International Journal of Social Science Research (IJSSR)
Volume- 3, Issue- 2 | March - April 2026 ISSN: 3048-9490

Public Health Governance and Pandemic Response: Global and Local Perspectives

Asha Pradeep
Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, University College,
Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India

Abstract

The governance frameworks that influence pandemic response have received fresh attention due to the exceptional scope and complexity of contemporary global health emergencies. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for more flexible, comprehensive, and context-sensitive approaches by exposing the advantages and disadvantages of centralized public health systems. In this scenario, decentralized public health governance, which emphasizes the division of power, accountability, and resources among various levels of governance, has become a crucial paradigm in this changing environment. The importance of local authorities, which serve as the main channel of contact between the government and the people during a public health crisis, is central to this paradigm. With an emphasis on the roles and capabilities of local governments, the article explores the crucial role of both global and local actors in public health governance and pandemic responses. The paper also examines how local institutions perform the global health governance tasks including monitoring, risk dissemination, delivering services, and social protection in order to support disaster preparedness, mitigation, and recovery. It emphasizes how local governments may more successfully identify risks, engage local assets, and carry out customized interventions when they are close to communities. The study also critically assesses functional and structural limitations of global and local pandemic response mechanisms such as restricted fiscal discretion, capacity shortages, and difficulties coordinating within multi-layered administrative structures.

Keywords: decentralization, global health governance, disaster preparedness, pandemics, mitigation

Introduction

Pandemics, which are characterized as widespread outbreaks of infections that transcend state borders and impact sizable populations, have become crucial global governance issues. Global pandemics have shown their propensity to disrupt not just medical systems but also financial security, political structure, and social cohesiveness, as seen by historical occurrences like the Spanish Flu and more contemporary crises like COVID-19. Pandemics have far-reaching effects that go well beyond illness and mortality, including the supply network disruptions, job insecurity, disruptions in schooling, and widening disparities between and within countries.

*Corresponding Author Email: ashamini490@gmail.com
Published: 04 April 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70558/IJSSR.2026.v3.i2.30980
Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

In this setting, nations, international bodies, corporate organizations, and non-state actors have all contributed to the development of the world's public health management. In order to coordinate responses, mobilize capital, and establish normative frameworks, organizations like the World Health Organization, Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, and the International Monetary Fund have been essential. In particular, the WHO serves as a major coordinating body, offering recommendations, promoting global collaboration, and serving as a forum for group action. However, the COVID-19 pandemic brought to light serious shortcomings in international healthcare management, such as fragmented coordination, inadequate compliance capabilities, financial limitations, and political rivalry among member states. The covid period also revealed the significance of local governments such as municipalities, panchayats, and regional authorities which are the front-line actors in a scenario of responding to a pandemic, carrying out health policy measures like testing, surveillance, contact tracing, quarantine enforcement, risk communication, and provision of critical services. Their closeness to people promotes participatory governance, increases public trust, and allows for specific context-based actions.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design grounded in an integrated analytical and historical-descriptive approach to examine the evolution, structures, and functional dynamics of the subject under investigation. The methodological framework is intended to capture both the temporal progression and the contextual complexity of institutional and governance processes. The article relies mainly on secondary data such as government documents, peer-reviewed journal articles and books. The historical analysis includes periodization of previous pandemics and its management.

Overview of Global Pandemics

An unanticipated, frequently abrupt rise in a particular disease within a group or area is known as an epidemic. When an illness spreads across global borders and affects a sizable population, it is referred to as a pandemic. Many infectious diseases can cause epidemics or pandemics and pose serious health risks on a local, regional, and worldwide scale. Vaccination, social distancing, and excellent sanitation are just a few of the household and community strategies that might help prevent and lessen epidemics and pandemics. (IFRC, n.d.)

One of the most significant and persistent threats to human society, global pandemics cross over national, political, and socioeconomic divides. pandemic is a complicated worldwide issue that affects healthcare systems, economy, government structures, and daily life in addition to being a prevalent form of disease. Events like the Spanish Flu and the Black Death show how infectious diseases have impacted global political changes, changed economic systems, and modified demographic trends from time immemorial. Nearly three human plague pandemics which are the Justinian plague, the Black Death, and the third plague are caused by the flea-borne bacteria Yersinia pestis. After starting in Egypt, the Justinian plague spread across the Eastern Roman Empire and its surrounding regions. About 100 million people perished from the epidemic in the Roman Empire between 541 and 543, particularly in Constantinople, the capital. The Justinian plague transmitted more easily via the Roman Empire's commerce and defense lines due to its highly advanced organization. The less organized barbarian civilizations away from Rome's boundaries, however, were unaffected by

