SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IN MALAYSIAN LOCAL AUTHORITIES: THE ROLE OF ENFORCEMENT APPROACHES

RAMLAN, N. S. A.[1] – SAMSURIJAN, M. S.[1*] – RAZALI, N. S.[2] – ZAMRI, M. H.[2]

[1] *School of Social Science, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.*

[2] *Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Selangor, Malaysia.*

**Corresponding author*
e-mail: aimiramlan97[at]gmail.com

(Received 18th March 2026; revised 26th June 2026; accepted 28th July 2026)

Abstract. Local authorities play a pivotal role in environmental governance in Malaysia through their statutory powers under the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171). As the government institutions closest to local communities, they are responsible for environmental regulation, pollution prevention, public health, and sustainable urban management. However, environmental enforcement practices vary considerably among local authorities due to differences in administrative discretion, institutional capacity, and enforcement strategies. These inconsistencies reduce the effectiveness of environmental legislation and hinder sustainable environmental governance. This study examines how Malaysian local authorities operationalise environmental enforcement through the complementary governance approaches of conciliation and confrontation and analyses how these approaches support the environmental law principles of Prevention, Polluter Pays, and Precautionary. A qualitative document analysis was undertaken using thematic analysis supported by NVivo on three principal governance documents, with the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171) serving as the primary analytical framework. The findings indicate that conciliation promotes negotiation, administrative discretion, and voluntary compliance, whereas confrontation reinforces statutory enforcement through legal sanctions, prosecution, and cost recovery. Neither approach is effective in isolation; rather, sustainable environmental governance requires their balanced integration. The study recommends an integrated enforcement framework supported by clearer operational guidelines, stronger institutional capacity, and consistent enforcement practices to enhance regulatory effectiveness and long-term environmental sustainability.
Keywords: *environmental governance, local authorities, sustainability, environmental enforcement, Malaysia*

Introduction

Environmental governance is essential for achieving sustainable development through effective coordination among governmental institutions. Malaysia adopts a three-tier governmental system comprising the Federal Government, State Governments, and Local Authorities (Pihak Berkuasa Tempatan, PBT). As the third tier established under the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171), local authorities are responsible for environmental health, public sanitation, drainage, licensing, waste management, and enforcement of local by-laws (Ahmad Atory Hussain, 1991). Their responsibilities are further supported by the Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 172), which governs Structure Plans, Local Plans, and Special Area Plans, and the Solid Waste and Public Cleansing Management Act 2007 (Act 672), which regulates solid waste management and public cleansing. Collectively, these legislative instruments provide the legal framework for environmental governance and sustainable urban development at the local level.

Environmental governance in Malaysia also involves the Department of Environment (DOE), which administers the Environmental Quality Act 1974 (Act 127). Unlike the DOE, which regulates industrial pollution, environmental standards, licensing, and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), local authorities focus on municipal environmental management, planning control, sanitation, and community-level enforcement. Effective governance therefore depends on coordination between national and local institutions. Nevertheless, previous studies reported that local authorities continue to face financial constraints, shortages of skilled personnel, and inconsistent enforcement practices, limiting the effectiveness of environmental protection (Rasli et al., 2018; Jahi, 1993). Ariffin (2019) further observed a decline in environmental prosecutions despite continuing environmental offences. Environmental governance at the local authority level is further guided by the statutory development plan prepared under the Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 172). The development plan, comprising the Structure Plan, Local Plan, and Special Area Plan, provides the policy framework for land use planning, environmental protection, and sustainable development. Local authorities are required to ensure that planning approvals and development control decisions are consistent with these statutory plans, thereby integrating environmental considerations into urban planning and governance.

Although previous studies have examined environmental legislation and institutional challenges, limited research has analysed how enforcement approaches influence environmental governance within Malaysian local authorities. In particular, the interaction between conciliatory and confrontational enforcement approaches in implementing the principles of Prevention, Polluter Pays, and Precautionary under Act 171 remains insufficiently explored. Therefore, this study employs qualitative thematic analysis of governance documents using NVivo to examine how these complementary enforcement orientations contribute to sustainable environmental governance. The findings are expected to strengthen environmental enforcement strategies and support more effective, consistent, and sustainable governance among Malaysian local authorities.

