APN and ICCCAD SESSION at
2014 ASIA-PACIFIC CLIMATE ADAPTATION FORUM

Climate Adaptation, Loss & Damage and Disaster Risk Reduction

A Partnership Approach towards Research & Capacity Development for Climate Adaptation

Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum 2014

13:20-15:00, Wednesday, 01 October 2014 (Session 2.3)

APN, ICCCAD, ActionAid, CANSA, KEI, SEADPRI-UKM

This session addressed the Forum theme: **Disaster Risk Reduction and Human Security**: **Session 2.3: Knowledge Foundations of Loss and Damage Systems** and, among others, addressed the following key questions: (1) *What climate information and knowledge is needed to support effective loss and damage knowledge systems? (2) Which actors hold key knowledge?* And (3) *What are the constraints to sharing or accessing this knowledge?*

ABSTRACT

Loss and damage from climate change has emerged as a new area that looks at limits to adaptation and explores adverse climate impacts under a warming regime and has been the focus of much attention in the Asia-Pacific region, particularly in the past year. For example, the recently formed Loss and Damage Forum, established at the Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum, in Incheon, Republic of Korea, March 2013, highlighted that "*the Asia-Pacific region is the most vulnerable region to a range of natural disasters and climate change impacts, from those emanating from extreme events to those resulting from slow onset processes*."

In the Asia-Pacific region, Asia is a disaster hot spot for extreme events, and the Pacific, while highly vulnerable to extreme events is impacted by slow onset processes that include sea-level rise, biodiversity loss, salinity intrusion and ocean acidification, among others. Taking this into consideration, the APN held a workshop that explored the most important areas for the region, reviewed work undertaken, particularly case studies, and discussed needs and opportunities for conducting research and capacity development activities to support APN's developing countries to address Disaster Risk Reduction and Loss & Damage as associated with climate change. From April 2014, the APN is supporting, under its Climate Adaptation Framework, activities aimed at linking Climate Change Adaptation with Disaster Risk Reduction and Loss & Damage (CCA-DRR-L&D). With funding from the Ministry of the Environment, Japan (MOEJ), a call for focused activities was launched at the end of August 2013, during APAN's Forum on Loss and Damage, and 14 new activities are being undertaken to address the key issues of both APAN and APN in the context of security. Activities include:

- Assessment of the impacts of climate change and adaptation limits – what is Loss and Damage?
- What are linkages with disaster management and disaster reduction?
- Gap analysis on regional needs and status quo in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Approaches to address loss and damage associated with adverse impacts of climate change
- What kind of underpinning scientific and policy-relevant planning and methodology is needed in response to Loss & Damage?

SESSION INTRODUCTION

Moderator, Linda Anne Stevenson, introduced the session mentioning that the session would aim to answer the following questions: 1) What climate information is needed to support Loss & Damage knowledge systems; 2) Who are the actors; and 3) What are the constraints to accessing knowledge? She

then introduced the speakers and panel members. The APN Secretariat Director, Mr. Hiroshi Tsujihara, then formally opened the session by introducing the APN to the audience. He highlighted the APN's core programmes on regional research and capacity building, in which APN is presently managing over 60 projects; and 3 new frameworks, the most recent of which is the APN's Climate Adaptation Framework, under which 14 projects and the Loss and Damage Forum are being supported.

PRESENTATIONS

1. Asia Pacific Forum on Loss and Damage- Prof. Saleemul Huq (ICCCAD), Bangladesh

Dr. Saleemul Huq stressed that Loss & Damage is both a very old and new subject and that every country has a mechanism to deal with environmental hazards. He went on to say that, from the beginning of the UNFCCC, AOSIS raised this issue, which was not accepted by developed countries, until now. This is historical in this sense. Loss and Damage was first mentioned in the Bali Action Plan; then at Warsaw with the creation of the 3-year Warsaw Implementation Plan (WIM), and a work programme that was created and accepted by all parties. He noted that **the Executive Committee of WIM has started to meet and that the 3 year work programme gives us an opportunity to do some research**. In the long term, he said, loss and damage will depend on the level of mitigation; otherwise we should think of a 3-4^{o}C warmer world, which will lead to significant losses and damages. In the near-term, we will see impacts but adaptation may help to reduce this. In terms of attribution, he noted the key, and perhaps sensitive, question of "Can we attribute loss and damage to climate change?" He argued that science is getting closer to answering this and, in fact, the recent drought in Australia has been attributed, by the climate science community, to climate change. In terms of taking the dialogue further, he stressed opportunities at the UNISDR World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, March 14-18, 2015; 9th Community-Based Adaptation Conference, Kenya in April 2015 and then at the UNFCCC/SBSTA meetings in Bonn in June, 2015.

