

# Proceedings from the Asia Pacific Forum on Loss and Damage Workshop

30 September 2014 | Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia



Sponsored By:



## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. Information on the Workshop</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Background Note</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Definitions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Notes from Workshop</b>	<b>5</b>
Introductions	5
Presentation 1	7
Presentation 2	9
Presentation 3	11
Afternoon Session	15
Follow Up/Next Steps	19
<b>Annex 1. Loss and Damage Workshop Programme</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex 2. Participants List</b>	<b>21</b>

## **1. Information on the Workshop**

30 September 2014, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia – The Asia Pacific Forum on Loss and Damage organized a side event to the Fourth Annual Asia Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum. Organized by the International Center for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) and International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and sponsored by that Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN), the workshop attracted over 30 experts to discuss loss and damage issues associated with climate change.

The workshop aimed to promote networking and discussions related to completed and upcoming research in the region. The first part of the workshop included presentations from Dr. Linda Anne Stevenson (APN), Ms. Erin Roberts (ICCCAD), Mr. Harjeet Singh (ActionAid International) and Dr. Louis Lebel (Chiang Mai University). With the exception of Ms. Roberts' presentation, the other presentations showcased APN's new Climate Adaptation Framework initiative that links disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA) and loss and damage (L&D).

In the second half of the day, participants divided themselves into two groups to discuss four thematic items. In the first group, participants looked at 'Research Gaps/Challenges and Tools/Approaches for Measuring L&D'. In the second group 'Financial Mechanisms for Supporting L&D and Links between Resilient Development and L&D' were discussed. Unlike previous workshops on loss and damage, researchers here more greatly deliberated on what the term means at the local level and how we might begin to assess such impacts for vulnerable communities.

The remainder of this report outlines what was discussed during this one-day workshop as well gives details of the presentations for those individuals who were unable to attend.

For a full programme of the workshop, please see **Annex 1**.

## 2. Background Note

The Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN-GCR) along with the International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) and the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) welcomes you to the Loss and Damage Workshop on 30 September in Kuala Lumpur. The workshop is being held in conjunction with the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Forum organized by the Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) which will be held from 1-3 October 2014.

The Loss and Damage Workshop aims to bring together researchers, academics, practitioners, and decision makers from the Asia Pacific to showcase past, present and future research on loss and damage. The workshop will provide a platform for researchers and stakeholders to brainstorm research gaps/challenges, tools/approaches, financial mechanisms and links to resilient development. It will also be a great opportunity for people to network with other individuals working on loss and damage in the region.

The workshop will be held by the Asia Pacific Forum on Loss and Damage which is an initiative supported by APN and coordinated by ICCCAD and IIED. The objective of the forum is to disseminate research on loss and damage in the Asia Pacific region. The Forum will create a community of practice through an online platform to promote discussions and sharing of research findings and best practices in addressing loss and damage. Researchers are encouraged to send us links to their research to be included on the website as well as join in on our discussion via LinkedIn. Additionally, a bi-monthly newsletter profiles the latest research on loss and damage to a larger audience of policymakers, practitioners and other stakeholders.

For any comments/questions please contact us at:

[lossanddamageforum@gmail.com](mailto:lossanddamageforum@gmail.com)

Related Links:

- <http://lossanddamageforum.org/>
- <http://www.apn-gcr.org/>
- <http://icccad.net/>

## 3. Definitions

loss [lôs, läs] & damage [dami:] (noun)

1. “Negative effects of climate variability and climate change that people have not been able to cope with or adapt to” (Warner et al., 2012)
2. “Current or future negative impacts of climate change that will not be addressed by adaptation efforts” (Nishat et al., 2013)
3. “The residual costs, which are not avoided through adaptation and mitigation, and which can be further split into” (UNFCCC, 2013)

## 4. Notes from Workshop

### Introductions

The day began with welcome note from the workshop organizers: Dr. Saleemul Huq, Mr. Hiroshi Tsujihara, Dr. Linda Anne Stevenson and Dr. Puja Sawhney.

