Sapiens Law and Justice

Sapiens Law and Justice. 2026;3.5. 003
ISNN: 3091-1656
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71068/SLJ00012

Article: Review

# Protection of human rights in disasters associated with natural hazards: state duties of prevention

# Protección de los derechos humanos ante desastres asociados a amenazas naturales: obligaciones estatales de prevención

[1]Nestor Uriostegui Díaz, [2]Victor Josue Rivera Bravo, [3]José Armando Castillo Montufar.

[1]Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero (AUAGro.), Guerrero, Mexico
[2]Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero (AUAGro.), Guerrero, Mexico
[3]Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero (AUAGro.), Guerrero, Mexico

***Corresponding author:** Nestor Uriostegui Díaz

**Submitted:** 08-19-2026 **Revised:** 08-30-2026 **Accepted:** 09-19-2026 **Published:** 10-21-2026

**How to cite:**

Uriostegui Díaz, N., Rivera Bravo, V. J., & Castillo Montufar, J. A. (2026). Protection of human rights in the face of disasters associated with natural hazards: state obligations of prevention. *Sapiens Law and Justice*, *3*(5), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.71068/SLJ00012

## ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Disasters associated with natural hazards threaten fundamental rights when exposure, social inequality, and weaknesses in institutional prevention converge.
**Objective:** To examine the legal duties of prevention incumbent upon public authorities and their relationship with human rights protection, focusing on Mexico and comparing selected international experiences.
**Method:** A qualitative, legal-documentary, and comparative review examined constitutional and civil protection rules, international instruments, decisions of human rights bodies, and technical reports on documented events. The analysis applied the categories of foreseeability, due diligence, information and warning, differentiated protection, and accountability.
**Results:** Mexico's Constitution and civil protection legislation provide enforceable grounds for identifying and managing risks, while the Sendai Framework guides public policy priorities. The comparison of events in Mexico, the United States, and Libya, together with international decisions concerning Australia and Russia, shows that attributing responsibility requires examining specific circumstances and does not follow automatically from the scale of damage. In Mexico, CENAPRED estimated losses of 88.91 billion Mexican pesos in 2023, equivalent to 0.3% of GDP.
**Conclusions:** Legal protection requires assessment of prior knowledge of the hazard, the authority's competence, the reasonable measures available, and their foreseeable consequences, with particular attention to groups in situations of vulnerability.

**Keywords:** human rights; disaster risk reduction; civil protection; state obligations; prevention

## RESUMEN

**Introducción:** Los desastres asociados a amenazas naturales ponen en riesgo el ejercicio de derechos fundamentales cuando concurren exposición, desigualdad social y deficiencias institucionales de prevención.
**Objetivo:** Examinar las obligaciones jurídicas de prevención que corresponden a las autoridades y su relación con la protección de los derechos humanos, tomando a México como ámbito principal y contrastando experiencias internacionales seleccionadas.
**Metodología:** Se realizó una revisión cualitativa jurídico-documental y comparativa de normas constitucionales

©2026 by the Authors. This article is open access and distributed under the terms and conditions under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. (CC BY 4.0) https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

y de protección civil, instrumentos internacionales, decisiones de órganos de derechos humanos e informes técnicos sobre acontecimientos documentados. El análisis utilizó las categorías de previsibilidad, diligencia debida, información y alerta, protección diferenciada y rendición de cuentas.
**Resultados:** La Constitución mexicana y la legislación de protección civil ofrecen fundamentos exigibles para identificar y gestionar riesgos, mientras el Marco de Sendai orienta prioridades de política pública. La comparación de acontecimientos en México, Estados Unidos y Libia, junto con decisiones internacionales relativas a Australia y Rusia, muestra que la atribución de responsabilidad exige comprobar circunstancias concretas y no se deriva automáticamente de la magnitud del daño. En México, CENAPRED estimó para 2023 pérdidas por 88.910 millones de pesos, equivalentes al 0,3 % del PIB.
**Conclusiones:** La protección jurídica requiere evaluar el conocimiento previo del peligro, la competencia de la autoridad, las medidas razonables disponibles y sus efectos previsibles, con especial atención a grupos en situación de vulnerabilidad.