Literature review

Recent studies have increasingly recognised environmental governance as a multidimensional process that requires effective collaboration among government institutions, regulatory frameworks, and local stakeholders to achieve sustainable development. The role of local governance in advancing sustainable development has long been recognised, particularly in relation to the challenges of translating sustainability objectives into local governance practices (Patterson and Theobald, 1999). Contemporary literature emphasises that local authorities play a central role in implementing environmental policies because they are directly responsible for planning control, public sanitation, waste management, environmental monitoring, and enforcement within their jurisdictions. Recent research further highlights that successful environmental governance depends not only on statutory authority but also on institutional capacity, inter-agency coordination, stakeholder participation, and consistent policy implementation. Emerging discussions also demonstrate that governance effectiveness is strengthened when local authorities integrate regulatory enforcement with long-term planning, policy compliance, and sustainable urban management rather than relying solely on legal sanctions.

Recent literature also indicates that environmental enforcement has gradually shifted from traditional punitive approaches towards more adaptive governance strategies that combine regulatory compliance with collaborative engagement. Studies published between 2021 and 2026 argue that negotiation, voluntary compliance, public participation, and inter-agency collaboration can improve regulatory effectiveness when supported by credible legal enforcement. Nevertheless, deterrence through prosecution, financial penalties, and statutory sanctions remains essential for addressing persistent environmental violations. Accordingly, scholars increasingly advocate balanced enforcement frameworks that integrate cooperative and coercive mechanisms to improve compliance while maintaining public trust and institutional legitimacy. Within the Malaysian context, recent systematic reviews similarly identify conciliation and confrontation as complementary enforcement orientations rather than competing regulatory approaches, particularly in environmental protection and river pollution governance.

Despite these advances, important research gaps remain within the Malaysian local government context. Existing studies primarily examine legislative provisions, institutional capacity, illegal waste management, or specific environmental programmes independently, while limited attention has been given to understanding how different enforcement orientations operationalise the environmental law principles of Prevention, Polluter Pays, and Precautionary within local authority governance. Furthermore, few studies systematically analyse how these principles are translated into practical enforcement under the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171) while considering the interaction between planning control, environmental management, and regulatory implementation. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by adopting a qualitative thematic analysis of governance documents to examine how conciliatory and confrontational enforcement approaches collectively contribute to sustainable environmental governance among Malaysian local authorities.

Materials and Methods

This study adopted a qualitative research design using document analysis to examine environmental governance and enforcement approaches within Malaysian local authorities. Qualitative document analysis is appropriate for exploring legal provisions, policy frameworks, and institutional governance because it enables researchers to interpret the meanings, relationships, and governance principles embedded within official documents rather than measuring numerical trends (Braun and Clarke, 2021; Creswell and Creswell, 2021). The approach was selected because the study aimed to understand how environmental enforcement is conceptualised and operationalised through statutory and governance frameworks that guide local authority practices.

The study analysed three principal governance documents that collectively regulate environmental governance at the local level in Malaysia: (i) the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171), which provides statutory powers for local authority administration and enforcement; (ii) the Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 172), which establishes the legal framework for development planning, land use control, and sustainable urban development; and (iii) the Solid Waste and Public Cleansing Management Act 2007 (Act 672), which governs solid waste management and public cleansing services in designated states. These documents were purposively selected because they directly define the legal responsibilities, planning functions, and environmental enforcement

powers of Malaysian local authorities. Relevant statutory provisions relating to environmental governance, enforcement mechanisms, planning control, and sustainability were identified and extracted for analysis.

The extracted documents were analysed using thematic analysis supported by NVivo software (Woolf and Silver, 2018). The analysis followed the six-phase framework proposed by Braun and Clarke (2021), including familiarisation with the documents, initial coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition, and report preparation. Codes were developed inductively and refined through constant comparison to identify recurring governance patterns associated with conciliatory and confrontational enforcement approaches, together with the environmental law principles of Prevention, Polluter Pays, and Precautionary. To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, coding procedures were applied consistently throughout the analysis, and interpretations were continuously compared across all statutory documents to ensure analytical rigour, transparency, and credibility.

Results and Discussion

On conciliation and confrontation

The thematic classification of environmental enforcement approaches identified through the qualitative analysis of the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171). Two dominant governance orientations emerged from the document analysis, namely conciliation and confrontation. Rather than representing opposing enforcement philosophies, both approaches function as complementary regulatory mechanisms that enable local authorities to respond proportionately according to the nature and severity of environmental issues. The conciliation approach emphasises administrative discretion, negotiation, consideration and collaborative relationships between local authorities and regulated parties. These characteristics are reflected in Sections 63, 72, 76 and 102, which empower local authorities to regulate public places, maintain environmental health, implement preventive measures and develop by-laws that promote voluntary compliance before punitive action becomes necessary. This governance orientation encourages early intervention, stakeholder cooperation and environmental awareness while reducing unnecessary legal disputes.