Dr. Saleemul Huq, Director of ICCCAD, started introductions with a thank you note to participants for organizing their own funding to attend the workshop. He also thanked APN and in particular, the government of Japan, for coming up with the resources to organize the workshop as well as getting the ball rolling on loss and damage research. He also took the opportunity to explain the research that ICCCAD is currently undertaking. In contrast to the prevailing paradigm that has looked predominantly at economic impacts, ICCCAD has been part of a consortium to conduct empirical research aimed at understanding what are non-economic impacts. This project is funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) alongside the Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS). (For additional information on this research, please contact Stephanie Andrei at [andrei.stephanie@gmail.com](mailto:andrei.stephanie@gmail.com)). This was preceded by a round of introductions from each participant. Participants in the workshop included experts and researchers from a number of leading academic, governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Mr. Hiroshi Tsujihara, Director at APN, then gave a brief welcome speech and introduced himself as the new Director proceeding Dr. Takemoto. He expressed his interest to be engaged in discussions during the workshop and looked forward to being a part of this process.

Dr. Linda Anne Stevenson from APN then gave a presentation as to the initiative under the Climate Adaptation Framework. She explained that the goals of APN are to support regional cooperation in global change research, strengthen interactions among scientists and policymakers, improve scientific and technical capabilities and cooperate with global change networks and organizations. Within the Climate Adaptation Framework as such a new initiative has emerged linking disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA) and loss and damage. While the call for proposals went out in 2013, the successful projects were presented in April 2014 at the Eighth Annual Community Based Adaptation (CBA) Conference in Kathmandu, Nepal. The proposals attempt to link DRR, CCA and loss and damage, understand the risk of slow onset events, impacts on those most vulnerable, impacts due to extreme weather events, risk reduction, risk sharing and human mobility. In total APN received 88 expressions of interest of which 14 were approved (9 research and 5 capacity building projects). She then went into detail about four of the 14 successful projects. Within these four projects, Dr. Stevenson explained that a number of countries were involved: Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Mongolia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia and Vietnam. (For complete project summaries please visit <http://lossanddamageforum.org>).

Dr. Puja Sawhney from the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) then introduced herself and explained how the APAN Adaptation Forum has come into being. Mentioning that Dr. Saleemul Huq has been a co-chair from the very beginning, this year they were expecting 650 participants. She also mentioned that from now the APAN Climate Change Adaptation Forum will be a bi-annual event.



*The morning introductions along with the first presentation by Ms. Erin Roberts created a backdrop for discussions later in the day.*

## **Presentation 1**

“Translating the loss and damage agenda for national policymaking”  
Erin Roberts (ICCCAD)

Ms. Erin Roberts began her presentation by giving a brief definition of loss and damage as the aspect of climate change impacts that cannot be and can be recovered, respectively. She then gave a brief history of loss and damage from the UNFCCC negotiations whereby discussions started from the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) who proposed an insurance pool in the negotiations. Although the issue was put to rest, it reemerged following the 2007 fourth assessment report which greatly fed into the Bali Action Plan. It was there that loss and damage was first mentioned in a decision. Then in 2010, in Cancun a work programme was created and by 2013 the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) on loss and damage was set up. Since then the two-year workplan has been finalized however the interim committee could not yet come to an agreement.

Discussions on loss and damage demonstrate we are not mitigating enough. We need adaptation risk management approaches and sustainable development. Reciting findings from a nine-case study report conducted by the United Nations University-Institute on Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), Ms. Roberts explained that loss and damage occurs when: 1) Coping and adaptation measures are not sufficient; 2) Coping and adaptation measures have costs that are not recovered; 3) Coping and adaptation measures are erosive and increase vulnerability, and; 4) No coping or adaptation measure have been implemented whatsoever (Warner and van der Geest, 2013).

In the pre-ambular text to the IPCC she mentioned loss and damage is framed as an issue beyond adaptation, and beyond the ability of a system to adapt. This is what we can consider the ‘adaptation frontier’ which provides a safe operating space for adaptation. The ability of society to stay within this frontier depends on path dependence, adaptation and development deficits, values and extent to which future loss and damage is discounted.

Finally Ms. Roberts explained the importance of understanding transformation for avoiding future loss and damage. As a term that has emerged from the IPCC, it defines transformation as a “change in the fundamental attributes of a system, often based on altered paradigms, goals, or values.”

Her presentation was then followed by a question/answer session.

Ms. Jessica Dator-Bercilla from Christian Aid in the Philippines was the first to take the floor and made a comment that we need to reexamine the role of resilience to address loss and damage. Dr. Saleemul Huq responded to this by stating that it depends a great deal on the words and language we use. He explained the decisions made at the UNFCCC are written in a language that is

deliberately vague – we need to work out what it means. As such, operationalization of these terms are for researchers and practitioners to decide. In particular we need to determine whether this is a good way forward.