**Palabras clave:** derechos humanos; reducción del riesgo de desastres; protección civil; obligaciones estatales; prevención

## INTRODUCTION

The protection of human rights from disasters requires examining the circumstances in which a natural hazard becomes a serious disruption of collective life. Risk reduction is not the same as preventing the occurrence of earthquakes, rains or cyclones; it includes prevention decisions that can reduce exposure and foreseeable consequences. According to the terminology of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, disaster arises from the interaction between hazards, exposure, vulnerability and response capacity (1). At the legal level, this relationship raises a precise question: under what conditions the lack of a preventive measure can constitute a breach of a State duty to protect life, health, housing and other rights.

Social research has questioned interpretations of disasters as purely natural consequences. The work of Wisner et al. identifies social processes that generate unsafe conditions and place certain groups in greater danger (2). Bankoff historically situates discourses of vulnerability, resilience, and adaptation, and warns that these categories are not exempt from political decisions about who bears the damage (3). Gaillard stresses the need to examine the relationships between knowledge, power, and community practices when studying disasters (4). These approaches coincide in recognizing the social construction of risk, but differ in emphasis: one privileges structural causes, another genealogies of concepts, and another the production and application of knowledge. Their legal utility depends on identifying concrete obligations, not just general inequalities.

In Mexico, Article 1 of the Constitution establishes duties to promote, respect, protect and guarantee human rights, as well as to prevent, investigate, punish and remedy their violations under the terms of the law. Article 4 recognizes, among others, the right to health protection and a healthy environment (5). The General Law on Civil Protection distributes competences and defines phases of comprehensive risk management; Articles 7, 10 and 19 are particularly relevant for examining coordination, prevention, surveillance and public information (6). The existence of these rules does not in itself demonstrate a failure to comply with any loss: in order to assess an omission, the competence of each authority, the knowledge of the risk and the reasonable measures it could adopt must be determined.

https://doi.org/10.71068/SLJ00012

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 sets out priorities for understanding risk, governance, preventive investment, and preparedness to respond and build back better (7). Its programmatic nature distinguishes it from the enforceable duties derived from domestic law and human rights treaties. The legal literature and international decisions allow for the formulation of additional criteria: prior knowledge or predictability, exposure of an identifiable group, real possibility of public action, and adequacy of the measures adopted. Therefore, a legal-documentary analysis must relate normative provisions, technical information, and concrete actions. International comparison is useful when examining similar functions, such as warning, evacuation, maintenance of critical infrastructure, or protection of people with specific needs.

The central problem of this review is the distance between the general formulation of civil protection policies and the determination of when insufficient prevention can legally compromise the State. The gap identified does not consist in ignoring social vulnerability, which has been widely documented, but in articulating it with verifiable criteria of due diligence and legal attribution. The general objective is to analyze the State's obligations to prevent disasters associated with natural hazards and their link with the protection of human rights, with emphasis on the Mexican framework and a contrast of international experiences. A legal synthesis of five categories is proposed: predictability, competence, reasonable prevention, differentiated protection, and accountability. This delimitation avoids confusing an adverse result with a violation automatically attributable to the authorities.

## THEORETICAL AND LEGAL FOUNDATION

### Threat, Exposure, and Structural Vulnerability

Disaster risk must be studied as a result of interactions between hazards, exposed people, and resources available to deal with damage. Vulnerability is not a fixed condition that accompanies certain groups by nature. It can increase due to territorial segregation, unsafe housing, mobility barriers, unequal access to information or health services, and lack of participation in urban planning decisions. The structural causes of vulnerability approach (2) explains why households subjected to the same threat can suffer radically different consequences. Bankoff's historical view (3) adds that public policies and technical discourses can make entrenched inequalities invisible. Translating both perspectives into a discussion of rights requires examining whether the authorities knew or could reasonably have known about these factors and whether they had mechanisms to reduce them.

