

# Advancing the Dialogue and Action on Loss and Damage

Sivapuram Venkata Rama Krishna Prabhakar

Presented at COP28 Side Event Dealing with Loss and Damage, Monday 11  
December, 10:00 – 11:00, WMO-IPCC Pavilion (Online)

- The loss and damage working group was established at the World Adaptation Science Program with an objective of furthering the science-based policy solutions to **Averting, minimizing, and addressing** loss and damages. The group consists of two co-chairs (Edmond Totin and Bhim Adhikari) and more than 15 members representing various academic research and policy backgrounds.
- As its **mandate**, the group has started reviewing the literature to distil policy-relevant solutions from the existing scientific literature.
- **Policy brief on L&D** and reviewed the literature.
- This is where I should recognize the considerable contributions made by **Prof Saleemul Huq** to the science and policy areas. The policy brief included several papers contributed by him.
- One of the qualities of Prof Huq is that he is one of the **great orators and writers** that I have seen in the climate change fraternity and rightly he is the best messenger for the complexity that adaptation and L&D brings.

# Messages: There is a need to declutter the L&D

- Just like adaptation, L&D has grown into an extensive science and policy area and things are very complicated even for the researchers to take a stock of it and to provide solutions. A large part of this confusion is coming from the disjoint between the global negotiations and at the national level. While at the ground level, most L&D solutions are largely drawn from the adaptation, which includes early warning, insurance, relocation etc etc. We often hear from national level stakeholders if they should consider L&D within the adaptation framework or it should be treated separately and they are not sure why it should be considered separately while many solutions are similar or same as that of solutions discussed in adaptation.
- More than 90% of the solution space of L&D comes from the GHG mitigation, CCA and DRR.

# There is a very less information on the residual risks and adaptation limits

- We also realized that there is a very less information on the residual risks i.e. risks remaining after implementing all known adaptation solutions at any given point of time in the future in a specific country context. This is an important limitation since without knowing residual risks, it is difficult to take a stock of L&D.
- Closely related is the soft and hard **limits to adaptation**. There is a need to take a clear stock of these limitations and what it means for strengthening adaptation. Which geographical area and sector is likely to receive adaptation limits in a country is not know.

# Economic L&D receiving more attention

- There is an undue/disproportionate emphasis on economic L&D in solution space compared to the NELDs.
- Several reasons for this is that
  - policy decisions have **traditionally** been focused on economic aspects of the life, so the awareness on the importance of NELDs in sustainable, rapid and robust adaptation is lacking.
  - L&D databases are disproportionately populated with economic indicators, and these databases inform the research and policy decisions going forward
  - **expertise required** to work on NELDs is yet to be fully strengthened in the line departments.

# The contentious issues

- Whether to keep **L&D outside the adaptation framework** at the national level or to integrate with the adaptation actions is yet to reach a consensus. This determines whether and how to prepare a national level L&D framework that strongly coordinates with the adaptation framework.
- Whether to **monetize NELDs** or not is another contentious issue. Many believed that monetization will not bring any additional advantage while other draw our attention to the monetization of carbon, ecosystem services etc which in itself is a growing field of science and policy.
- **Transboundary planned relocation**, how to deal with this subject within the science and policy framework is another area that needs significant debate and solutions.

# Thank You

[prabhakar@iges.or.jp](mailto:prabhakar@iges.or.jp)