

**INTERVENTION OF THE MEXICAN DELEGATION IN THE OPEN-ENDED
INFORMAL CONSULTATIVE MEETING TOWARDS THE POST 2015 FRAMEWORK
FOR DISASTER RISK REDUCTION**

Geneva, September 5th, 2014

Excellencies, dear colleagues,
Good morning,

We would like to thank the co-chairs for the presentation of the pre-zero draft of the post 2015 framework for disaster risk reduction that constitutes the basis for the open-ended informal consultative meetings.

For Mexico is imperative to inspire the new framework from the pragmatic approach of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Considering the progress and challenges of countries in disaster risk management, it is important to maintain alive HFA1 while guaranteeing an effective transition towards the HFA2. There are still many things that countries need to do to fulfill the objectives and spirit of HFA.

The new framework should focus on the challenges that we did not foresee ten years ago and as well on the pending issues. We should not qualify HFA1 as a failure but rather a successful initiative that set the basis for better facing current and future defies towards development.

The HFA1 showed us how to address policy and structural challenges in disaster risk management through corrective actions. That is the reason why HFA2 approach must be essentially preventive. One of the lessons learnt was how to develop legal and institutional frameworks to provide national governments with the tools to address DRR. After this decade and the reviews of the implementation of the HFA1 we have to move forward to a development-oriented perspective.

From our own analysis, what we want from HFA2 is:

- To reiterate the general principles of HFA1. In this context, we have to recall the fundamental principle of the primary role of the State in the drafting, implementing and assessing policies, frameworks and actions in DRR at the national and local levels.

- To focus on those issues where HFA1 was not able to fully achieve its goals, particularly the underlying causes of disasters (climate change adaptation and mitigation, environmental protection, sustainable development). Therefore, HFA2 has to become a reference to the global processes currently taking place such as sustainable development goals, climate change and the World Humanitarian Summit.
- To ensure the multi-stakeholder approach in DRR, due to the contributions of the different sectors involved, but also looking forward to generating commitments in support of the implementation of public policies in this matter.
- To improve and profit from public-private partnerships. We have seen and proved that the private sector is a key actor on DRR. PPPs can help substantially in planning and developing projects with a risk reduction vision, strengthening business and contributing to economic dynamism.
- DRR policies and frameworks, both national and global, should be achieved with proper financial mechanisms, providing decision making in public investments with a disaster risk-based approach, in line with the social and economic development we desire.
- With regard to the means of implementation they should be general and flexible, given its progressive nature, incorporating qualitative approaches in the monitoring/assessing tools. Peer-to-peer review mechanisms could be helpful to achieve this goal.
- To reiterate the value of international and regional cooperation in the field of DRR by reinforcing good practices exchange and mainstreaming DRR in regional and global initiatives and also promoting triangular and south-south cooperation.

Regarding the structure of the new framework:

- We would like to have a document in which we could see reflected some of the core elements of the HFA1, in order to guide the spirit of the new framework, avoiding duplications and reinterpretations of what has been done in the past, but rather to take into account the added value that the HFA2 could have.
- The preamble should emphasize the transition to HFA2, the links to other global processes as well as the economic approach in risk management.
- We do believe that we need a scope which frames what we want to achieve with the new framework followed by principles that provide a proper basis to the endeavor of HFA2.
- We all know that the way to fulfill the principles is to have clear goals. We think that it would be desirable to have a clear vision on establishing goals as it has

- been put forward in the pre-zero draft. In our perspective outcomes should be addressed at a later stage once goals, scope and priorities are clearly identified.
- For us HFA2 cannot set parallel tracks of understanding the management of disaster risk nationally and internationally. We should start from the same basis: national and international means for implementing HFA2 should complement and feedback each other.
 - We are supportive of the importance to provide spaces and promote commitments to relevant stakeholders. However, the document should reflect practical mechanisms to generate strategic partnerships from the beginning in order to contribute to the implementation of the HFA2 and the achievement of its goals.
 - The language and drafting of the HFA2 has to be clear, concise and action-oriented as it was mandated by the General Assembly.

Comments on parts A and B:

- We appreciate the references and lessons learnt from HFA1 in the preamble. However, it is desirable to acknowledge those progresses and the identification of new challenges, considering the changing and evolving environment in the field of disasters.
- After the review of the HFA1, it is clear that underlying risk factors and resilience is a key element to understand and take action for the future in terms of DRR. We would actually like to see those factors referred in the preamble, as the starting point for addressing the new framework.
- We are very interested to have more clarity on the purpose and scope. One of the elements for the success of the HFA1 was the neat perception on the dimensions of the work ahead. It is important to conceive a framework with the same levels of understanding on the purpose, scope, outcome and global target.
- We also would appreciate clarification on the rationale behind keeping HFA1's expected outcome. If we want to really provide a preventive framework and incorporate DRR as a key element for development, we should reflect those aspirations in the outcome. In our understanding, the provided "strategic and mutually-reinforcing goals" give us better perspectives to really generate new insight to address DRR needs in the future.
- We certainly agree on the importance of the essence of the five global targets. Reduce both disaster mortality and number of affected people and increase the number of countries with national and local strategies are essentially the objectives of DRR and a paramount element of the HFA1; while reducing disaster economic loss and damage to health and educational facilities reinforce

the upgrade of the HFA in addressing future challenges with a development approach. However, their achievement have to be supported by monitoring tools, scientific research and assessment, and the commitment of the international community to follow up.

We thank again both co-chairs and the ISDR Secretariat for the huge efforts to produce this draft. You have all our support. We are always ready and willing to collaborate and take part in this collective effort.

Thank you.