the epidemic. The virus's high death rate may have played a role in the Byzantine Empire's deterioration and final fall. Following this first pandemic, there were sporadic outbreaks of the plague every eight to twelve years of age for two centuries before they vanished for unclear causes. Along the terrestrial and maritime trade channels of the medieval Silk Road, the Black Death, the second plague epidemic, spread from East Asian countries over Central Asian and into Europe. 200 million people died during the second plague pandemic, which persisted in Europe until the early 19th century. The Justinian plague and the Black Death have been caused by distinct lineages of Y. pestis that emerged into the human community. Up to 30% of Europeans perished during the Black Death (1347–1351), which was carried out by surges like the plague of Milan (1630), the great epidemic of London (1665–1666), and the plague of Marseille (1720–1722). Following the Black Death, an upsurge of plague was thought to have spread from Europe to Asia, settling in China and causing the third plague outbreak, according to genetic study of both old and new genes. The one that follows plague catastrophe began in the Yunnan region of China in the midpoint of the 19th century, made its way to the city of Canton, and then moved to Hong Kong. In 1894, Alexandre Yersin found the bacteria Y. pestis in samples from dead rats and plague victims in Hong Kong. The vessels later carried the pandemic to Taiwan, Singapore, Japan, and India. The epidemic spread throughout several nations in the ensuing decades (Jocelyne & Bolivin, 2021).

At the beginning of the century, a fresh spread of cholera, a bacterial sickness acquired by consuming tainted water and food, starts in India. It is the most recent outbreak of an infection that has periodically produced global outbreaks since the beginning of 1800s. Thousands of people die because of the pandemic, which also extends to regions of the Middle East and North Africa. The mortality rate is especially severe in Russia and India. It is believed that improvements in community cleanliness and hygiene prevented the epidemic from spreading over North America and Europe. Amidst the chaos of World War I, a new influenza virus starts to spread over the world named as Spanish flu. The global outbreak's roots are still up for debate; however, it first appeared in Spain. It kills about 50 million people, with an exceptionally high mortality rate among generally healthy teenagers, and transmits approximately 500 million individuals, or about roughly a third of the global population at that point in time. The containment strategy is hampered by the worldwide mobility of forces, even though several nations rely on isolation measures, quarantines, and disinfection initiatives. Medications to treat subsequent infections caused by bacteria have yet to be invented, and there is currently no flu vaccination. The typical lifespan in the US is reduced by over two decades due to the approximately 675,000 deaths that occur there alone (Major Pandemics of the Modern Era, 2025).

Ebola virus disease (EVD), also known as Ebola hemorrhagic fever, is one of the most acute, deadly, and deadly infections. It is caused by a species of ebolaviruses, including the Ebola virus, Sudan virus, Bundibugyo virus, Reston virus, and Bombali virus, in both humans and nonhuman primates, including monkeys, gorillas, and chimpanzees. The ebolaviruses which cause human diseases are Ebola, Sudan, Taï Forest, and Bundibugyo viruses. In 1976, the Ebola virus first appeared in two concurrent events in two tropical regions of sub-Saharan Africa: Sudan in a village close to the Ebola River and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In the initial and following outbreaks, there were 284 infections with a death rate of 53% and 318

with a death rate of 88%, respectively. The Ebola virus has mostly affected a number of African nations over the past 40 years, with periodic outbreaks and a global worry due to over 25 fatal occurrences.

There have occurred five significant influenza outbreaks in the past 140 years. Bird flu, dog flu, H1N1 flu, H3N2 flu, horse flu, human flu, and swine flu are some of the virus varieties that have surfaced. The 1918 flu pandemic, which was brought on by the H1N1-type influenza A virus along with to the Arctic and isolated Pacific islands, was the deadliest of these. Due to the exceptionally high rates of infection brought on by cytokine storms and lung infection, the 1918 influenza pandemic claimed over 50 million lives globally, comparable to the Black Death. Consequently, the 1918 epidemic produced terror in the impacted areas, social unrest, and psychological damage to many people. The most recent influenza outbreak of the twenty-first century in 2009, a type of H1N1 caused a virus known as swine flu. The WHO reports that during the influenza H1N1 pandemic, there were 482,300 illnesses and 18,000 deaths in 199 countries. Acute myocardial infarction and stroke were the primary morbidities during the 2009 influenza outbreak, which greatly increased the proportion of fatalities (Nizam & Acter, 2021).

