (LEMA). Sadly, the existence of LEMA has being more of political creation with no substantial operational base at the over 776 local government areas across the country (Ogboi, 2013 cited in UNECA, 2015).

Nonetheless, after sixty-two years of independence, there is not much to show for the series of efforts made by the government to ensure disaster risk reduction measures to ameliorate the huge impact of disasters. According to Ibidun (2020) many cities in sub-Saharan Africa lack official records of deaths and of serious illnesses and injuries from everyday hazards and disaster events at all scales. This is a major limitation to effective planning for disaster risk reduction measures. On their part Davidson, Emily and Solomon (2017), contends that disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria have failed in yielding the desired result. This they argue happened due to inability of the government to re-strategize it efforts in disaster risk reduction measures to meet up with current event. Pointing out that there is an increasing need to accept risk and on how to cope with the possibility of disaster occurrences. Also, the introduction of insurance companies to pay and cover damages resulting from disaster will go a long way in alleviating the pain of the citizenry. It is pertinent therefore to critically analyze disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria with a view to coming up with appropriate recommendations in an attempt to overhaul the disaster risk reduction measures and to cope with the prevailing issues, trends and dynamics in disaster management in the country.

II. Objective of the Study

The major objectives of this paper are:

1. To explain disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria
2. To determine the issues, trends and dynamics of disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria
3. To critically assess the challenges of disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria
4. To provide alternative options or recommendation to policy makers based on findings of this study

III. Methodology

The study used secondary sources of data as text books, journals, magazines, newspapers, bulletins, pamphlets, and report with a view to coming up with a result-oriented study.

IV. Theoretical Framework

This paper adopts the system approach as a theoretical framework. According to Ikelegbe (1994), the list of critical factors affecting the efficiency of policies varies in different context and analytical framework. Among them are the elite theory, liberal theory, Marxian theory, system theory, incremental policy model, institutional model etc, However, the most appropriate framework for this study is the system approach. The reason for this is that the system theory provides insight into the totality of the policies process and into the interactions between the component parts. A system can be organized or complete whole, an assemblage or combination of things or parts forming complex or unitary whole (Hampton, 1986 cited in Oyadiran and Adekeye, 2010).

The basic idea of system theory is that the whole is more than the sum of the parts, that organization be seen as "an assemblage or combinations of sub-units or part that are inherent and play complementary to affect the entire organization or system (Mitchell.1978 cited in Oyadiran and Adekeye 2010). Based on the above definition of system theory, the system analysis provides a rational means for examining integrations between an organization, its environment and within the organization. Thus, the use of system theory in the study will inevitably lead to the conclusion that every public policy like disaster risk reduction measures is indeed an open system (UNECA, 2015). Monday (1980) cited in Oyadiran and Adekeye (2010) view open system as an assemblage of things that affect or are affected by outside events. This means that the disaster risk reduction measures are affected by a number of forces, both external and internal to the policy framework. The implication of the above views in our analysis on disaster risk reduction measures is that it has component or sub-system (relief distribution, rehabilitation, medication, prevention, reintegration) that are linked together

according to a plan to achieve specific objective. The disaster risk reduction measures is subject to the influence of such factors as social, political, economic environment and religious sentiment which are distinct but interrelated.

According to Olorunfemi and Raheem (2010) that disasters, irrespective of causal factors are associated with diverse externalities such as mortalities, loss of income, home, farmlands, social networks, livelihoods and infrastructures. Therefore, it affects all ramifications of human existence and being. No nation can tolerate the occurrence of disaster in their environment without pragmatic disaster risk reduction measures. As every aspect of humanity is negatively impacted as a result of disaster.