Risk management must consider those who face specific barriers during alerts, evacuations, and recovery. These may include people with disabilities, older adults, children, rural communities, indigenous groups, or families without their own transportation. However, the category of vulnerable group is not a substitute for assessing their specific needs; local capacities and community networks are also part of the response. The critique of external and top-down approaches developed in disaster studies (4) makes it possible to question programs that produce maps without social participation or issue warnings without checking their understanding. Legal relevance arises when the omission of reasonable accommodations, discrimination, or the inequitable distribution of resources can be related to specific duties of equality, information, and protection.

https://doi.org/10.71068/SLJ00012

**Enforceable prevention and due diligence obligations**

The Mexican Constitution configures a framework of protection that links the general duty to respect and guarantee rights with precise administrative powers (5). The General Law on Civil Protection is not limited to the subsequent response: Article 10 incorporates knowledge of the risk, identification, forecasting, prevention, mitigation, and preparedness within comprehensive management. Article 19 attributes to the national coordination functions related to systems for warning, information, and updating of risk atlases, while Articles 83 to 87 relate these instruments to settlements and mitigation measures (6). These provisions help to formulate verifiable questions: what risk was mapped, what authority should act, what budget or power it had, and what information it provided to the population. The response must be constructed on a case-by-case basis and not presumed on the basis of the damage that occurred.

The General Law of Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection incorporates principles of prevention, responsibility, and ecological management that can contribute to reducing environmental risks associated with land use and ecosystem deterioration (8). However, it is convenient to separate three regulatory levels: constitutional rights and conventional obligations, specific administrative duties, and public policy commitments. Not all management goals by themselves produce an enforceable legal action, nor does every administrative action equate to sufficient protection. The diligence assessment requires identifying the type of threat, the competencies distributed among levels of government, the information available at the time of decision, and the reasonableness of the measures adopted. The lack of an optimal policy does not automatically prove a violation of rights.

The international dimension makes it possible to clarify these criteria. The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in Budayeva and Others v. Russia linked positive obligations to protect life with identifiable natural hazards, advance warnings and mitigation measures that could be within the reach of the State (9). In Daniel Billy et al. v. Australia, the Human Rights Committee examined the lack of adequate adaptation measures in the face of the impact on the privacy, home and culture of Torres Strait Islanders (10). The two cases differ in fact and legal basis, but illustrate that responsibility requires an analysis of risk knowledge, specific rights and State action. Neither of these decisions makes every disaster an automatic legal breach.

The Human Rights Committee's General Comment 36 on the right to life provides an additional reference for positive obligations in the face of foreseeable threats, including environmental conditions that may endanger the survival of people (11). This approach does not eliminate the requirements of attribution: a duty to protect must be interpreted in the light of known conditions and real possibilities for intervention. International, administrative or patrimonial liability may require different evidence and standards depending on the forum, so it is inaccurate to equate them. For the analysis of civil protection, it is interesting to construct a documentary trail that identifies sources of risk, existing warnings, official decisions and available measures. This sequence makes it possible to differentiate inaction, insufficient response and consequences that would have been difficult to prevent even through diligent action.

### Risk management commitments and early warning systems

The Sendai Framework (7) guides the design of preventive policies through objectives and indicators, but it must be distinguished from norms that attribute enforceable duties to an authority. Its usefulness for legal analysis lies in pointing out functions that can be examined: understanding risk, coordinating institutions, investing in resilience, and preparing timely responses. The World Meteorological Organization describes four interdependent components of early warning: risk awareness, monitoring and forecasting, dissemination of warnings, and community response capacity (12). A siren or message alone is not an effective system. The information must be understandable, accessible, timely, and accompanied by possible courses of action, particularly when there are language barriers, disability, geographic isolation, or lack of means of transportation.

From a rights perspective, the design of alerts requires considering who actually receives the messages and whether they can act on them. A technologically correct notification could be insufficient for a person who lacks connectivity or does not have the means to evacuate. The legal assessment must therefore connect technical criteria with the equality and differentiated protection provided for in the applicable law. A distinction must also be made between an uncertain scientific prediction and specific warnings that allow a relevant danger to be recognized. The level of preventive obligation is not identical for remote risks, periodic threats and imminent dangers warned in a specific way. This distinction helps to assess due diligence without imposing an impossible obligation to guarantee total absence of damage.