Global Public Health Governance of Pandemics

Pandemics like COVID-19 have drawn attention to the critical need for organized worldwide response in an age of globalization characterized by quick travel, urbanization, ecological destruction, and economic interconnectedness. Partnership between governments, global institutions, scholarly groups, and non-state actors is necessary for efficient governance, but it is frequently hampered by institutional constraints, geopolitical conflicts, and inequality. The notion that health is a global public good is the foundation of global health governance. Because pandemics cross national boundaries, unilateral solutions are inadequate. Authority is distributed at the international, regional, national, and local levels under the framework's multi-level governance structure.

At the center of global pandemic governance is the World Health Organization (WHO), which provides leadership, sets norms, and coordinates international responses. In order to improve pandemic mitigation, readiness, and response, member states of the World Health Organization agreed to a worldwide procedure to design and discuss a convention, accord, or other multilateral mechanism under the WHO Constitution. The Seventy-eighth World Health Assembly accepted the Pandemic Agreement on May 20, 2025, and formed an Intergovernmental Working Group to wrap up the agreement's implementation so that WHO Member States could sign and ratify it. The International Health Regulations, worldwide systems and organizations striving to fairly share health technology standards, knowledge, and expertise, and other projects, activities, and strategies intended to make the world secure from infectious diseases are all complemented by the Pandemic Agreement. The Agreement improved upon the COVID-19 pandemic by applying the lessons learnt. One of the main goals, tenets, and outcomes of the new Agreement is equity. By guaranteeing an all-government and all-society attitude inside nations as well as consistent and adequate political and funding within and across nations, the Agreement fosters political loyalty at the pinnacle (WHO, 2025).

As per WHO direction there are six phases regarding a virus’s outbreak. These phases determine declaration of a pandemic. The phases are: phase 1 - Although a virus has been

observed in animals, human infections have not been confirmed, phase 2 - Human beings have become infected with an identified animal virus, phase 3 - Human cases of the infection can be dispersed, solitary, or spread in tiny groups; there may be instances of transmission from person to person but not enough to result in spread at the community level, phase 4 - transmission from individual to individual at a pace that results in a community spread, phase 5 -The infection is currently spreading among people in multiple nations, phase 6 – There are breakouts at the community level in at least one other nation besides the one in phase 5. After phase 6, plans are developed for a worldwide epidemic. Every phase has a set of steps that must be taken in order to promote openness and educate the public and health organizations (Contributors, n.d.).

However, the organization confronts challenges in managing public health pandemics, the world's public health pandemic management processes have not produced adequate results. The first of these is the WHO's responsibility in helping states with crisis governance. There has been disagreement on the proper scope of its public health pandemic management. Traditionalists suggest that the WHO should only provide essential aid in times of emergency and not provide nations with technical advice. Others, however, contend that the WHO should at the very least provide its member nations with the assistance they need in the form of health tools, statistical aid, epidemiological assistance, and educational and training programs in order to improve pandemic treatment. Some have gone far enough as to say that member states should not be the only ones receiving this kind of assistance, particularly when it comes to developing nations. The inability to effectively respond to viral breakouts and promote worldwide cooperation is the second issue. The pandemics of Zika, Middle East respiratory syndrome, and severe acute respiratory syndrome showed that the WHO's six-year-long pandemic influenza preparedness strategy was only suitable for influenza outbreaks and was ineffective in responding to general global emergencies.

The COVID-19 pandemic further illustrated the need for immediate changes to the WHO's multilateral cooperation skills in pandemic management, such as coordinating immunizations for the entire globe and swiftly exchanging pandemic management practices. The WHO's unstable fiscal assets are the subject of the fourth issue. Less than 40% of its yearly budget comes from dues from members and monetary donations from its member nations, but more than 60% comes from voluntary offerings from institutions, associations, and people (Xu, Dai, Effinger, & Zhang, 2024).

Decentralization in Pandemic Management

Decentralization has some specific features with regards to the management of a pandemic. The three traits of responsiveness to the society, a sense of authority to perform state responsibilities, and the capacity of local governments to navigate contextually specific local conditions are probably crucial for the present situation. In summary, they contend that local governments may be more adept at reaching people with a variety of welfare programs and disease mitigation initiatives, with a greater level of local coordination and readiness to respond to the general population in providing socioeconomic security services during an unprecedented period of crisis. In the early stages of the lockdown, it was critical to manage the epidemic while simultaneously guaranteeing inhabitants' essential necessities and food

security. Under each nation's Disaster Management Authority, panchayats and other local players, including medical care providers and social workers are required to execute specific activities according to recommendations supplied by the national government to state governing bodies and district administrations.