V. Conceptual Analysis

In line with academic tradition, it is pertinent to conceptualize some of the basic terms considered to be critical to the study in an attempt to come up with a rich, robust and result oriented research work. Foremost, disaster simply is the occurrence and reoccurrences of event that impact humanity negatively. The international Solidarity for Disaster Reduction (1SDR) (2002) cited in Ibidun (2020), defined disaster simply as a function of the risk process. This they said happened as a result of the combination factors of hazards, conditions of vulnerability and insufficient capacity or measures to reduce the potential negative consequences of risk (ISDR, 2002 cited in Ibidun, 2020). That is why Olorunfemi and Raheem (2010) opined that disaster is an emergency event caused by natural hazards or human-induced actions resulting in a significant change in circumstances over are relatively short time period. They added that what we referred to as disaster are the typically event that leads to death, displacement, disease, loss of crops, damage to physical and service infrastructure, depletion of natural and social capitals, institutional weakening and a general disruption of economic and social activity (Olasunkanmi 2019; UNECA, 2015).

On the other hand, the concept of disaster in the word of Otero and Marti, (1995) cited in Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017), what happened as disaster. A broad definition are dramatic, sudden, unscheduled events that are often accompanied by large losses of human life, suffering and affliction to a society or a significant part of it, and a temporary breakdown of prevailing life lines and systems. Meanwhile, disaster in totality considerable loss of human and material damages, as well interruption of the normal functioning of an economy any of society in general (Olasunkanmi 2019; UNECA, 2015; Olorunfemi and Raheem 2010). However, as contended by government of South Africa official concerns about disaster, it said a disaster is a serious disruption of the functioning of a society, causing or threatens to cause, widespread human, material, or environmental losses which exceed the ability of affected community to cope with using only its own resources (UNECA, 2015; South Africa, 2002). Therefore, what constitute disasters are event or occurrences that disrupt human society such as flooding, volcanic eruption, war, drought, fire outbreak, heatwave, building collapse, violent clashes etc. Meanwhile disaster can occur in sudden and unexpected manner. For instance, flash floods or progressive drought disasters. And all this form of disasters and others are caused due to the interaction of humans with their environment or the man-made disaster such as war, building collapse and violent clashes (Olasunkanmi, 2019).

Risk is another concept we need to define for clearer understanding of its usage in this work. International Solidarity for Disaster Reduction (1SDR) (2002) cited in Ibidun, (2020) were of the view that risk entails actual stand to prevent unhelpful occurrences. This followed what United Nation in 1992 considered as risk. In this wise, risk preventive actions and a remedial program is also important. Risk in terms of disaster management has a specific focus (UN, 1992 cited in Ibidun, 2020). According to Olorunfemi and Raheem (2010), that in fact risk is associated with the inability of people to manage hazard events that may eventually lead to negative consequences like destruction of the environment, socio-economic activities, properties and losses of lives etc. However, risk in entirety is usually rooted in conditions of physical, social, economic, and environmental vulnerability. Interestingly, we can therefore define risk as the possibility that a particular hazard might exploit a particular vulnerability (Nierkerk, 2002 cited in Ibidun, 2020). In other words, risk is usually due to hazard events exploiting the vulnerable situation of an environment or community. It is the production of the possible damage caused by a hazard due to the vulnerability within a community. As this form of risk conditions require assessment and management on a continuing basis with the main aim of minimizing exposure to hazards (Olasunkanmi 2019; UNECA, 2015; Olorunfemi and Raheem 2010 citing ISDR, 2003). Consequently, risk can be fathom not just as assessing and preventing damages, it is the capacity and institutional policy to withstand destruction or damage, but to hasten recovery at post disaster.

Reduction according to Ibidun, (2020) is to deal with outcome of unpleasant event by successfully preventing its reoccurrence. In this regards reduction take absolute control in ensuring a direct impact from harmful situation. For instance, Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017) argued that reduction is a planning incidence to reduce negative effects of disasters. They however went ahead to highlight the necessity for reduction direct planning and decision-making processes at all levels. Therefore, reduction primarily is a planning exercise across board against disaster. More so, reduction policies in disaster are implemented with a

two-fold aimed at (1) how to enable societies to be resilient to natural hazards while ensuring that development efforts do not increase vulnerability to these hazards, (2) to ensure reduction is essential for communities to understand disaster reduction approach (Olorunfemi and Raheem (2010). With this understanding of these scholars would bring them to become more resilient to the effects of disaster hazards. Subsequently, reduction is an important attribute toward society gaining a proactive disaster reduction measure (UNECA, 2015).