### Comparative experiences and common criteria

International contrast requires studying documented cases under the same categories, even if the sources and legal frameworks are not uniform. In the United States, the Government Accountability Office examined evacuation difficulties for hospital patients, nursing home residents, and people without means of transportation after Katrina, highlighting specific planning needs (13). In Libya, journalistic investigations documented warnings about dam maintenance before the Derna floods of September 2023, but public information alone does not constitute a sentence that determines individual responsibilities (14). These examples are compared with legal decisions on Australia and Russia (8,9) and with information on Mexico. The common criterion is not the intensity of the event, but the existence of identifiable risks, institutional duties, and protection mechanisms.

## METHOD

### Legal-documentary design and scope

A qualitative, legal, and documentary review was developed, with a descriptive-analytical scope and a comparative component. The object of examination was the obligations of prevention in the face of natural hazards that can lead to disasters and affect human rights. Mexico constituted the main normative reference, complemented by international decisions and cases from different contexts. Constitutional texts, civil and environmental protection legislation, United Nations instruments, resolutions of human rights bodies, technical documentation of public bodies, and academic studies

on vulnerability and risk management were used. The unit of analysis was the documented relationship between a risk, an institutional competence, and public protection measures. This approach does not seek to estimate statistical causality or attribute criminal responsibilities to specific persons.

### Source selection and delimitation

The documentary selection was guided by relevance with respect to three questions: what preventive duties are recognized, what actions allow their compliance to be assessed, and what differences are shown in the selected cases. Priority was given to primary regulatory sources, decisions of competent bodies, and technical reports with identification of the author, date, and geographical scope; academic studies were used to interpret vulnerability and diligence. Comparative examples included Hurricane Otis in 2023 and Hurricane John in 2024 in Mexico, Katrina in 2005 in the United States, the 2023 Derna floods in Libya, and two international disputes involving Russia and Australia. A previous number of publications was not set as a saturation criterion, nor was the procedure characterized as a systematic review. Figures without identifiable origin and narratives that did not provide comparable elements were excluded as comparative examples.

The period of the events examined encompassed historical cases that serve as precedents and recent events in 2023 and 2024 relevant to Mexico. The normative consultation was located on the current legislation considered during the review, with special attention to constitutional and civil protection provisions. International events were selected for the availability of a legal decision or sufficiently identifiable documentation on prevention, warning, evacuation, or maintenance of infrastructure. Journalistic sources and technical documents were not interpreted as if they were judicial resolutions. Temporal and jurisdictional diversity limits comparisons of economic results or deaths; therefore, mainly state functions and legal criteria were compared, without constructing a common quantitative indicator of responsibility.

### Categories of interpretation and comparison

The content was organized into five categories: foreseeability of risk, legal duty and competent authority, reasonably possible preventive actions, protection of exposed persons, and accountability mechanisms. In each source, it was examined whether there were prior warnings, public information, preventive attributions, measures adopted, and relevant consequences for rights. The comparison distinguished evidence of facts, technical evaluations, and express legal determinations. In cases without a judicial decision, documented problems were identified, but a definitive legal breach was not declared proven. The synthesis was constructed by convergence and contrast of these categories and presented in a brief matrix. This procedure allows linking the research objective with the results and reduces the repetition of material accounts lacking legal interpretation.

## RESULTS

### Duties of prevention identified in the Mexican framework

An examination of the Mexican framework made it possible to identify three complementary levels of protection. First, Articles 1 and 4 of the Constitution provide the general basis for assessing the

protection of life, health, and the environment, without dispensing with the analysis of the rights specifically affected (5). Second, the General Law on Civil Protection articulates operational mechanisms for risk assessment, coordination, information, and prevention; Articles 7, 10, 19, 83, 86, and 87 of the Constitution are particularly relevant for reviewing decisions prior to the event (6). Third, environmental legislation provides management and prevention instruments that can reduce exposure factors (8). The relationship between these levels makes it possible to formulate specific duties according to institutional competence, rather than automatically attributing every consequence of a disaster to any authority.

