

SHELTER CLUSTER NEEDS AND GAPS ANALYSIS

MARCH 2011

SHELTER NEEDS AND GAPS ANALYSIS

1. INTRODUCTION

As part of the emergency response to the January 12th earthquake, so far 56,743 Transitional shelters have been built. . According to current plans submitted to the Shelter Cluster, a further 59,696 will be built, bringing the total to 116.000

Taking into account the current situation and the demand from the shelter partners to have a clear picture of the current needs by commune, the Shelter & Non Food Items (NFI) Cluster is trying to define the need and gaps in shelter assistance.

Based on the available sources of information, a preliminary analysis of needs has been carried out in order to determine the general situation. These information sources are

- IOM's database, called the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), of internally displaced people (IDPs) that have been registered in camps;
- Haitian Ministry of Public Works, Transportation and Communications (MTPTC) safety assessment of all structures in the earthquake-affected area.

A gaps analysis is also presented,, taking into account the above-mentioned sources and the last updated Shelter Cluster data. (March 2011)

It is highly recognized that at this time there are new challenges in terms of missing information that should be included in the analysis. These are:

- Self-reconstruction by commune: Reconstruction done by the community themselves.
- Data from Faith Based Organization (FBO) that are not part of the Shelter Cluster
- Data from government projects and Private sector projects

In order to factor in this information into the analysis, a field assessment will be carried out at the commune level in the coming weeks. Once this exercise is complete, a more detailed report will be produced. However, for the time being this initial report based on the above listed sources will provide a general estimate of possible gaps in provision in the earthquake-affected area.

2. IOM - DISPLACEMENT TRACKING MATRIX

The IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) is used to track the location on internally displaced people (IDPs) moving in and out of the many spontaneous settlements formed after the earthquake of January 12th.

"This is a monitoring tool to collect the most updated data on the earthquake affected internally displaced persons (IDP) population living in IDP sites in Haiti. The DTM was initially rolled out in March 2010, and was further revised (DTM v2.0) in October 2010 under the supervision of the IOM Data Management Unit with the data collection being undertaken by IOM directly.

The estimated IDP population in March 2011 is about 680,000 individuals. This indicates a decrease of 56% compared to the estimated 1,500,000 individuals reported living in IDP sites in July 2010¹".

¹ IOM. Displacement Tracking Matrix V2.0 Update. March 2011

2.1. Coverage of the Data

The data analysed by the cluster covers all of the people registered in IDP camps across the earthquake affected area, but does not cover people affected by the earthquake living outside of IDP camps registered by IOM, including: people living on their original plot of land, people living with host families, people having migrated outside the earthquake affected area and people living in camps of less than ten families.

Commune	Sites January	Sites March	Households January	Households March	Individuals January	Individuals March
CARREFOUR	140	127	16,742	15,658	68,398	64,549
CITE SOLEIL	47	46	6,782	6,348	26,529	25,236
CROIX-DES-BOUQUETS	83	81	24,022	17,805	94,891	70,309
DELMAS	248	231	57,326	51,265	244,068	212,043
GANTHIER	5	4	734	404	2,593	1,998
PORT-AU-PRINCE	167	162	49,880	47,059	207,755	183,804
TABARRE	76	76	11,801	11,289	48,208	45,546
PETION-VILLE	89	77	12,331	10,136	50,781	39,348
GRAND-GOAVE	39	37	1,742	832	6,983	2,285
GRESSIER	36	34	1,415	1,109	5,013	3,147
JACMEL	21	19	1,772	1,241	7,893	4,492
LEOGANE	118	93	6,756	5,553	26,054	18,591
PETIT-GOAVE	83	74	4,473	2,608	17,211	9,146
Total	1,152	1,061	195,776	171,307	806,377	680,494
Difference January - March	Sites	-91	Households	-24,469	Individuals	-125,883
% of January	Found in March	92%	Found in March	88%	Found in March	84%
% of decrease in March		8%		12%		16%