Measure simply connotes the various practical and progrommes to mitigate a problem. Succinctly, measures come in the form of policies document, law and regulation to safeguard against wrongful act. In this situation of disaster, measures are probably the things put in place by government, private organization and others to mitigate harmful consequences (Ibidun, 2020; Davidson, Emily and Solomon, 2017; UNECA, 2015; Olorunfemi and Raheem 2010). Thus, measures take care and prevent further losses of lives, injuries, damage to property and/or the environment, livelihoods lost, disruption of economic activity or social systems arising from human interaction with the environment or greed of some persons.

To further broaden our discussion in this paper it is imperative we explain what disaster risk reduction measures entail. As scholar at different point give an expository meaning to what disaster risk reduction measure. Disaster risk reduction measures aims at motivating people to be more involved in the conscious management of disaster in the society. Olorunfemi and Raheem (2010) said disaster risk reduction measure is to bring about sustainable development at pre, during and post disaster periods.

Initially, the concepts of disaster risk reduction measure, according to Lee, Henstra and Mcbean (2005) and Birkmann (2006) cited in Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017) focus on relief distribution, recovery and disaster preparedness. However, over the years according to Ibidun, 2020, NEMA (2020), Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017), disaster risk reduction measure has been refocus to deeper addressing the underlining and frontlines issues in disaster. They added that disaster risk reduction measures have moved towards a more sustainable approach incorporating hazard mitigation. An approach that people centered on how to cope with disaster of both natural hazard and man-made. This also includes active humanitarian response that is comprehensive. While its target is to ensure a designed human pragmatic intervention to reduce the susceptibility in the society and lessen the impact of disasters.

As argued by Birkmann et al (2013) cited in Davidson, Emily and Solomon, (2017) that disaster risk reduction measures is a comprehensive system that incorporate the assessment of disaster that is detailed. This they added involved risk analysis, accurate data assessment and reduction strategy. Hence, the operation of disaster risk reduction measures is a departure from initiation, within the last three decades. This according to Ibidun, 2020, NEMA (2020) has reawakened global consensus on the disaster risk reduction measures.

It is imperative to point out that the paradigm shift was hinged to accelerated and focused on anthropogenic activities that alter natural environment. For instance, drift toward understanding the quantification and analysis, as well as assessment of hazard component to identification, assessment and ranking of vulnerabilities give more sustainable approach. Interestingly, this is regarded as the means to fast tracking and having a clearer picture on increasing exposure of people, susceptibility and state actors and non-state actor's response capacity or lack of it in mitigating disaster resilience. (Birkmann et al 2013 cited in Davidson, Emily and Solomon, 2017; UNECA, 2015)

Thus, as earlier said global concerns in recent past has broaden the concept of disaster risk reduction measure from an informed perspectives that we need to acknowledge several initiatives at the global level leading to adoption at national and local levels with a view to engendering disaster risk reduction measures. First among this initiative was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The outcome of that conference of global stakeholders produced a document tagged agenda 21. With conference document acknowledging disaster risk reduction measures as an element of global, national and local efforts to implement Agenda 21.

Another, global initiative and concerns was the Global Environmental Outlook report by the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP, 2002). The UNEP Report substantially focuses greatly on disaster risk reduction measures. By noting and calling for even progress in disaster risk reduction measure as well as balancing the 'vulnerability gaps'. In addition is to align to the fact that disaster risk reduction measure cannot be overemphasized at World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 Johannesburg. The summit unequivocally reaffirmed the place of disaster risk reduction measure within its notion of 'sustainable development'. Collaborating the foregoing as a major global stamp on adoption of disaster risk reduction measure was recorded under the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR 2007) code named initiative Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015(UNECA, 2015).