Mr. Harjeet Singh from ActionAid International further expanded on the UNFCCC negotiation process explaining that the negotiations are involved in politics but politics are missing the DRR forums. There are also specific similarities between the goals of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and risk reduction. We must see the UNFCCC as a window for groundwork to go back and generate knowledge and transform that window into a door to reach the goals of the SDGs. Ms. Roberts then went into an example of mentioning resilience during the UNFCCC negotiations and being shot down since at that time there was still no agreed upon definition of resilience.

Dr. Saleemul Huq then mentioned that loss and damage is a euphemism since we still do not yet have a definition and the onus is on researchers to advise how we should move forward from here. There is a three-year period for us to conduct ground level research in preparation for COP 22 when the mechanism will be reevaluated.

Mr. Ali Sheikh from LEAD Pakistan added that the definition of resilience is expanding to which Dr. Saleemul Huq suggested we can use different terms to mean the same thing. For instance, resilience is getting a lot of traction on the ground and through empirical research. As the result of the 2014 Resilience Academy, a commentary piece in *Nature and Climate Change* is coming out which defines resilience in the context of climate change and livelihoods.

Mr. Nauman Haque from GIZ then posed a question to Ms. Roberts as to the difference between transformation and transformational adaptation. She replied by stating she had her own trouble finding this distinction but that in terms of the connotation with the UNFCCC, it is highly problematic: everything about avoiding residual impacts can be considered transformative. Dr. Saleemul Huq added that transformation is a difference in state: whereas adaptation is meant to reduce individuals' vulnerability, we have been doing this incrementally however this is now proving insufficient. We need transformational change in order to better respond to climate change in the future. Using the case study of the coastal area in Bangladesh whereby tens of millions are affected by salinity intrusion for which they have been adapting using saline tolerant rice varieties, in the long run these people will no longer be able to live there and meet their subsistence needs. Education may therefore be a tool to catalyze this process.

Dr. Saleemul Huq closed this discussion session by stating “we need to have a new paradigm as we want to prevent loss and damage... otherwise we will have tremendous losses and damages in the future.”



Following a brief coffee break, presentations resumed and was chaired by Mr. Ali Sheik who began by introducing both presenters.

## **Presentation 2**

“Overview of APN Projects on Loss and Damage”

Harjeet Singh (ActionAid International)

Mr. Harjeet Singh presented on two projects for which ActionAid International forms part of a consortium of organizations. Starting with the first projection entitled “Developing and promoting a people-centred approach to assess and address impacts of climate change induced loss and damage”, for which ActionAid International is the lead organization, Mr. Singh explained that it is a three year project. Developing case studies in five countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Myanmar, Nepal and Vietnam), the consortium includes the Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network (ADRRN) as well as the Climate Action Network – South Asia (CANSA).

Key activities in this project include research as well as capacity building component. The three objectives therefore are to: 1) Develop community-level assessments using participatory and scientific methodologies to integrate loss and damage perspective into existing resilience thinking, practice and policies; 2) Develop range of approaches to effectively link DRR, CCA, and loss and damage, for practitioners and policymakers, and; 3) Enhance capacity of DRR and CCA networks across South Asia and South East Asia on comprehensive resilience approach - linking DRR, CCA and loss and damage. Mr. Singh also mentioned the project is an opportunity to start at the grassroots level and make sure all these objectives get integrated. Through the engagement of the two networks, it is predicted that this project will be engaged heavily with policy so as to positively impact local level development.

The second project is entitled “Enhancing capacity of policymakers and practitioners in India, Sri Lanka and Nepal on Loss and Damage related to slow onset events in the region” and will be a two-year project. Three countries are involved (India, Nepal and Sri Lanka) and will bring together the same partners with CANSA taking the lead role. Unlike the previous project however, the key deliverables are mainly to build capacity in the region. Specifically, the project will: 1) Mobilise scientists, policymakers and practitioners to comprehensively assess the impact of slow onset events and prepare a comprehensive response; 2) Spread awareness about the loss and damage caused by slow onset events to people and eco-systems, and; 3) Sensitise, engage and build capacity of stakeholders, particularly policymakers and practitioners to develop appropriate solutions.

His presentation was followed by a question/answer session.

Beginning with a comment from Ms. Jessica Dator-Bercilla from Christian Aid, she mentioned that her organization had been working with World Climate Research Programme (WCRP)'s Coordinated Regional climate Downscaling EXperiment (CORDEX) on regional climate modeling which may be a useful tool for disseminating research findings.

Mr. Aarjan Dixit from Care International then asked a question regarding what types of capacities are needed to address slow onset events for which Mr. Singh replied that there needs to be various level discussions on the issue. In particular, we must look at the knowledge available and set up the capacity.

