

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

**K. Sudmeier-Rieux (Referee)**

karen.sudmeier-rieux@unil.ch

Received and published: 18 July 2016

General comments The premise of this brief communication is highly praiseworthy: testing a new "tool kit" of loss and damage as applied to a case study, the Jure landslide in Nepal, one of Nepal's largest landslide disasters. The communication gives valuable information on losses occurred, coping strategies, methodological insights of the tool and policy recommendations. It is also written in clear and error free English.

A few overall comments: However the commentary as it reads lacks a number of key pieces of information in order to give the reader a clear understanding about the methodology, results and analysis. It is possible that the word limit of the brief commentary article format did not allow for more details, in which case authors should consider

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



submitting their research in another format as the article comes across as incomplete as currently published, with the conclusions not adequately substantiated.

**Specific comments Section 1 Introduction** It would be useful to mention why you developed a tool for loss and damage as this is one of the most controversial and discussed mechanisms of the international climate change agreements. This would also help to explain your entry point to the topic and why you have included section 1.2 Climate change attribution, which otherwise appears out of place. This section should be more balanced to include references to some of the work published by Petley (eg. Petley et al. 2007) which does attribute greater occurrence of landslides in Nepal to more intense monsoon rainfall. Before discarding the attribution to climate change, it would be useful to briefly summarize whether there was a rainfall event precedent the landslide and its intensity to understand the triggering mechanisms that led to the landslide.

**2 Results** As I am not so familiar with the "brief commentary" format of NHES, I assume that the authors were not given the option of a "methodology" section or had no space to develop one? However it would have been useful to understand which households were selected and why. Other key questions: -how was the effectiveness scale established? - how is "successful" defined? Successful in reducing loss of lives, loss of property? Successful according to respondents or the researchers?

Another issue relates to the preventive measures that individual households undertook to reduce losses and many of the physical measures were considered "unsuccessful". What about the measures that government agencies undertook to reduce losses? Were there any and would these have been more successful?

**3 Conclusions** One piece of missing information relates to how much each household received in government compensation, which is usually standard, quite minimal and usually the same for each house, human life and livestock that was lost. So certainly it is true that poorer households may encounter more difficulties in recuperating but the statement that their losses will be compensated less as the value of their assets were

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

lower in monetary terms may not be accurate.

To sum, overall the contribution of this paper to advancing our understanding of various tools for assessing loss and damage is valuable but there are a number of gaps in the paper which need to be addressed despite the word limitations given by the brief commentary format.

---

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