Table 1. Source: IOM –DTM March 2011

2.2. Methodology:

Based on the previous IDP Registration report of October 2010, the percentage of IDPs who were tenants, owners of a repairable house or owners of a house which could not be repaired, was applied to the current IDP populations reported in March. This calculation assumes that the same percentages are applicable, which is unlikely to be true; however, in the absence of any other current data on house ownership/repairability, this has been used as an approximate measure. (According to the last DTM report and the last IOM surveys it is estimated that higher percentage of tenants remains in the camps while the owner that can repair have left the camps. However there is no systematic way to obtain a percentage that we could assume for this analysis.

Owner can Repair	Owner can not Repair	Tenant	NA
19,29%	15,10%	60,16%	5,46%

Table 2. Shelter Cluster analysis based on DTM report November 2010

2.3 Resulting Indicator for Transitional/Permanent Shelter Needs

The light grey column represents data taken directly out of the DTM, the yellow and red columns represent the data obtained after applying the percentage above-mentioned

and the dark grey column represent estimated of total needs of shelter based on the data of Owner (can not repair), Tenant and NA (not applicable). This result could be interpreted as a total need of T-shelter or as a need of both shelter solutions: permanent houses and T-shelters.

Commune	IDPS IN CAMPS (march 2011)	OWNER can repair	OWNER can not repair	Tenant	NA	Estimated of total need of shelter*
Carrefour	15.658	3.020	2.364	9.420	854	12.638
Cite Soleil	6.348	1.224	958	3.819	346	5.124
Croix-Des-Bouquets	17.805	3.434	2.688	10.711	972	14.371
Delmas	51.265	9.887	7.740	30.841	2.797	41.378
Grand-Goâve	832	160	126	501	45	672
Gressier	1.109	214	167	667	61	895
Léogâne	5.553	1.071	838	3.341	303	4.482
Pétion-Ville	10.136	1.955	1.530	6.098	553	8.181
Petit-Goâve	2.608	503	394	1.569	142	2.105
Port-au-Prince	47.059	9.076	7.105	28.311	2.568	37.983
Tabarre	11.289	2.177	1.704	6.791	616	9.112
Ganthier	404	78	61	243	22	326
Jacmel	1.241	239	187	747	68	1.002
	171.307	33.038	25.864	103.058	9.347	138.269

Table 3. Estimated of total needs of Shelters (T-Shelters and/or permanent houses)

2.4 Special considerations:

- This result is based only on the people living in camps, it is important to highlight that the information of other affected population such as the ones that are living in emergency shelters on their plot of land (reparable or un-reparable residences) is not included, due to the lack of systematic information. In Port au Prince (including metropolitan area) and municipalities outside, there is certain percentage (not defined officially) of affected population living in these conditions.

2.5 Gap Analysis:

A comparison between the needs identified from the DTM data and the planned permanent and transitional solutions reported to the Shelter Cluster (which have still to be built) offers a general idea about the probable remaining gaps in shelter assistance, once all the planned shelter projects are complete.

The dark grey column represents DTM-based needs data, the light grey column indicates permanent and transitional shelter still to be built (from the Shelter Cluster database) and the orange column represents the difference between these two columns.

Commune	Estimated of total needs of shelter*	Remining planning for 2011*	Estimated GAP of shelter**
Carrefour	12.638	3.876	8762
Cite Soleil	5.124	680	4444
Croix-Des-Bouquets	14.371	4.550	9821
Delmas	41.378	3.818	37560
Grand-Goâve	672	1.562	-890
Gressier	895	1.988	-1093
Léogâne	4.482	19.936	-15454
Pétion-Ville	8.181	308	7873
Petit-Goâve	2.105	3.168	-1063
Port-au-Prince	37.983	16.467	21516
Tabarre	9.112	2.295	6817
Ganthier	326	0	326
Jacmel	1.002	4.692	-3690
Others	0	1.000	-1000
* Difference between Total planned and completed (Tshetler and permanent houses)			
** Repairs are not taking into account			