Recently, in covid management, local governments played a crucial role in contact tracing, mitigation, and disease surveillance. By mobilizing local health workers and community networks, they ensured early containment and response mechanisms. For instance, in India, the Accredited Social Health Activist (ASHA), Auxiliary Nurse midwives (ANM), women's Self-Help Groups (SHGs), teachers, and other health care professionals on the front were to collaborate with panchayats in order to accomplish this. This was accomplished by creating panchayat or village-level committees known as Panchayat Jagrata Samiti (in Kerala), control rooms (in Rajasthan), and quick response teams (in Odisha). Although the committees' names vary each Indian state, they carry out comparable tasks. A self-help group (SHG) is a committee that acts as a financial mediator and is often made up of ten to twenty local women from comparable socioeconomic backgrounds. In South Asia, these organizations have become a means of providing microfinance services to the underprivileged and promoting village women's financial security. In addition to enabling access to medical care by helping with institutional births, running vaccination programs, and supplying contraceptive products, these staff members educate society about proper nutrition, basic hygiene and sanitation habits, current medical care, and the necessity of promptly utilizing family welfare and health care programs. They serve as a link between underprivileged populations and medical services in this way.

The Ministry of Panchayati Raj has advised the Panchayats in several states, such as Rajasthan, Odisha, and Kerala, to accept migrants at nearby train and bus stations and arrange for their mode of transport to rural isolation centers. According to a district-specific administrator we spoke with, some Local governments have been given vehicles specifically for this use. In addition, the local governments oversee recording their information, tracking down the connections and travel histories of individuals displaying typical symptoms, and enforcing fines or filing police charges against those who disobey quarantine regulations. Local government and panchayat authorities use a variety of technology to accomplish these tasks, including web portals, Google spreadsheets, and WhatsApp groups. According to our responses from all three states, panchayat-level committees have established WhatsApp groups that they use to communicate with residents and raise information of current welfare programs and illness prevention. Additionally, different line agencies use these networks to share information and coordinate both within and between divisions. Google spreadsheets are used by neighborhood groups and Panchayats in Kerala to send daily reports to the DM (Dutta & Fischer, 2021). The instances shows that local governments can effectively carry out service delivery, public health communication, and context specific response during a crisis period.

Conclusion

Thus, a crucial aspect of pandemic management is the interaction between national, municipal, and international levels of administration. While national governments create broad regulations and international organizations offer normative advice and coordinating frameworks, local

governments are responsible for operationalizing and implementing such regulations. Decentralized systems can facilitate more flexible and responsive governance by customizing initiatives to localized epidemiological and sociocultural contexts, according to scientific experiences during COVID-19. Decentralization does, however, come with some inherent difficulties. Inconsistent results may result from differences in local governments' structural readiness, financial assets, and capacity for management. Moreover, dispersed power may make it more difficult to integrate national and international strategies, impede coordination, and delay decision-making. In many situations, policy inconsistency along with execution gaps were caused by the unclear division of duties between national and regional authorities. Despite these challenges decentralized pandemic governance enables a more responsive and quick response in crisis situations. These highlights the need to strengthen decentralization networks, local capacity, and integration of local authorities into global public health management structures for future challenges.

References

1. Contributors, P. (n.d.). *Endemics, Epidemics and Pandemic*. Retrieved from https://www.physio-pedia.com/index.php?title=Endemics,_Epidemics_and_Pandemics&oldid=261904
2. Dutta, A., & Fischer, H. W. (2021). *The Local Governance of Covid-19 Disease Prevention and Social Security in Rural India*. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com
3. Greer, S. L., Rozenblum, S., Falkenbach, M., Löblová, O., Jarman, H., Williams, N., & Wismar, M. (2022). Centralizing and decentralizing governance in the COVID-19 pandemic: The politics of credit and blame. *Health policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, *126*(5), 408–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2022.03.004
4. IFRC. (n.d.). *What is a disaster?* Retrieved from https://www.ifrc.org
5. Jocelyne , P., & Bolivin, G. (2021). Pandemics Throughout History. *PMC, 11*. Retrieved March 15, 2026, from https://www.frontiersin.org
6. Liu, J., & Liu, S. (2020). The management of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Journal of medical virology*, *92*(9), 1484–1490. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25965
7. *Major Pandemics of the Modern Era*. (2025, March 10). Retrieved from Council of Foreign Relations: https://www.cfr.org
8. Nizam, U., & Acter, T. (2021, August 6). *An Overview of Global Epidemics and the Challenges Faced*. (L. Gruenwald, S. Jain, & S. Groppe, Editors) doi:10.1016/B978-0-323-89777-8.00011-7
9. WHO. (2025, June 27). *Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and Response Agreement*. Retrieved from https://www.who.int
10. Xu, J., Dai, W., Effinger, B. P., & Zhang, G. (2024, October 15). Global Pandemic Governance: A Multilevel Concept for Managing Pandemic Crises Worldwide. *International Journal of disaster risk reduction, 113*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2024.104829