Conversely, the confrontation approach reflects the formal legal authority of local authorities to address environmental violations through statutory enforcement. Sections 69, 70 and 71 provide legal mechanisms to deal with river pollution, commercial waste and the recovery of remediation costs, while Sections 147–151 strengthen enforcement through legal recovery procedures and sanctions. These provisions ensure that environmental offenders remain accountable for their actions and reinforce the deterrent function of environmental regulation. Consequently, the findings indicate that effective environmental governance under Act 171 requires an appropriate balance between cooperative engagement and legal enforcement to achieve sustainable environmental management.

Governance implications of the enforcement approaches

Table 1 demonstrates that the two enforcement approaches identified in this study contribute differently, yet complementarily, to environmental governance. The conciliation approach primarily supports preventive governance by encouraging

administrative discretion, stakeholder engagement, negotiated compliance and voluntary environmental responsibility. Through Sections 63, 72, 76 and 102 of the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171), local authorities are empowered to regulate public places, maintain environmental health, eliminate environmental nuisances and introduce by-laws that prevent environmental degradation before formal legal intervention becomes necessary. These preventive measures strengthen public awareness, encourage community participation and promote long-term environmental stewardship while reducing enforcement costs. Conversely, the confrontation approach strengthens institutional authority by ensuring that environmental violations are addressed through legal enforcement mechanisms. Sections 69, 70 and 71 provide statutory powers to regulate river pollution, commercial waste disposal and the recovery of remediation costs, while Sections 147 to 151 reinforce legal accountability through recovery procedures, enforcement actions and statutory sanctions. These provisions operationalise the Polluter Pays Principle by ensuring that environmental offenders bear responsibility for remediation rather than transferring environmental costs to society. Consequently, confrontation enhances regulatory credibility, deters repeated offences and reinforces public confidence in environmental governance.

***Table 1**. Governance implications of conciliation and confrontation approaches under the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171).*

Enforcement Approach	Relevant Provisions of Act 171	Governance Implication	Sustainability Contribution	Practical Outcome
Conciliation	Sections 63, 72, 76 & 102	Promotes cooperative governance, administrative discretion, stakeholder engagement and voluntary compliance through preventive measures and negotiated solutions.	Strengthens environmental awareness, community participation, public trust and long-term behavioural change by preventing environmental degradation before it escalates.	Higher voluntary compliance, reduced enforcement costs, stronger community-government collaboration and improved environmental stewardship.
Confrontation	Sections 69, 70, 71 & 147–151	Reinforces statutory authority through legal enforcement, penalties, cost recovery, prosecution and institutional accountability against environmental offenders.	Enhances deterrence, protects ecological resources, ensures polluters bear environmental costs and strengthens public confidence in regulatory institutions.	-

The findings further indicate that sustainable environmental governance cannot rely exclusively on either conciliation or confrontation. Conciliation is effective in promoting voluntary compliance and collaborative environmental management, whereas confrontation is essential for maintaining regulatory legitimacy when preventive measures fail. Therefore, the integration of both approaches enables local authorities to balance flexibility with legal certainty, thereby strengthening institutional effectiveness and supporting sustainable environmental governance in accordance with the objectives of Act 171. *Table 2* demonstrates that the three internationally recognised environmental sustainability principles are embedded within different provisions of the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171), collectively forming an integrated framework for environmental governance. The Prevention Principle is reflected through Sections 63, 72, 76 and 81, which authorise local authorities to regulate public places, eliminate nuisances, maintain environmental health and undertake immediate corrective measures where necessary. These provisions prioritise preventive intervention by encouraging

early action before environmental harm escalates into more serious public health or ecological problems.

***Table 3**. Relationship between the Local Government Act 1976 (Act 171) and the three environmental sustainability principles.*

Sustainability Principle	Relevant Provision of Act 171	Description of the Provision	Governance Analysis	Sustainability Implication
Prevention Principle	Sections 63, 72, 76 & 81	These provisions empower local authorities to regulate public places, protect environmental health, eliminate nuisances, control unsanitary conditions, and undertake immediate actions where environmental risks threaten public safety.	The provisions emphasise preventive intervention through inspection, notices, monitoring, nuisance control and corrective actions before environmental damage becomes irreversible. Confrontational enforcement is applied only where voluntary compliance fails.	Reduces environmental degradation, protects public health, promotes early intervention and supports sustainable environmental management.
Polluter Pays Principle	Sections 69, 70 & 71	These provisions establish offences relating to river pollution and commercial waste disposal while authorising local authorities to recover the costs of remedial works from responsible parties.	Environmental liabilities are transferred to polluters through financial penalties and cost recovery, ensuring that environmental restoration costs are not borne by the public.	Strengthens accountability, reinforces deterrence and promotes responsible environmental behaviour.
Precautionary Principle	Section 102	Section 102 grants local authorities the general authority to make by-laws necessary for protecting public health, public safety and environmental well-being within their jurisdictions.	The broad by-law making power enables local authorities to regulate emerging environmental risks proactively even before significant environmental damage occurs, thereby supporting adaptive environmental governance.	-