Table 4. Gaps Analysis based on IOM-DTM data and Shelter Cluster data. March 2011

2.6 Results:

- Port au Prince and Delmas municipalities represent the critical cases where the gaps are 29% and 51% respectively.
- In Carrefour (12%), Croix de Bouquets (13%), Petion Ville (11%) and Tabarre (9%), the gaps represent in total the 45% of the total gap.
- **Note:** As mentioned before, the reliability of this analysis decreases outside of the Port-au-Prince and wider affected area. There is no systematic information that shows the needs of affected population outside the camps and it is clear according to field visits and Shelter cluster partners knowledge of those areas that there are needs outside the camps that have not been identified systematically.
- In Petion Ville (11%) a new structure of coordination will be put in place. So far four (4) Shelter Cluster partners have activities in this municipality; however the planned shelter figures are low according to the needs.

3. MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS (MTPTC) - BUILDING SAFETY ASSESSMENT

The Ministry of Public Works, Transportation and Communications (MTPTC), in close cooperation with UNOPS and PADF, have been conducting a structural damage evaluation of all buildings in the earthquake-affected area. The goal of the assessment is to determine which structures are safe for habitation and which are unsafe.

“The structural damage evaluations conducted by MTPTC have been conducted by teams of engineers doing door-to-door visits to all affected structures in the earthquake area and categorising them based of the Applied Technology Council’s “ATC 20” is the post-earthquake safety assessment methodology. That methodology describes the following three categories of post-earthquake building safety assessments:

- Red – structures that are unsafe to enter or occupy;

- Yellow – structures that should have restricted use, but could be made safe for occupancy through targeted repairs;
- Green – structures safe enough for immediate lawful occupancy.”²

3.1 Coverage of the Data

So far, 392,697 buildings have been assessed (Feb. 2011); it represents the 98.17% of the planned assessments by MTPTC. 213,335 buildings have been tagged as green, 98,457 as yellow, 80,160 as red and 4119 have no category. The previous T-shelter needs analysis carried out by Shelter Cluster in 2010, was done while the 62.5% of the assessment were completed.

In order to make this analysis the most accurate possible, MTPTC have also provided an estimated percentage of coverage by municipality of the areas that were assessed - see table below:

	% of estimated coverage*	MTPTC Red Real	MTPTC RED +estimated % no cover	MTPTC Yellow Real	MTPTC Yellow +estimated % no cover	MTPTC Green Real	MTPTC Green +estimated % no cover	Total by MTPTC	Total Estimated
Cabaret	30%	396	1320	784	2613	1270	4233	2450	8167
Carrefour	92%	11874	12907	16092	17491	33792	36730	61758	67128
Cite Soleil	20%	2169	10845	3651	18255	6112	30560	11932	59660
Croix-Des-Bouquets	61%	7771	12687	12840	20963	32587	53203	53198	86854
Delmas	85%	10121	11907	17341	20401	33275	39147	60737	71455
Grand-Goâve	1%	1	100	9	900	16	1600	26	2600
Gressier	67%	2655	3983	1984	2976	2066	3099	6705	10058
Léogâne	43%	8218	18965	3821	8818	4137	9547	16176	37329
Pétion-Ville	80%	5604	7005	9113	11391	35677	44596	50394	62993
Petit-Goâve	1%	25	2500	31	3100	76	7600	132	13200
Port-au-Prince	85%	25201	29648	25107	29538	36136	42513	86444	101699
Tabarre	95%	2320	2442	4410	4642	14516	15280	21246	22364
Kenscoff	90%	85	94	363	363	953	1059	1401	1516
Ganthier	40%	1777	4443	521	1303	4673	11683	6971	17428
Thomazeau	30%	121	403	595	1983	1184	3947	1900	6333
Bainet	30%	146	487	250	833	429	1430	825	2750
Cayes-Jacmel	40%	862	2155	353	883	1186	2965	2401	6003
Cote-De-Fer	1%	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
Jacmel	50%	814	1628	1191	2382	1876	3752	3881	7762
Total		80160	123518	98457	148935	209961	209961	388578	482415

* Source: UNOPS March 2011

Table 5. MTPTC structural damage evaluations, real and estimated data.

