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We wish to thank both co-chairs and the Secretariat for convening this consultative process.

We see value in the HFA Monitor as a tool for monitoring the progress made at different levels in the implementation of the first framework. We also recognize the ongoing process aiming at its improvement and strengthening. Nonetheless, we strongly believe that every framework should be equipped with a clearly stated and robust mechanism of global monitoring and accountability, in order to evaluate and incentivize the fulfilment of commitments, to identify gaps in accountability, and to strengthen capacities where they are most needed.

In this line, we deem it compulsory that monitoring have its own separate section in the structure of the framework, in the understanding that said monitoring has to be performed on the entirety of the actions that precede it in the document. As such, we suggest that a new section be established, gathering what is consigned in articles 19.d and 19.e, and clarifying the role of UNISDR in further driving the development of the HFA Monitor and in supporting States in the monitoring and reviewing of their national processes as currently present in 26.g and 28.

Additionally in this proposed section for monitoring and accountability, there must be explicit reference of three minimal elements:

* + 1. Flexibility, in response to different national and regional contexts and priorities.
		2. Clarity in the allocation of responsibilities for the different stakeholders, as well as in the value each of these actors adds to the fulfilment of the goals.
		3. A guarantee that the outcomes of periodic monitoring lead to decision making on the specific gaps identified.

Furthermore, and within the boundaries of national capacities, it should prioritize the official figures and statistical information that the States collect as sources for data verification.

Finally, and acknowledging the great complexity in the nature of international accountability and the difficulties in conceiving a one-size-fits-all model for a global monitoring framework, we suggest to use a model based on mutual accountability or peer review, as mentioned in article 19.d in the current pre-zero draft.

Thank you.