In the intervening time, UNISDR provides an umbrella under which effective strategies for Disaster Risk Reduction Measure, through coordination and accountability can flourished, and technical and political agreement on areas that needs to be addressed to reduce risk. The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015, on the other hand which focuses on building the resilience of nations and countries to disasters, encourage state actors and government to 'take on, or adjust where required, enact legislation and extant law to support

disaster risk reduction measure. As this will go a long way to ensure regulation, compliance and adaptation to local situation and incentives for undertaking disaster risk reduction measure actions (Ibidun, 2020; NEMA 2020; Davidson, Emily and Solomon, 2017). The Hyogo Framework for action has five priorities for action.

1. Ensure that disaster reduction is a national and a local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation;
2. Identify, assess and monitor disaster risk and enhance warning;
3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture safety and resilience at all levels;
4. Reduce the underlying risk factors and
5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels. (UNISDR, 2007).

Conversely, at the expiration of the Hyogo framework for Action in 2015, by shared wisdom of the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), a Post Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 Framework for Action 2 was initiated. This is setting a new focus for Disaster Risk Reduction. This came to be at the 4th Africa Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in Febuary, 2013 in Arusha Tanzania. With the objectives of monitoring progress in the implementation of African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2005-2015; sharing information; expertise; lessons learned and tools to accelerate progress; and building the steps for post disaster 2015 DRR agenda in Africa. The bottom line of Post Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 Framework for Action 2 is:

1. Raising awareness: city officials to gain more knowledge of dynamics of vulnerability and risk, and the implications on development;
2. Bottom-up approach: local governments to have responsibilities. This entails promoting political will, harmonizing policies and decentralizing Disaster Risk Reduction process;
3. Knowing more: increase capacities to accelerate implementation of plans and policies;
4. Making Disasters Risk Reduction a core function: based on awareness, political will and capacity;
5. Involves local officials from the start: to ensure that national authorities communicate with city officials, inform them about the national and global commitments, and involve cities/ local government in planning (UNECA, 2015).

Significantly, numbers of initiatives have been undertaken by the Nigerian Government for the purpose of facilitating disaster risk reduction measure in Nigeria. Foremost, was earlier initiation in the 1970s through NERA that metamorphosed into present day National Emergency Management Agency NEMA, having the task of coordinating disaster risk management activities in the country. NEMA over the years lead advocacy in the establishment of state emergency management agencies and local emergency management at the state and local government levels, respectively. With the understanding to complement NEMA's effort at the lower levels of government but, to date, the process of establishing them has been very slow because state and local governments do not consider the project as expedient and of any immediate priority The best local government executive have done so far is to simply make provisions for relief materials to victims of disaster within their areas of jurisdictions. At present, all the 36 states and FCT Abuja have their respective emergency agencies. Regrettably, none of the 774 local government councils in Nigeria have made a giant stride in this respect. Interestingly, NEMA, in collaboration with several stakeholders, has developed a number of policies and plans on disaster risk reduction and the effective management of disasters in Nigeria. Examples include the National Disaster Response Plan, National Reduction, and National Contingency Plan for Nigeria. The Ministry of Environment has also developed various policies and plans on environmental management for the purpose of reducing disasters, among which are the National Policy on Drought and Desertification: Drought Preparedness Plan, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and National Policy on Erosion and Flood Control. The National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency was created to enforce these regulations and policies (NEMA, 2020; UNECA, 2015). Flowing from the above is for us to appreciate global and regional initiative toward disaster risk reduction measure. While we don't lose sight of the fact of various issues, trends and dynamics of disaster in and across the globe, it becomes imperative to assess issues, trends and dynamics in Disaster Risk Reduction Measures in Nigeria.