Ms. Neera Shrestha Pradhan from International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) explained how her organization has been working with eight different countries for which ICIMOD has become a knowledge hub for producing different kinds of knowledge. For instance, in Nepal ICIMOD has done a lot of work on drought. As such she extended a hand for support to discuss issues related to slow onset events further. She then went to ask how DRR, CCA and loss and damage will be defined in the project since at the community level, climate change has already started to impact them and they have already started addressing such impacts in their own way.

Mr. Harjeet Singh responded by stating the project will not distinguish between hazards and disasters and thus will focus more on impacts. It will be useful for us to create a problem tree to understand what are the different causes of impacts and where do the limits of adaptation lie. In DRR, there was little effort to look 50 years into the future but nowadays planning is important. There is also an issue of how to frame questions around the community. We will pick up lessons learnt from different organizations.

Ms. Hina Lotia from LEAD Pakistan then asked whether the assessment on loss and damage would be qualitative or quantitative. In her own study, she explained, she has kept the number of villages small since the purpose is to develop a methodology. Ms. Lotia also mentioned she will be working closely with these two projects when developing her own APN project on developing a toolbox to assess loss and damage at the local level.

### **Presentation 3**

“Analysis of Longer-term Recovery Following Disasters: Opportunities for Collaboration and Methodological Issues”

Dr. Louis Lebel (Unit for Social and Environmental Research, Chiang Mai University)

The final presentation for the morning session was given by Dr. Louis Lebel on the long-term perspective of recovery following a disaster. He started his presentation by explaining that the long-term perspective is important so as to learn more about the recovery phase post-disaster given the likelihood of increasing climate change related disasters in the future. Mentioning some of the examples where the recovery process has made the situation worse, Dr. Lebel explained that integrated planning in the process requires livelihood restoration and local knowledge.

Some of the questions he put forth about the recovery process included: 1) What are the main loss and damage systems involved in post-disaster recovery?; 2) What formal promises were made and objectives set for recovery and what role were loss and damage systems expected to play?; 3) Did recovery programs and loss and damage systems meet their objectives?; 4) What are the greatest achievements and challenges in building disaster resilience post-event over 5-10 years?, and; 5) What other factors influence the success of interventions? Have interventions increased resilience?

In explaining the project, Dr. Lebel stated that four case studies of major disasters would be considered from Myanmar, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam and Cambodia ten years after the event. The research will aim to understand if damages were caused due to the disaster or due to other factors and the role that adaptation has played in reducing/exacerbating the amount of losses. This discussion is more predominantly a discussion on counterfactuals in the recovery process following a disaster.

Dr. Lebel then went to explain the various loss and damage systems which catalyzed discussions amongst participants. Ranging from irrigation infrastructure, early warning systems, social safety nets, humanitarian aid, re-development projects and micro-insurance, questions on these ‘loss and damage systems’ stemmed from its categorization of items. Mr. Ali Sheikh prematurely began discussions, raising question as to what ‘system’ Dr. Lebel was referring to. According to him loss and damage is a downstream impact of a larger system, not a system in itself. Mr. Aarjan Dixit added that it would be easier to break up these items since the unit of analysis was not clear. To respond to this feedback, Dr. Lebel clarified there were more than one system.

Mr. Harjeet Singh mentioned the distinction between avoidable, unavoided and unavoidable impacts. Countries are already taking measures to avoid future loss and damage, how is this considered in the system?

Ms. Jessica Dator-Bercilla then provided a comment for future collaboration. Specifically, the coastal study on risk from Christian Aid asks the question how do you build resilient systems. Since it is a transboundary study we are trying to build an index to apply to a standard set of variables of which may be useful for assessing recovery measures.

Dr. Lebel continued part of his presentation explaining that post-disaster events have mainly been considered humanitarian relief. He added, this ad hoc mentality may be negatively affecting development that may be reliant on such actions. There is also an issue that 'disaster are normal'. In the long term, 'disasters' or 'shocks' or 'disturbances' are normal not extra-ordinary. They are expected. But yet how does acknowledging disasters this way alter the way we think of development?

In terms of opportunities for future collaboration, Dr. Lebel mentioned opportunities for comparative work, meta-analysis, opportunity to set the research agenda, incorporating DRR and CCA, opportunity to link with sustainable development, and frame such discussions in an agenda-setting paper.