The obligation to prevent has a material and a procedural content. The first refers to measures such as examining risk, maintaining critical infrastructure, planning evacuations, and reducing exposure of settlements. The second includes generating and communicating information, substantiating decisions, coordinating entities, and offering avenues for evaluation and accountability. None of these functions can be abstractly qualified as sufficient or insufficient without identifying a specific hazard and period. The normative texts do allow us to conclude that prevention occupies a proper place within comprehensive risk management, and does not constitute an optional activity subordinated exclusively to subsequent assistance. This finding is legal and documentary; it does not imply that all Mexican authorities have failed to comply with their powers.

**Mexican evidence: chronology and scope of the figures**

In Mexico, the report of the National Center for Disaster Prevention for 2023 quantified damages and losses associated with disasters at 88,910 million pesos, equivalent to 0.3% of the gross domestic product of that year (15). This figure expressly refers to 2023 and should not be described as a proportion that is repeated annually. The technical documentation identifies Hurricane Otis among the main events of the period; the National Hurricane Center places its impact in Acapulco on October 25, 2023 as a category 5 cyclone (16). The economic damage evidences the relevance of the exposure, but it does not allow us to identify by itself a lack of diligence attributable to a specific authority. To do this, it would be necessary to relate warnings, decisions, capacities, and chronology of each preventive measure.

Hurricane John corresponds to September 2024, not to the first months of that year or to the sequence of phenomena in 2023. The National Water Commission reported on September 23, 2024 on its intensification and the forecasts of extraordinary rainfall for Guerrero and Oaxaca (17). The temporal delimitation matters because the aggregate economic figures for 2023 do not include that 2024 event. In legal terms, forecast bulletins can be used to examine the technical information available at a given time, but they must relate to the response capacity, the recipients of the warning, and subsequent decisions. The existence of a bulletin is not sufficient to establish, by itself, that all exposed persons had effective protection.

**Comparative findings on risk awareness and protection**

International decisions provide more directly legal elements than general damage figures. In Budayeva et al. v. Russia, the examination of the known risk of mudslides, the previous warnings and the operation of protection measures made it possible to discuss positive obligations linked to the

right to life (9). The communication Daniel Billy et al. v. Australia addressed effects related to the inadequacy of adaptation actions in the face of risks to the home and cultural continuity of indigenous island communities (10). Both files illustrate different legal paths: one focused on a localized and imminent danger and the other on threats of progressive development. The common feature is the evaluation of State actions based on concrete information and individualized rights.

The U.S. institutional assessment of Katrina documented particular difficulties in evacuating hospitals, nursing homes, and people without transportation, showing that a general plan may omit specific needs of exposed groups (13). In Derna, journalistic documentation pointed to historical warnings and dam maintenance problems prior to the September 2023 floods (14). These materials allow for the identification of questions about planning, infrastructure, and responsiveness, but they present an evidentiary scope different from that of a legal ruling. For this reason, the comparative matrix separates documented facts from their analytical implications. The findings of an auditing institution, a journalistic investigation, and the determinations of international human rights bodies are not considered equivalent.

**Table 1**. Legal-documentary comparison of risks, duties and sources

| Case | Danger and evidence | Duty or dimension reviewed | Scope of the source |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mexico, Otis (2023) | Cyclone and documented losses | Alert, exposure, coordination and prevention | Technical report; does not automatically attribute responsibility |
| United States, Katrina (2005) | Evacuation problems | Differentiated protection and planning | GAO Public Evaluation |
| Russia, Budayeva (2008) | Recurrent and warned avalanches | Positive protection of the right to life | Judgment of the European Court |
| Australia, Billy (2022) | Long-term environmental risks | Adaptation, family life and culture | Views of the Human Rights Committee |
| Libya, Derna (2023) | Dam Break Damage and Warnings | Maintenance and prevention | Journalistic investigation; not sentence |

Note. Comparative synthesis of sources cited. Authors' elaboration.