3.2 Special considerations:

- Municipalities such as Carrefour, Delmas, Petion Ville, Port au Prince, Tabarre, and Kenscoff have a percentage of coverage of more than 80%. Based on this we can assume this data as the most accurate one in order to proceed with the gap analysis.
- For municipalities such as Petit&Grand Goave and Cote-De-Fer where the percentage of coverage is 1%, it is not possible use this data for any analysis. Nota: Any of the rural areas of the provinces have been assessed, according to shelter cluster partners that are working in those there are need that have not been identified ye.

² Shelter Cluster. Transitional Shelter Needs Analysis. September 2010
DRAFT updated 13/042011

- In municipalities such as Cabaret, Croix des Bouquets, Cite de Soleil, Gressier, Leogane, Ganthier, Thomazeau, Bainet, Cayes-Jacmel and Jacmel, the assessments were done approximately in 34% of the territory. Hence, the above-mentioned results should be used only as a general idea; more detailed sources of information should be included into the analysis. Note: Rural areas were not assessed, according to Shelter Cluster partners gaps remind in those areas.

Cite de Soleil was not assed by MTPTC for security issues; hence no concrete information is available. Other sources of information were contacted to identify the current situation in the area, however there is no systematic study about the damage.

3.3 Gap Analysis of Red and Yellow Building:

A comparison between this MTPTC based needs analysis and the Shelter Cluster data offers a general idea about the probable future gaps in shelter assistance once all the planned T-shelter, permanent houses and repairs projects are completed.

3.3.1 Red Building

Commune	MTPTC RED +estimated % no cover	Planned Permanent houses + T-shelters	GAP - Total planned Permanent and T-shelter
Cabaret	1320	50	1270
Carrefour	12907	9670	3237
Cite Soleil	10845	962	9883
Croix-Des-Bouquets	12687	9943	2744
Delmas	11907	6957	4950
Gressier	3983	4971	-989
Léogâne	18965	35547	-16582
Pétion-Ville	7005	1183	5822
Port-au-Prince	29648	26899	2749
Tabarre	2442	4384	-1942
Kenscoff	94	0	94
Ganthier	4443	0	4443
Thomazeau	403	5000	-4597
Bainet	487	668	-181
Cayes-Jacmel	2155	250	1905
Jacmel	1628	7299	-5671

Table 6. Gap Analysis of T-shelters (or Permanent houses) based on MTPTC building safety assessments.

- According to this comparison, Carrefour, Delmas, Petion Ville and Port au Prince are the municipalities in which there are major gaps
- The indication is that there will be an over-supply of shelter solutions in Tabarre of 1,942 T-shelters. However, it is important to highlight that 95% of the municipality was assessed, and the result shows that 4642 houses should be repaired; so far according to Shelter Cluster Data, very few agencies are planning to conduct repairs – therefore transitional/permanent solutions may serve to fill the shortfall in repair activities

- The results indicate that there will be an over-supply of approximately 16,552 T-shelters and permanent houses in Leogane It is worth bearing in mind that the coverage of MTPTC assessments in this area was only 43% in the urban area so may not present a completely accurate picture, and that cluster partners indicate that periurban and rural areas have not been taken into account, (mostly all the population is living in those areas).
- The same caveats apply for Cabaret, Croix des Bouquets, Cite de Soleil, Gressier, Ganthier, Thomazeau, Bainet, Cayes-Jacmel and Jacmel