The Polluter Pays Principle is operationalised through Sections 69, 70 and 71, which establish offences relating to river pollution and commercial waste while empowering local authorities to recover remediation costs from responsible parties. These provisions ensure that polluters remain financially accountable for environmental damage, thereby strengthening regulatory deterrence and protecting public resources from bearing environmental restoration costs. In contrast, the Precautionary Principle is primarily reflected in Section 102, which empowers local authorities to formulate by-laws that safeguard public health, safety and environmental quality. This broad legislative authority enables local authorities to respond proactively to emerging environmental risks, even where scientific certainty may be limited. Overall, the findings indicate that the three sustainability principles should not be interpreted independently but rather as complementary governance mechanisms. Prevention reduces the likelihood of environmental degradation, the Polluter Pays Principle ensures accountability when violations occur, and the Precautionary Principle enables local authorities to anticipate future environmental risks through proactive regulation. Collectively, these principles strengthen institutional effectiveness, improve regulatory consistency and support sustainable environmental governance within the Malaysian local government system.

Conclusion

The legislation is not the problem. Act 171 already contains everything Malaysian local authorities need: the Prevention Principle across Sections 63, 72, 76, and 81; Polluter Pays cost recovery under Sections 69 to 71; precautionary by-law authority in Section 102; and compound and civil action powers in Sections 147 to 151. The integrated enforcement architecture is already there, written into the Act. The problem is that the architecture is not being used as designed. Conciliation dominates by default not always by principled governance choice, but because prosecution is resource-intensive, courts are slow, and training for confrontation-oriented enforcement has not kept pace with demand. Ariffin (2019) documented the drift. Jahi (1993) predicted it thirty years earlier. The gap between what Act 171 permits and what councils actually do remains one of the most consistent findings in the Malaysian local government literature. Conciliation should be the first response. It builds trust, produces voluntary compliance, and lowers the cost of governance over time. But it has to be backed by credible confrontation when good faith fails particularly for deliberate or repeat violations where Pidgorodynska (2022) and Raff and Earnhart (2018) both show deterrence matters most. An enforcement culture that is conciliatory all the way down eventually stops being credible. This study contributes a synthesis of enforcement orientation and sustainability governance in the Malaysian local authority context. Theoretically, it maps two approaches against three principles in a framework that has not been assembled before. Practically, it provides a basis for enforcement guidelines, officer training programmes, and legislative instruments that give councils genuine direction on when to negotiate and when to escalate without requiring any changes to Act 171 itself. The tools are already there. What has been missing is the institutional commitment to use them.

Acknowledgement

This research is self-funded.

Conflict of interest

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest involve with any parties in this research study.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmad Atory Hussain (1991): Pengantar pentadbiran awam: Paradigma baru. – Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur 198p.
[2] Ariffin, M.F. (2019): Prosecution decline in Malaysian environmental enforcement: Trends and institutional explanations. – Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 120p.
[3] Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2021): Thematic analysis: A practical guide. – SAGE Publications, London 376p.
[4] Creswell, J.W., Creswell, J.D. (2021): Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. – SAGE Publications, California 304p.
[5] Jahi, J.M. (1993): Environmental management in Malaysia: Its problems and prospects. – Borneo Review 4(1): 1-14.
[6] Patterson, A., Theobald, K. (1999): Emerging contradictions: Sustainable development and the new local governance. – In S. Buckingham-Hatfield & S. Percy (Eds.),

Constructing Local Environmental Agendas: People, Places and Participation, Routledge 12p.

[7] Pidgorodynska, A. (2022): Confrontational compliance mechanisms in international environmental treaty regimes. – Journal of Environmental Law 34(1): 95-121.

[8] Raff, A., Earnhart, D. (2018): The interaction between cooperative and confrontational enforcement in wastewater regulation. – Journal of Regulatory Economics 54(1): 24-50.

[9] Rasli, M.R., Abdul Manaf, H., Ismail, M. (2018): Lessons from Malaysian local government: Does resource management matter in enforcement actions? – The Journal of Social Sciences Research Special Issue 6: 477-487.

[10] Woolf, N.H., Silver, C. (2018): Qualitative analysis using NVivo: The five-level QDA method. – Routledge, New York 234p.