The comparison reveals that the predictability of risk is not always expressed in the same way. In Russia, specific warnings about a recurrent threat were examined; in Australia, effects linked to ongoing environmental processes; in the United States, planning to evacuate groups with differentiated needs. Libya provides documentary evidence on the maintenance of critical infrastructure, while Mexico provides a defined regulatory framework and recent events with an identifiable technical chronology. The difference between these scenarios prevents a uniform legal conclusion, but allows cross-cutting criteria to be recognized: information on the hazard, competence of the institutions, preventive measures within their reach, and consequences on specific rights. This is the main finding of the comparison, rather than the enumeration of losses or deaths.

### Synthesis of findings and attribution limits

The documentary analysis made it possible to distinguish three situations that require different treatments. The first is socially unequal exposure to danger, which requires differentiated preventive and protection policies, but does not immediately prove an infraction. The second is the existence of specific public obligations, the execution of which can be documented through maps, alerts, plans, and maintenance records. The third is possible legal liability for omission, which requires examining the foreseeability of the damage, the applicable duty, the reasonably required action, and the relevant relationship between the omission and the affected right. Mexican information and foreign cases confirm that these situations can be related, but should not be confused. The assessment of liability corresponds to competent procedures and authorities, based on relevant evidence and normative standards.

## DISCUSSION

The results offer a connection between vulnerability theory and the enforceable content of prevention. The approaches of Wisner et al. (2) help to identify structural conditions that produce exposure; Bankoff (3) warns that the categories of vulnerability and resilience contain historical and political perspectives; and Gaillard (4) demands attention to situated knowledge and decisions. These contributions explain why the population does not face a threat from equivalent positions. However, in order to assess legal responsibility, it is not enough to demonstrate social inequality: it is necessary to link it with the duties of an authority, possibilities of action, and foreseeable risk. This distinction avoids turning the social analysis of disasters into an indiscriminate imputation and, at the same time, allows us to recognize that constitutional protection requires concrete preventive actions.

A study of Mexican provisions shows that prevention is a legally organized function and not just an abstract recommendation. The General Law on Civil Protection establishes information instruments and coordination powers that can be used to evaluate administrative conduct (6). The Sendai Framework (7) completes this panorama as a governance guideline, but its goals do not replace the foundation of a duty enforceable in an internal or international standard. This distinction is important when analyzing risk atlases, evacuation routes, or communication of warnings: the effectiveness of a policy can be subject to technical evaluation, while a possible responsibility requires additional requirements. It is advisable to study both dimensions together, avoiding affirming that every operational insufficiency is equivalent to a legally declared violation.

The experience of Russia and Australia demonstrates the interest in using precedents with identifiable legal reasoning. In Budayeva (9), the recurrent and warned nature of a danger appears to be related to the measures that the State could adopt. In the Torres Strait Scotch case (10), the analysis focused on the consequences of insufficient adaptation and on rights related to family life and culture. The differences between the two controversies make it necessary not to equate the physical causality of the phenomenon, legal foreseeability and responsibility by omission. It is not a question of copying an international result from the Mexican context, but of examining criteria that guide the argument: knowledge, attributions, reasonableness and protection of specially exposed groups.

The behavior of alerts illustrates the need to connect law, technology, and social organization. A system that produces forecasts does not necessarily guarantee safe evacuations: warnings must be conveyed, understood, and made into possible decisions. The four components promoted by the World Meteorological Organization (12) provide a guideline for evaluating this operational chain. The U.S. report on Katrina (13) provides a documented example of problems with evacuation of people with specific needs. In areas with territorial inequality, general instruction may require accommodations for older people, indigenous peoples, or those without transportation. The specific legal obligation will depend on the system and the capacities available, but the accessibility dimension must be part of the preventive review.

The Mexican evidence also requires caution in the inferences made from figures. The 88,910 million pesos estimated by CENAPRED correspond to the set of losses documented during 2023 (15), and do not demonstrate the cost attributable to an individualized state omission. Otis belongs to October 2023 (16), while John was developed in September 2024 (17); mixing them would distort the temporal interpretation. Similarly, the narrative about Derna allows us to notice infrastructure problems, but requires different evidentiary processes before determining responsibilities (14). The traceability of dates, sources, and units of analysis is not an editorial formality: it conditions the accuracy of legal conclusions and prevents contextual data from being used as conclusive evidence of non-compliance.