Dr. Saleemul Huq thanked him for his stimulating presentation and mentioned two suggestions he had picked up on. Firstly, he ask participants how they felt about collaborating on an agenda setting paper. The feedback was quite positive and Dr. Lebel offered to take the lead on writing said paper. Secondly, Dr. Huq expressed the importance of the APN research projects to continue to work together: "the sum of the final product should be greater than the sum of its parts". As a result, he encouraged all the project partners to start strategizing their research for opportunities next year. Namely he mentioned opportunities to get together again to discuss progress at the Future Earth Conference or possibly as a PROVIA workshop. He clarified that PROVIA is an initiative to bring together the scientific community, practitioners and decision makers to discuss a particular issue.

Mr, Harjeet Singh also mentioned the need to collate research and have a repository of information. For instance, CDKN has continued to conduct research on loss and damage recently completing a quantitative assessment on non-economic losses and damages in Pakistan. Dr. Saleemul Huq then suggested the coordinator of the Forum to provide a brief presentation at the end of the day showing participants how to access the LinkedIn Group as well as add research to the Forum's webpage.

Ms. Jessica Dator-Bercilla continued discussions by asking an important question as to the engagement to climate scientists. Specifically she asked if we talk about attribution, what is the methodology? There are countless variables and loss and damage can no longer be considered in general terms.

Dr. Lebel responded by stating the research he and his team are conducting is not solely about climate science but also about good social science and methods. As such, some specific techniques can be applied in many circumstances. The answers however will vary.

In a follow up comment, Ms. Dator-Bercilla mentioned that she does not see the element of innovation. Transformation will require us to think outside the box but if you want investments in future research you need to be specific as to what technologies you want to engage the public sector in.

Mr. Mihir Joshi for ADDRN inquired on how we might identify underlying risks or causes. As he found in the Mekong delta, flooding was related to development policy and that tourism policies are not equipped to deal with such risks. In their research he explained that they do community resilience surveys of which some of the questions includes stresses and shocks so that they may better understand the factors on building resilience. They have faced a question on how to validate such kinds of indicators.

Dr. Linda Anne Stevenson continued to encourage such dialogue explaining that the workshop was not only meant to consider the 14 APN projects but also other projects taking place. Also responding to the call for collaboration by Ms. Jessica Dator-Bercilla, Dr. Stevenson mentioned that WCRP does not do much on loss and damage since they are focused on vulnerability and assessments. A collaboration with Cordex may however be useful.

Mr. Aarjan Dixit from Care International expanded on Dr. Lebel's long-term version to add that much of the work we do on adaptation has been on building capacity for the poor and vulnerable people to deal with the uncertainties of climate change. Yet still in the conversation we have not heard about the issues surrounding attribution. Dr. Lebel responded explaining we know there will be extreme events but we cannot just wait for such events to take place. It is therefore essential to make sure that resilience and resilient development take these into consideration.

Mr. Harjeet Singh contributed to the discussion by mentioning we should not dwell on attribution and uncertainties, our focus should be on models and downscaling. For instance, the lack of fish is not just about global warming but also about overfishing as well as other factors. Since downscaling has still not taken place, we should consider ranges and levels of interventions.

Mr. John Brinkman added the non-economic perspective by inquiring about cultural resilience. He explained that there is a lot of research already taking place on the role of culture in determining agricultural processes. There is a great deal of influence that culture has on practice and we must adjust our models to reflect this.

The round of discussions was then summarized by Dr. Saleemul Huq and participants were asked to write their names under the group that was of most interest to them before the break for lunch. The groups included: Research Gaps/Challenges, Tools/Approaches for Measuring L&D, Financial Mechanisms for Supporting L&D, and Links between Resilient Development and L&D. For interest of maximizing conversations and to take into consideration the size of groups, it was decided by the organizers that themes be categorized into two larger groups for the afternoon session.



*Dr. Louis Lebel's presentation on long-term recovery following disasters catalyzed discussions before the afternoon session commenced.*

## Afternoon Session



*In the afternoon session, groups were divided into two groups. This group looked into Financial Mechanisms for Supporting L&D and Links between Resilient Development and L&D.*

### **Group 1: Financial Mechanisms for Supporting L&D and Links between Resilient Development and L&D**

In the afternoon session, two groups of 12-16 people were made and discussions were garnered towards encouraging future collaborations between participants. The following notes were taken directly from the presentations from the two breakout groups.