2. Integrating Climate Adaptation with Disaster Risk and Loss & Damage to Address Challenges; Prof. Joy Jacqueline Pereira, (SEADPRI-UKM), Malaysia

The next speaker, Professor Joy Jacqueline Pereira, discussed the issues and challenges of integrating Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation and Loss & Damage. She stressed that when looking at the IPCC context, anthropogenic and natural causes are both considered. In Malaysia, for example, people are very practical and consider any change. Drawing from the IPPC changes, as a physical scientist she stressed that we consider susceptibility so as to take coping measures. **The IPCC has pointed out that we can attribute warming to human activity, although there is no clear start/end to slow onset events.** In the Asia Chapter of the IPCC, she said, 51 regions are covered in identification of flooding risks/flash floods. **She stressed that we are dealing with cascading risks; which are difficult to account for**. In terms of weaknesses, she noted predictions based on historical records, changes in land use affects analysis, and changes in climate and extreme events. She said that given that we have different types of floods; we need to be better categorize them. However, we still do not have good information on the kind of damage induced during historical flood events. The key risks in Asia are increased flooding and others such as droughts in pockets. Decision making tools such as maps are poorly developed in terms of geographical and temporal scales. **Data availability is a prevailing problem for decision making in most developing countries and addressing legal issues emanating from LOSS & DAMAGE**.

3. Enhancing Capacity of Policymakers & Practitioners on Loss+Damage; Mr. Sanjay Vashist, (CANSA), Bangladesh

Mr. Sanjay Vashist presented on enhancing the capacity of policy makers and practitioners on LOSS & DAMAGE in South Asia. He pointed out that **climate hazards put significant pressure on poor people and that stakeholders are already trying to integrate adaptation into policy but there is little**

known on slow onset events. Practitioners are facing problems integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation into development and, again, this is particularly problematic for slow onset events. He noted that the present APN-funded project is interested in drawing conclusions for the entire South Asia region.

4. Approaches to Assess and Address Impacts of Climate Change-induced Loss+Damage; Mr. Harjeet Singh, (ActionAid), India

Mr. Harjeet Singh's presentation provided an overview on approaches to assess climate change impacts and loss & damage. He noted that the key thing is to understand that whatever work we are doing on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation, we need to take into account that we will always hit road blocks: i.e., where Climate Change Adaptation will fail, when Disaster Risk Reduction is not enough, etc. He said that we need to consider loss and damage scenarios which are directly related to emissions. In this context, are we talking about transformative adaptation? He noted that **a number APN projects came at a time when the international community has agreed on developing the Warsaw International Mechanism and that all projects that APN is funding will feed into the evaluation of WIM in 2016**. In terms of the project being funded by the APN, Mr. Singh said that we are not linking Loss & Damage well to scenarios; and we also need to do better to address this at the community level, specifying that grassroots integration on Loss & Damage is very important. While this is recognised, we have not yet created forums to discuss. In developing and promoting a people-centred approach to assess and address impacts of climate change induced loss and damage we hope to reach out to partners to feed into the process and disseminate this knowledge. He closed the presentation by noting that models have not yet been downscaled adequately and this needs to be taken up between scientific and community levels to better develop a comprehensive approach using appropriate data and tools.

5. Estimation of Socio-economic Impacts of Climate Change using Indicator-Based Approach; Dr. Yeora Chae, (KEI), Republic of Korea

In Dr. Yeora Chae's Presentation (KEI) on estimation of socio-economic impacts of climate change she said that we have found that by comparing existing data on socio-economic indicators there are variable responses and there are impacts of climate change in Korea. Indicator-based approaches have come to stay to estimate climate change impacts due to the robustness they provide. Different indicators were helpful to compare country level impacts of climate change. At sub-national levels, the data indicated that municipalities showed significant vulnerability. It has become clear that **data on secondary impacts and their attribution is missing and there is a need for consistent monitoring of gradual impacts of climate change**.

QUESTION & ANSWER SESSION

Dr. Eric Kemp-Benedict addressed the panel noting, "I see the difficulty of attribution as being a long term challenge". He asked whether we can get away from attribution and still get a mechanism for compensating loss and damage.

Dr. Huq noted that the way in which he described loss and damage; i.e. avoidable and unavoidable, there is an opportunity for insurance and that there are a number of cases already happening in this respect. For example, in the Caribbean insurance premiums are being paid.

Mr. Singh said that attribution is becoming clearer on some issues. From the grassroots perspective, it is more important to understand how loss and damage will impact at this level. Governments do have social safety nets in many places. He also said that insurance is about risk transfer and, at the local level, compensation is not an issue. Compensation becomes an issue at the national level.

Dr. Anna Brown asked about avoiding costs and benefits: What more work is needed to quantify and capture these benefits and promote Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation? In particular, at the national and city level? What research is still needed to make the cost-benefit analysis?

Dr. Huq responded by stressing that one thing we need to achieve is to align investments in the future. Both private and public sector investment will be involved in making this analysis. The challenge, he said, is to make these sectors understand that their investments are at risk if they continue to conduct business as usual. We need to detract investors from investing in fossil fuel companies, for example. He provided an example in that the Rockefeller Foundation has decided to de-invest in fossil fuels and more of this kind of action is needed.

Ms. Jessica Bercillia noted that in order for us to address loss and damage we need to understand susceptibility. Previously, this was the least understood topic. She asked the panel what are the current indicators that have context validity in susceptibility.

