

# ***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](mailto:schindler@ehs.unu.edu)

Received and published: 13 September 2016

Dear Mr Chhetri,

Your comments are highly appreciated, thank you very much.

You are correct in stating that there is sufficient scope for a longer publication. However, we intended to communicate our key findings as succinctly as possible. The brief communication format seems to suit this purpose perfectly. We nevertheless agree that some further explanation of Sindhupalchok's geographical/climatic history and situation, as well as the methodology, would be appropriate and will work to see this reflected in the revised text.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The toolbox to assess loss and damage contains information on how to plan, conduct and evaluate research on loss and damage. The content put forward in this toolbox area applied in the Nepal research, as a way to test its feasibility in the field. However, the toolbox is not yet publicly available, and we expect to publish it in late 2016. The overall knowledge on climate change by the respondents was limited, but people were very much aware of many of the environmental threats that applied specifically to them. Thus, their actions can be seen as a response to the potential risks that they face. As you correctly point out, we will clarify the linkage between landslides and climate change, and the connection of 1.2 to the overall L&D concept in the next version of the brief communication.

The data does not allow for an in-depth disintegration of impacts on women and children. However, we have information from open questions in our survey. These showed how the majority of respondents felt that while impacts were different for different age groups (e.g. no work for adults, no school for children), the impact was not necessarily 'worse' for a specific group.

Finally, respondents did offer input on how to improve on preventive and coping measures. If the scope allows, suggestions by the respondents, as well as us, will be included for policy guidance.

Thank you again for your valuable input,

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](#)