

Interactive comment on “Brief communication “Loss and Damage from a catastrophic landslide in Nepal”” by Kees van der Geest and Markus Schindler

Kees van der Geest and Markus Schindler

schindler@ehs.unu.edu

Received and published: 13 September 2016

Dear Dr. Sudmeier-Rieux,

Thank you very much for your constructive comments to our brief communication on Loss and Damage from a catastrophic landslide in Nepal. We have read your comments with great interest, and hope that our reply will be able to address them adequately.

As you have correctly suspected, we initially cut every corner of content on our submission in order to ensure that it complies with the formal limitations of the format. Fortunately, we have since learned that there is space to spare, so that we will be able

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



to ensure our readers' understanding of the methodology used, to go more into detail in the sections on climate change attribution, to mention measures by organizations and to address the issue compensation more thoroughly.

Your comment particularly highlighted to us that we need to be clearer in describing what we mean by the conclusion that those in direst need of support end up receiving the least because their losses are lower in monetary terms. As you correctly suspected, government compensation followed the general rule of being quite minimal and similar for each house, human life and livestock that was lost. However, our analysis highlights a clear discrepancy in the relative importance of quantifiable losses and damages, as higher losses in absolute terms sustained by wealthier households are likely to be less severe than the losses sustained by poorer households, albeit lower in absolute terms. Where our transcript lacked clarity is in emphasizing that the differences in compensation for loss and damage from natural disasters based on different needs and levels of income become particularly apparent from a global perspective. For example, a comparable disaster in the USA would lead to an estimation of monetary losses and damages much higher than in Nepal. Hence, what we are trying to do is to provide local evidence for a global discussion on the evaluation of and distribution of compensation for losses and damages from natural disasters.

Since we now have a better understanding of the format's formal limitations, we are confident that we will be able to fully incorporate your feedback into our manuscript, once the review-round is concluded.

Thank you again for your valuable inputs,

Kind regards, Markus Schindler & Kees van der Geest

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-210, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)