VI. Issues, Trends and Dynamic of Disasters in Nigeria

Accordingly, Nigeria has three major climatic regions: tropical monsoon in the south, tropical wet and dry in the central area and semi-arid in the far north. Meanwhile, these climatic conditions have given rise to unique ecological zones in the country: tropical rain forest in the deep south, savannah woodlands of different composition in the central area and Sahel dry land in the far north. More so, these ecological zones predisposed the country to various types of natural hazards; flood, coastal erosion and landslides are common in the southern part of the country while, in the north, desertification, drought and occasional flooding are common (UNECA, 2015). However, a look into the issues, trends and dynamic of disaster in Nigeria afford us a wide range of disasters. These disaster occurrences are recorded for instance earlier after Nigerian independence in 1960. Abubakar and Yamusa, (2013) argued that in the 1970s and 1980s, disaster occurrences such as droughts reduce agricultural contribution to national GDP from 18.4 percent in 1971-1972 to 7.3

per cent in 1972-1973.

Again, as reported by Emergency Data Association in 2011 cited in UNECA, (2015), a long-term average value of disaster occurrence in Nigeria was 94 disaster events occurred between 1980 and 2010. These resulted in the death of 21,002 people, affecting 6,306,441 more people and causing economic damage amounting to US$ 188 million. Yet still Baiye, 1988; Akinyemi, 1990; Nwaubani, 1991; Edward-Adebiyi,1997 cited in IBUKUN, (2020) said flood disaster in Nigeria forced millions of people from their homes, destroyed businesses, polluted water resources and increased the risk of diseases. Chiefly, Nigerians would perhaps never forget floods of 2012, and that of 2022 that lead to fuel scarcity in Abuja, submerging over 700 houses in Lokoja Kogi state, killing over 600 people, displacing and dislocating thousands of people in Anambra coastal communities.

In addition, the dynamic of disaster in Nigeria is the bane of disease epidemics with recurring incidences of measles, meningitis, cholera, and Lassa fever. Adagbada et'al (2012) cited in NEMA, (2020); UNECA, (2015), contends that cholera infection is endemic in Nigeria and outbreaks are not unusual in the last quarter of 2009 to 2011. With a death toll that is more than 260 people died of cholera in different states across the country. Again, we acknowledge the fact that Nigeria periodically experiences a wide range of natural and man-made hazards: floods, wind-storms, drought, desertification or desert encroachment, landslides, soil erosion, gully erosion, coastal erosion, wildfires, sandstorms, pest invasion, and volcanic eruptions and building collapses, associated activities (UNECA, 2015). The study however provide data on occurrence of this disaster between 2015 to 2022, in a spatial distribution of these hazards across the country in the below.

Table 1. PROFILE OF DISESTER IN NIGERIA

DISASTER	GEOGRAPHICAL AREA AFFECTED
FLOODS:	Urban areas with poor drainage ; settlements located in low-lying river flood plains; settlements fringing the Niger, Benue, Cross, Katsina Ala, and Imo rivers.
GULLY-EROSION	Predominantly in Anambra, Cross River, Akwa Ibom, Imo, Benue, Abi, Enugu, Ekiti, Kogi, Edo and Plateau states. It is caused by devegetation of sloppy terrains and the impact on people.
COASTAL EROSION	This happens in Lagos,Ondo, Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Rivers, Beyelsa, Delta state respectively.
DROUGHT AND DESERTIFICATION	Drought and desertification are phenomena of the drier northern part of the country of Sokoto, Katsina, Kano, Jigawa, Zamfara,Borno, Yobe, Gombe state
BUILDING COLLAPSE	This happens across the country, Although Lagos and Abuja witnessed higher incidences
MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT	It happens across the country
FIRE OUTBREAK	Happens across the country especially in urban and semi-urban populated areas
WIND STORM	Happens across the country
VIOLENCE CLASHES	Occurred across the country

Source: *Compiled by the Researcher, 2022.*

From the above table the Nigerian disaster index is determined as an aggregate of the both hazard and manmade factors.