In the first group, the links between resilient development and loss and damage were explored. In their reflections they discussed the definition of resilient development and came to the understanding that sustainable development was development that maintains or increases social/ecological resilience. As such, resilience was considered as the ability to bounce more effectively from shock and stresses which requires cross sectoral coordination. In reaching this end

goal, a mechanism to ensure losses and damage are minimized must be reached and tools and approaches must be considered. These may include aspects who are we addressing, communities, private sector, SMEs, groups at risk and ability to better access such groups.

In order to have a strong impact on loss and damage therefore good governance must be ensured, there must be a strong level of development, resources must be considered, share risk and shared wealth must be shared regionally and globally and national boundaries should not be considered. Therefore it is important that there is not only a humanitarian response but also resilient development.

In order to ensure resilient development paradigm considers loss and damage there is a need to accept the concepts of shared risk, shared finances, responses to more loss and damage measures, more pressure on donor communities and also understand that prevention is cheaper than reconstruction. In doing so, we must understand that non-economic impacts are not easily calculated in measures of prevention.

It was further discussed that at present we have not looked at development from a loss and damage perspective. For instance energy sources following hurricane Haiyan were lost mainly due to the lack of good governance. Balance is needed between resilience and development and resilient development cannot be solely a consideration for the rich – it needs to be implemented out of necessity. One of the more general links between loss and damage and development is that if a strategy aimed to reduce loss and damage in the future is effective, then resilience is necessarily improved.

Risk should be an essential part of any development: if risk exists, then it must be defined in the development processes and insured/reduced accordingly. In terms of slow onset events, resilient development must not go past critical thresholds. Resilient development must think beyond simply the immediate: sea level rise will be an ongoing issue especially since 75% of populations lie near coral areas. In an attempt to reduce future impacts, formal and informal accounts must be considered, governments need to look beyond sudden onset events to provide relief, and changing of disasters must be considered. In their presentation, the group stressed that the interaction between discreet events and slow onset events is crucial.

In looking at the financial mechanisms for supporting loss and damage, the same group reflected on a number of issues. This included: implementation costs, tidal surges, displacement, changing livelihoods, spiral of poverty, and the issue that development has continuously glorified rural life. In addition there is an issue from an economist point-of-view that would argue it is more expensive to develop based on a 50-year scenario. In terms of pooling the risk, it is not clear whether index-based systems would be most effective, whether people can afford the



premiums and whether they would inadvertently award bad management practices. Furthermore, there is an issue with ensuring a fair system – in an index-based system, we may be forcing the poor farmer to pay for issues they would otherwise not have faced in a world without climate change.

An important area of consideration for this group was ensuring that national governments would step in, particularly when markets fail. The government may step in to promote social protection, and or private/public protection. For instance, in the Philippines there was a 24 million dollar fund that ensured loss and damage would be considered as part of adaptation practices. International/national mechanisms can be effective but it will also be important to look at the community.

It was generally accepted that the more we invest, the more resilient we become. As such it was difficult to deal with developing states who were unaware of new mechanisms or did not have the capacity to access existing and new financial mechanisms that might have otherwise helped them reduce losses in the future. Cross border mechanisms should also be considered since disasters are not limited by borders.



*The second group discussed Research Gaps/Challenges as well as Tools and Approaches for Measuring Loss and Damage.*

## **Group 2: Research Gaps/Challenges as well as Tools and Approaches for Measuring Loss and Damage**

In the second group, participants discussed research gaps/challenges as well as potential tools and approaches for measuring loss and damage. In terms of the former, the group discussed items that advocacy must be evidence based on gaps/challenges. They identified a few research gaps that were the most interesting such as: what currently exists and what is needed; what does climate change mean in terms of disasters; are institutional arrangements adequate; what is needed to make institutions better? Additional questions that remained difficult to clarify included: the difference between addressing loss and damage and adaptation, the ability to downscale future climate change scenarios, and attribution of loss and damage due to climate change.

In terms of the tools and approaches, the group raised a question as to the role of participation in tools, current tools/approaches being used/valuation of loss and damage in terms of monetary and non-monetary assessments, the cost/benefit analysis needed to consider a wide range of factors, need to consider a level of uncertainty, issues with shifting baselines and economic valuations.

Further considering the effectiveness of risk transfer tools, the group explained the importance of providing other livelihood options. It was also considered that assessments of loss and damage from the community perspective must be better integrated with climate science. For instance there is a need to understand the risks related to climate change first (ie. study the vulnerability of crops).

As a way forward, the group made several suggestions. For instance a collection of tools for measuring loss and damage will be necessary and researcher should provide information on what they have been doing. A research group on non-economic losses and damage should be established as well as a group linking resilience to loss and damage. In terms of issues related with slow onset processes, it was put forth that Mr. Ali Sheikh could potentially get such a discussion going online. Finally, the group expressed interest in creating a matrix of activities from each member/organization since it would be incredibly useful in moving initiatives forward.