The review has limits derived from the heterogeneity of sources and regulatory systems. International decisions allow legal criteria to be examined, while technical reports provide information on events and institutional capacities; neither completely replaces the other. An audit of administrative files was not carried out, nor was testimonial evidence from affected persons assessed, so the work does not resolve specific controversies. Its contribution consists of ordering categories applicable to future evaluations and offering a comparative reading that distinguishes risk, preventive action, and eventual liability. Subsequent research could compare alert protocols, budgets, atlases, evacuation orders, and administrative responses in delimited events, with special attention to people who faced barriers to access information and protection.

## CONCLUSIONS

The research established that the protection of human rights in the face of disasters associated with natural hazards requires integrating structural vulnerability with legally identifiable prevention duties. The threat alone does not constitute a violation of rights, nor does the magnitude of the losses automatically prove an omission attributable to the State. The interpretation must take into account the known or reasonably foreseeable risk, the competent authority, the available measures, and the right potentially affected. In Mexico, the Constitution and civil protection legislation provide the basis for carrying out this evaluation from the perspective of prevention and institutional coordination.

The comparative analysis showed that protection obligations can manifest themselves in different scenarios: warnings about localized risks, adaptation to continuous environmental processes, and evacuation of groups with specific needs. The international decisions studied help to identify elements of due diligence; the technical and documentary sources of other events allow questions to be asked about information, maintenance, and organization, without substituting the corresponding

legal determination. Therefore, the central contribution of the article lies in distinguishing the facts that increase the risk from the normative and evidentiary conditions necessary to attribute responsibility for a possible preventive omission.

The Mexican evidence underscores the importance of placing the figures within their year and documentary provenance. The 2023 losses reported by CENAPRED, as well as the chronology of Otis and John, help describe the context of exposure, but do not authorize automatic inferences about state non-compliance. Strengthening effective protection requires keeping risk information accessible, coordinating authorities, examining differentiated needs, and documenting decisions taken before emergencies. These measures make it possible to articulate risk management priorities with the guarantee of rights, without confusing public policy objectives with judicially determined obligations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES


1. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Definition: Disaster. Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction [Internet]. Geneva: UNDRR; 2017. https://www.undrr.org/terminology/disaster
2. Wisner B, Blaikie P, Cannon T, Davis I. At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters. 2.ª ed. Londres: Routledge; 2004. https://www.routledge.com/At-Risk-Natural-hazards-peoples-vulnerability-and-disasters/Wisner-Blaikie-Cannon-Davis/p/book/9780415252164
3. Bankoff G. Remaking the world in our own image: vulnerability, resilience and adaptation as historical discourses. Disasters. 2019; 43(2):221-239. https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12312.
4. Gaillard JC. Disaster studies inside out. Prog Hum Geogr. 2019; 43(1):112-122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517735108.
5. Mexico. Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, Articles 1 and 4 [Internet]. Mexico City: Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation; 2026. https://www.supremacorte.gob.mx/constitucion-politica-de-los-estados-unidos-mexicanos
6. Mexico. General Civil Protection Law [Internet]. Mexico City: Official Gazette of the Federation; amended text as of December 21, 2023. https://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Documentos/Federal/html/wo71347.html
7. United Nations. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. General Assembly resolution A/RES/69/283 [Internet]. New York: United Nations; 2015. https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030-0
8. Mexico. General Law of Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection, Articles 15 and 19 [Internet]. Mexico City: Chamber of Deputies of the Honorable Congress of the Union; current text. https://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/LGEEPA.pdf
9. European Court of Human Rights. Budayeva and Others v. Russia. Applications Nos. 15339/02, 21166/02, 20058/02, 11673/02 and 15343/02. Judgment of 20 March 2008 [Internet]. Strasbourg: ECtHR; 2008. https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-85436
10. United Nations Human Rights Committee. Daniel Billy et al. v. Australia. Communication No. 3624/2019. Views of 21 July 2022, CCPR/C/135/D/3624/2019 [Internet]. Geneva: United Nations; 2022. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4027144?ln=es