Table 2. Over views of Disasters 2015-2020

Number of events	230
Number of people killed	6,000
Average number of people killed per year	1,000
Numbers of people affected	11,200,500

Source: *Compiled by the Researcher, 2022.*

In the table above, the disaster occurrences in Nigeria showed 15,000 people were killed in the year under study

Table 3. Natural Disaster Occurrences in Nigeria

Disaster Rank	Number of affected people	Year of occurrence
FLOODS	7,000,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018, 2019,2020 & 2022
GULLY-ERROSION	50,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019,2020
COASTAL EROSSION	100,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019,2020
DROUGHT AND DESERTIFICATION	2,000,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019,2020
Building Collapse	23,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019,2020
Fire Outbreak	70,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019,2020
Wind storm	1,000,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019, 2020
VIOLENCE CLASHES	15,000,000	2015, 2016, 2017 2018,2019, 2020

Source: *Compiled by the Researcher, 2022.*

From the above table violence clashes affected millions of people more than other disaster in Nigeria under the years of the study.

VII. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF DISASTER RISK REDUCTION MEASURES IN NIGERIA

Without mincing words, disaster risk reduction measure in Nigeria modestly can be found in the working and operation of National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). However, the working of NEMA is in collaboration with stakeholders in Nigeria (NEMA, 2020; UNECA, 2015). Meanwhile, NEMA is mandated to with responsibility to fostered necessary disaster risk reduction measure system necessary to safeguard Nigeria from the devastating impacts of natural and man-made disasters. This stakeholder includes community-

based institutions or groups, such as community associations, vigilante groups, and faith-based organizations (FBOs), and grassroots volunteers. Others are the Military, the Police, the Fire Service, the Para-Military Organizations, the Red Cross, and of course NEMA. More formal stakeholders are the humanitarian and development agencies (local or international) which may intervene in disaster situations in order to assist the affected population in coping with and recovering from the disaster impacts (Olasunkanmi 2019; NEMA, 2020; UNECA, 2015).

It is noteworthy that since its creation, NEMA, has developed disaster risk reduction measures in line with United Nations ISDR and Hyogo framework for Action as well as AU and ECOWAS Protocol use in working with other disaster management stakeholders in Nigeria. Some of the most notable are described below.

The National Disaster Response Plan was formulated in 2001 and was put in place to assist NEMA in its role as the coordinator of disaster response in Nigeria. The plan was given legislative backing through its formal endorsement by the Federal Executive Council. The essential features of the plan are with following features:

a) Specifies the disaster response and recovery actions and responsibilities of the Government and its agencies. Outlines the Government response and the recovery resources available to support state and local governments and communities at the ward level to save lives, protect public health and safety, protect property, and assist victims in reconstruction efforts after a disaster.
b) Describes disaster management facilities available within some NGOs that may be called upon for assistance in times of emergency.
c) Describes the standard operating procedures or disaster response functions of relevant Government agencies and some NGOs;
d) Assigns disaster response functions to various Government agencies and NGOs;
e) Provides a coordinating framework for disaster response, with NEMA as its hub (National Disaster Management Framework)

The National Disaster Management Framework was developed to serve as a regulatory guideline for the effective and efficient disaster management in Nigeria. The framework defines measurable, flexible and adaptable coordinating structures, and aligns key roles and responsibilities of disaster management stakeholders across the nation. The framework has the following attributes:

a) It describes specific authorities and best practices for managing disasters;
b) It explains a paradigm shift from response and recovery in disaster management to disaster risk reduction;
c) It offers a holistic approach to disaster management and serves as a legal instrument to address the need for consistency among multiple stakeholders;
d) It is a coherent, transparent and inclusive policy for disaster management in Nigeria (National Action Plan on Disaster).