## **Follow Up/Next Steps**

Three items were discussed as follow-ups to the workshop.

Firstly, we are considering hosting side-events at the following conferences:

1. COP20, Peru in December 2014
2. Sendai, Japan in March 2015
3. CBA9, Kenya in April 2015
4. SBSTA Meeting, Germany in June 2015

We will share more information closer to the dates if/when we decide to host an event. Also, if anyone is interested in co-organizing an event with ICCCAD, please inform Stephanie Andrei: [andrei.stephanie@gmail.com](mailto:andrei.stephanie@gmail.com).

Secondly, Dr. Louis Lebel has agreed to take the lead on writing a "framing paper" on loss and damage with help from the group. Dr. Lebel has already started to receive feedback from participants of the workshop and a draft is currently being prepared. For those who have not yet sent their contributions, please send an email inquiry to: [louis@sea-user.org](mailto:louis@sea-user.org).

Thirdly, it was discussed to continue discussions using the LinkedIn Group. It would also be a good opportunity to share upcoming information, news and reports on loss and damage (particularly in the Asia Pacific). The link to the LinkedIn Group can be found [here](#).

## Annex 1. Loss and Damage Workshop Programme

Time	Activity
09:00-09:45	<b>Introductions</b> Dr. Saleemul Huq (Director, ICCCAD), Mr. Hiroshi Tsujihara (Director, APN-GCR), Dr. Linda Anne Stevenson (APN-GCR), and Puja Sawhney (IGES)
9:45-10:30	<b>Presentation</b> “Loss and Damage: What does it mean for national governments?” By: Erin Roberts (ICCCAD) + 15 min. Q&A Session
10:30-10:45	Tea & Coffee Break
10:45-12:00	<b>Presentations</b> 1. “Upcoming projects on loss and damage in the Asia Pacific” By: Harjeet Singh (ActionAid International) 2. “Analysis of longer-term recovery following disasters: opportunities for collaboration and methodological issues” By: Dr. Louis Lebel (Chiang Mai University) + 30 min. Q&A Session (Participants will sign up to the Group Work Session of their choice before breaking for lunch)
12:00-13:00	Lunch Provided at Putra World Trade Centre
13:00-15:30	<b>Group Work/Brainstorming Session</b> 1. <b>Research Gaps/Challenges</b> (chaired by Erin Roberts and Tanjir Hossain) a. What are the challenges with quantitative assessments? b. What kinds of methods can we use to address non-economic losses and damages? 2. <b>Tools/Approaches for Measuring L&amp;D</b> (chaired by Ali Sheikh) a. What kinds of tools exist for measuring losses and damages from sudden onset and slow onset processes? b. How do DRR and CCA measures differ? 3. <b>Financial Mechanisms for Supporting L&amp;D</b> (chaired by Dr. Linda Stevenson and Harjeet Singh) a. What is currently being discussed at the international level as potential financial mechanisms? b. How effective is insurance as a tool for supporting loss and damage? 4. <b>Links between Resilient Development and L&amp;D</b> (chaired by Dr. Louis Lebel) a. How could loss and damage systems influence resilient development? b. How could the resilience of development affect loss and damages?
15:30-16:00	Tea & Coffee Break
16:00-16:30	<b>Group Presentations</b>
16:30-17:00	<b>Next Steps</b> Dr. Saleemul Huq (Director, ICCCAD)