Mr. Singh responded that we need to keep development at the core: those places are most vulnerable and their lack of access makes them more vulnerable. He provided a scenario in that a single woman would be resilient only when she has land in her name. Without this basic need, we cannot 'top the cake' with adaptation.

Dr. Huq responded that there has been a notion of non-economic losses and damages that have emerged at the UNFCCC and that in Kiribati and Tuvalu people are talking about something very valuable - we could write them off with money but they do not want to leave their countries! In that sense, we want to make loss and damage less about compensation.

Dr. Pereira noted that while scientists know where those susceptible areas are, businesses also need to know. Where there is information on susceptible areas, it needs to be shared, but more often than not, the information is locked away in agencies.

Mr. Tanjir Hossain stressed that displacement and migration from loss and damage has increased significantly: it crosses borders. He noted that after Cancun we know people look away from tackling this issue. He asked whether there is any methodology for being future looking and assess the cost of social, environmental impacts from migration that will take place and cross boundaries.

Mr. Vashist responded by saying that permanent losses and damages exist and normally compensation has been at the national level. He continued by stressing that now we face a situation at the international level and how do we deal with that? How do we deal with non-economic losses and damages? In Tuvalu, for example, people will have to move from their place of origin.

Dr. Pereira stressed that implications on loss and damage is at the international level but a difference can be made at the local level.

Mr. Singh noted that we need to differentiate between safe and unsafe migration.

Dr. Rajib Shaw said that some people gave examples of small islands, but even in Japan we see the impact on non-economic losses and damages. Psychological impacts on the elderly are coming out at the local level but not at the policy level and, as such, would be interested to see what comes out of research on Loss & Damage. He stressed that drought, or other SOE that cause education loss, migration, or health and psychological impacts are not well addressed. In Kyoto University, he said, we also do indicator

approaches but a main issue for us is weighting these different variables. The concept of the weight could vary significantly.

Dr. Huq responded by saying that the solution would be to avoid climate change in the first place – the window is still open for that. However, we cannot control the consequences, we can still take action: that is, what we are trying to promote in our research?

Dr. Eric Kemp-Benedict noted that in economics you look for an optimal cost for return. In his view, loss and damage favours the economic way of thinking but the avoidance notion favours the engineering response. If you simply said "no loss of small island states" and now you try to find the optimal path, you would have a different framing.

Dr. John Brinkmann perspective was that the more dramatically you can explain that the more beneficial this could be. He quoted a hydrologist: "**If you take a person's future away, you rob them of all hope**". This type of insight could be useful to your articulation.

Dr. Ali Sheikh stressed that the genesis of Loss & Damage comes from UNFCCC but the conversation places it into sustainable development or the Hyogo Framework for Action. How can it be addressed in the Hyogo Framework for Action and what kind of domestic mechanisms would be appropriate for addressing loss and damage?

Mr. Singh responded that millennium goals could not be accomplished because of disasters. He noted that 17 goals were agreed upon and 3 goals talk about climate change: 1) poverty 2) climate change 3) urban risk and resilience. Disaster management departments are picking up loss and damage terminology: **the issue of mainstreaming integration and coordination and holistic planning will be important to ensure coherent thinking and coordination.** In this respect, you need to bring together many different processes at the national level.

Dr. Pereira said that custodian-ship at the national level is very contentious. People in the Disaster Risk Reduction community are extremely practical and the focal points go from the national to the local level with ease but their main problem is horizontal integration and that they tend to act, still, in silos. Looking at the disaster management cycle you find much on recovery and rehabilitation but very little on prevention. She noted that Malaysia now has prevention measures in its Disaster Risk Reduction framework. She emphasised that **all roads without Climate Change Adaptation will lead to disaster**.

WRAP UP WITH KEY MESSAGES

Dr. Stevenson summarised the session by stressing some key points:

- How can we better quantify disaster risk to enhance resilience?
- At the community/grass roots level, we need to keep development at the core.
- There are significant issues of displacement and migration and this is an incredibly complex issue. For example, the question of "how do we deal with non-economic losses and damages?" is not an issue about financial compensation in the case of some small island developing states.
- There are less obvious impacts of disasters that need to be addressed, such as psychological impacts, as well as the need to avoid disasters in the first place – place greater emphasis on prevention and risk reduction.
- Many APN projects are undertaking regional research and capacity-building on non-economic losses and damages. In this context, bridging Loss & Damage, Disaster Risk Reduction and

Climate Change Adaptation is crucial, and actions are being taken across various levels, both horizontal and vertical, to address this.

Later, the APAN rapporteur for the session provided the following summary, which will be reflected in the outcomes of the Forum:

Limited interaction between different stakeholders and lack of understanding on what is L&D and how it can be addressed in the CCA, DRR and sustainable development spheres appear to have emerged as an important point from the session. The non-economic losses and damages and availability of limited solutions to assess and address non-economic losses and damages in particular have emerged as an important problem. Hence, science research, capacity building and policy approaches are relevant to comprehensively address this problem.