The National Contingency Plan focuses on the hazards that have highest probability of occurrence and greatest severity, such as flooding, conflicts, drought and disease & epidemics. The plan addresses the readiness of disaster management stakeholders in the country and defines the modus operandi for engaging international assistance if and/or when required. The plan emphasizes sectoral responses in the areas of camp management; basic education; food and nutrition; logistics and telecommunication; security and protection; water, sanitation and hygiene; health; and emergency shelter and non-food items.

,,,,

Armed Forces of Nigeria Pandemic Contingency Plan

This plan was developed by the Nigerian Armed Forces to serve as a guideline for responding to global pandemic situations. The purpose of the plan is to provide a framework for response by the Armed Forces to accomplish the following objectives:

a) Contribute to an effective national response to as global influenza pandemic;
b) Reduce influenza-related morbidity and mortality;
c) Minimize disruption of critical social and medical services during a pandemic;

Looking at the above Nigerian state commitment toward disaster risk reduction measures is well capture in this paper.

While the implementation of this in reality cannot be said to be encouraging, it behooves on the national government to renew its commitment toward implementing the disaster reduction measures for economic transformation. This brings to the fore that government in Nigeria have not been forth coming in ensuring compliance on disaster risk reduction measures and to forestall effective intervention to national emergencies.

VIII. Conclusion

There is no gain saying that both natural and human-induced disasters require urgent intervention from the government in order to protect lives and properties which coincides with the primary role of the state to its citizenry. At the same time, government should mobilize all critical stakeholders through constructive engagement to comply with extant rule guiding town planning, and construction while discouraging people from building along water ways (river bank). However, disaster is a global phenomenon that the whole world grapples with, hence the need for the establishment of an all-round safety measures becomes necessary so as not to reverse the gains of national development. Therefore, it is important for the government to ensure a well broaden disaster risk reduction measures across board to mitigate the devastating consequences of both natural and human-induced disaster in Nigeria especially now that the climate change disasters prevail.

IX. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following options or recommendations are made;

- A good disaster risk reduction measure should be inculcated at urban, semi-urban and rural areas of the country.
- Government decision on disaster risk reduction measures be sustainable through funding and capacity development as well as stakeholder engagement.
- Disaster risk reduction measures must be infused to our school curriculum and part of national teaching pledge.
- The paper calls for total review of the disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria with a view to reversing the ugly trends and prevailing reality.
- There is need for transparency and accountability on part of stakeholders in disaster risk reduction measure operation in Nigeria.
- There should be regular sensitization of the local people as well as people with disability who are the most vulnerable group of the society. There should be inclusiveness of people with disability in all disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeria especially at the multi hazards early warnings in order to save more lives and properties.

REFERENCES

[1]. Davidson, A., Emily, A., and Solomon, N., J. (2017) Disaster Risk Reduction Framework as Paneacea for Coping with Flood Events in Nigeria Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences (DUJOPAS) Vol. 3 No. 1

[2]. Ibidun, O.,A (2020) Urban Dynamics, Every day Hazard and Disaster Risk in Ibadan, Nigeria in International Institute of Environment and Development (IIED) Vol.1, No 2.

[3]. Olasunkunmi, H., O, (2019) Spatial Analysis of Disaster Statistics in Selected Cities of Nigeria Int.J. Emergency Management,Vol.15, No.4,2019

[4]. Olorunfemi, F., B and Raheem U., A. (2010) Sustainable Disaster Risk Reduction in Nigeria: Lessons for developing Countries in Research Gate online Pp13

[5]. Oyadiran, P and Adekeye, A., J. (2010) Transport Policy in Nigeria: Issues, Challenges and Options in Journal of Political Studies Vol. 2, No 1, pp89-102

[6]. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2015) Assessment report on mainstreaming and implementing disaster risk reduction measures in Nigeriae: cainfo@uneca.orgWeb:www.uneca.org