## Annex 2. Participants List

No.	Name	Organization	Email	Attended?
1	Tanjir Hossain	ActionAid Bangladesh	tanjir.hossain@actionaid.org	✓
2	Harjeet Singh	ActionAid International	harjeet.singh@actionaid.org	✓
3	Su El Nandar	ActionAid Myanmar	su.ei1991@gmail.com	✓
4	Mihir R. Bhatt	All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)	mihir@aidmi.org	
5	Linda Anne Stevenson	Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN-GCR)	lastevenson@apn-gcr.org	✓
6	Hiroshi Tsujihara	Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (APN-GCR)	htsujihara@apn-gcr.org	✓
7	Mihir Joshi	Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network (ADRRN)	mihir@seedsindia.org	✓
8	Mariam Zahan	ADRRN	Mariam@mercy.org.my	✓
9	Sanjay Vashist	CAN South Asia	sanjay@cansouthasia.net	✓
10	Aarjan Dixit	CARE International	adixit@careclimatechange.org	✓
11	Amirul Alam Shiplu	Center for Human Development & Management	ashiplu@hotmail.com	
12	Ibne Abu Masud	Center for Human Development & Management	chdm.ngo@email.com	
13	Trang Tran Thi Thu	Center for Technology Responding to Climate change - Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment	ttrang_1703@yahoo.com	
14	Saleem Khan Amsad Ibrahim Khan	Centre for Climate Change and Adaptation Research, Anna University, Chennai 600025, Tamil Nadu, India	asaleemkhan.cc@gmail.com	
15	Louis Lebel	Chiang Mai University	louis@sea-user.org	✓
16	Jessica Dator Bercilla	Christian Aid	JBercilla@christian-aid.org	✓
17	Senashia Ekanayake	Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA)	senashia@cansouthasia.net	
18	Vositha Wijenayake	Climate Action Network South Asia (CANSA)	vositha@cansouthasia.net	✓
19	Maria Josella Pangilinan	Conservation International	mpangilinan@conservation.org	✓
20	Nauman Haque	GIZ - Deutsche Gesellschaft fŸr Internationale Zusammenarbeit	haque.nauman@gmail.com	✓
21	Michael Hoppe	GIZ - Deutsche Gesellschaft fŸr Internationale Zusammenarbeit	michael.hoppe@giz.de	

22	Michael Siebert	GIZ - Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit	michael.siebert@giz.de	✓
23	Erin Roberts	International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD)	roberts.erin@gmail.com	✓
24	Saleemul Huq	International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD)	saleemul.huq@iied.org	✓
25	Stephanie Andrei	International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD)	andrei.stephanie@gmail.com	✓
26	Neera Shrestha Pradhan	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)	Neera.Pradhan@icimod.org	✓
27	Kairos dela Cruz	International Centre for Sustainable Cities (ICSC)	kairos@ejeepney.org	✓
28	Muchamad Arif Wijayanto	IFSA LC UGM (International Forestry Student Association Local Committee Universitas Gadjah Mada)	marifw44@gmail.com	
29	Puja Sawhney	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	sawhney@iges.or.jp	✓
30	Yi Ying Lee	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	ylee@alumni.duke.edu	
31	Ali Sheikh	LEAD Pakistan	atsheikh@lead.org.pk	✓
32	Hina Lotia	LEAD Pakistan	hlotia@lead.org.pk	✓
33	John Brinkman	Maryknoll NGO	comecore@yahoo.com	✓
34	Md. Hafiz Iqbal	Ministry of Education, Bangladesh	vaskoriqbal@yahoo.com	
35	A. S. A. Ferdous Alam	National University of Malaysia	rial.ferdous@gmail.com	✓
36	Md. Mahmudul Alam	National University of Malaysia	rony000@gmail.com	✓
37	Lubna Alam	National University of Malaysia	lubna_762120@yahoo.com	✓
38	Benoit Mayer	National University of Singapore	bmayer@nus.edu.sg	✓
39	Saroj Baniya	National Youth Council, Nepal	sarose.baniya@gmail.com	
40	Janice Ian Manlutac	Oxfam	jmanlutac@oxfam.org.uk	✓
41	Onis Ben Namu	SPC-GIZ	namuoben@gmail.com	
42	Navam Indrajith Niles	Sri Lanka Youth Climate Action Network	navam.niles@gmail.com	✓
43	Victor Arriaga Cervantes	The Climate Reality Project	victor.arriagac@gmail.com	
44	Perlyn M. Pulhin	The Oscar M. Lopez Center for Climate Change Adaptation	ppulhin@omlopezcenter.org	✓
45	Amy Reggers	UN Women	amy.reggers@unwomen.org	✓

46	Joanne Manda	UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre	joanne.manda@undp.org	
47	Jung Choi	UNDP Timor-Leste	activiachoi@gmail.com	
48	Jaeyoon Park	UNEP	jaeyoon.park@unep.org	✓
49	Mohammad Imam Hasan Reza	National University of Malaysia	rezamih@gmail.com	✓
50	John Duncan	University of Southampton	J.Duncan@soton.ac.uk	✓
51	Syed Emdadul Haque	United Nations University-International Institute for Global Health (UNU-IIGH)	emdad91@gmail.com; syed.emdadul@unu.edu; emdad@urb-bd.org	
52	Aung Kyaw Moe	WPNA	moe.aungkyaw51@gmail.com	
53	Sharan Raj Muniandy		raj28sharan@yahoo.com	