11. United Nations Human Rights Committee. General Comment No. 36 on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (right to life). CCPR/C/GC/36 [Internet]. Geneva: United Nations; 2018. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CCPR/CCPR_C_GC_36.pdf
12. World Meteorological Organization. Early Warnings for All [Internet]. Geneva: World Meteorological Organization; . https://wmo.int/all-activities/build-resilience/early-warnings-all
13. United States Government Accountability Office. Disaster Preparedness: Preliminary Observations on the Evacuation of Vulnerable Populations due to Hurricanes and Other Disasters. Informe GAO-06-790T [Internet]. Washington (DC): GAO; 18 de mayo de 2006. https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-06-790t
14. Magdy S. Libya was mired in chaos and corruption. For years, warnings the Derna dams may burst went unheeded. Associated Press [Internet]. 18 de septiembre de 2023. https://apnews.com/article/libya-derna-dams-collapse-floods-corruption-neglect-chaos-45f76d2ac76be634865539a27b518ada
15. National Center for Disaster Prevention. Socioeconomic impact of the main disasters that occurred in Mexico in 2023 [Internet]. Mexico: CENAPRED; June 2025. 169 p. https://www.cenapred.unam.mx/PublicacionesWebGobMX/buscar_buscaSubcategoria?categoria=Series+especiales+%2F&palabraClave=de+los+Desastres+en&subcategoria=Impacto+Socioecon%26oacute%3Bmico+de+los+desastres+en+M%26eacute%3Bxico
16. National Hurricane Center. Hurricane Otis (EP182023): Tropical Cyclone Report [Internet]. Miami (FL): National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; 7 de marzo de 2024. https://www.nhc.noaa.gov/data/tcr/EP182023_Otis.pdf
17. National Water Commission. John intensified to a category 1 hurricane off the coasts of Guerrero and Oaxaca [Internet]. Mexico City: CONAGUA; September 23, 2024. https://www.gob.mx/conagua/prensa/john-se-intensifico-a-huracan-categoria-1-frente-a-las-costas-de-guerrero-y-oaxaca?idiom=es-MX
18. Conflict of Interest: The authors affirm that there are no conflicts of interest in this study and that the processes established by this journal have been ethically followed. In addition, they assure that this work has not been partially or totally published in any other journal.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study was developed through a literature review based exclusively on previously published documentary sources. It did not involve the direct participation of human or animal beings, the performance of interventions, the use of biological samples, or access to personally identifiable data. Consequently, it did not require approval from an ethics committee or the obtaining of informed consent. During the research process, the principles of scientific integrity, adequate attribution of authorship, rigorous citation, and responsible use of the sources consulted were observed.

## ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USAGE STATEMENT

The authors state that the AI tool was used exclusively to support the organization of the article and the translation of the text. Its use did not determine the scientific content, study design, selection of

sources, data analysis, interpretation of results, or conclusions. Full responsibility for the content remains with the authors.

## FUNDING

The authors state that this study did not receive any external funding from public, private, or non-profit organizations. All research, analysis, and development activities were carried out with their own resources.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to this study and that all the procedures followed comply with the ethical standards established by the journal. They also confirm that this work is unpublished and has not been published, either partially or totally, in any other publication.

## AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

**Authors' names and initials:** Nestor Uriostegui Díaz (NUD), Victor Josue Rivera Bravo (VJRB), José Armando Castillo Montufar (JACM)

**1. Conceptualization:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**2. Data curation:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**3. Formal analysis:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**4. Acquisition of financing: not applicable**
**5. Inquiry:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**6. Methodology:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**7. Project Management:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**8. Remedies: Not applicable**
**9. Software: Not applicable**
**10. Supervision:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**11. Validation:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**12. Vista:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**13. Original Draft:** NUD, VJRB, JACM
**14. Writing, proofreading and editing:** NUD, VJRB, JACM