3.3.2 Yellow buildings

Commune	MTPTC Yellow +estimated % no cover	Total Planned Repairs	GAP Repairs
Cabaret	2613	0	2613
Carrefour	17491	25	17466
Cite Soleil	18255	0	18255
Croix-Des-Bouquets	20963	0	20963
Delmas	20401	2350	18051
Grand-Goâve	900	0	900
Gressier	2976	200	2776
Léogâne	8818	720	8098
Pétion-Ville	11391	0	11391
Petit-Goâve	3100	500	2600
Port-au-Prince	29538	2174	27364
Tabarre	4642	0	4642
Kenscoff	363	0	363
Ganthier	1303	0	1303
Thomazeau	1983	0	1983
Bainet	833	146	687
Cayes-Jacmel	883	169	714
Cote-De-Fer	100	750	-650
Jacmel	2382	1332	1050

Table 7. Gap Analysis of repairs based on MTPTC building safety assessments.

- Based on the above-mentioned results, all the municipalities except Cote-De-Fer are under-served in terms of repairs. According to Shelter Cluster data, 13 partners have projects of repairs, 7 of them working on the Southeast department.

4. ANALYSIS: Triangulation

PCODES	Commune	GAP - Red Houses: T-shelters and/or Permanent houses*	GAP- Yellow houses: Repairs (or T- shelters)*	GAP DTM: T-shelters
142	Cabaret			
113	Carrefour	3.237	17.466	8.765
117	Cite Soleil			4.444
131	Croix-Des-Bouquets	2.744	20.963	9.821
112	Delmas	4.950	18.051	37.560
123	Grand-Goâve			
116	Gressier			
121	Léogâne			
114	Pétion-Ville	6.145	11.391	7.746
122	Petit-Goâve			
111	Port-au-Prince	2.899	27.364	21.654
118	Tabarre	-1.942	4.642	6.817
115	Kenscoff			
133	Ganthier			
132	Thomazeau			
221	Bainet			
213	Cayes-Jacmel			
222	Cote-De-Fer			
211	Jacmel			
	Others			
	Total	18.033	99.878	
	Gran Total	117.911		96.808

*Due to the lack of information about projects of permanent solutions such as permanent housing and repairs, it is assumed that those population will need a transitional shelter solutions before they get something more durable.

1. Based on the above-mentioned information the most accurate results are from Carrefour, Croix-des-Bouquets, Delmas, Petion Ville, Port Au Prince and Tabarre. Information from the region is not considered till more accurate information about needs is gathered.
2. Delmas and Port u Prince remain the most critical communes due to high level of gaps.
3. Petion Ville is under-server, few shelter partners are carrying out projects in this commune.
4. Situation in Cite Soleil is uncertain, as in Petion Ville few shelter cluster partners are working in this area.
5. A data collection process of needs in the provinces should be carried on in order to have a more accurate idea of the gaps in those territories.

HOW TO IMPROVE THE RESULT OF THE PREVIOUS ANALYSIS?

4. WEAKNESS OF THE SHELTER NEED ANALYSIS BASED ON IOM, MTPTC AND SHELTER CLUSTER DATA:

- The sources of information used for the previous analysis all have their caveats when used in this way to derive needs, so the results remains indicative only.
- Information about IDPs living outside the camps has not been gathered systematically in all the affected territory.
- MTPTC structural damage evaluations were focussed in Port au Prince and the metropolitan area. There is a gap of coverage in municipalities such is Petit Goave, Grand Goave, Leogane, Cabaret, Thomazeau, Cote-de-Fer, and Marigot. This analysis has provided an indication of the percentage of territory that was not covered, as it is accepted that there is less confidence in the accuracy of the results of the analysis in these areas.
- The Shelter Cluster database does not guarantee that the reported planned activities have all been funded (and therefore will definitely be built) A strong information management process was put in place to gather the most accurate information, but not all the shelter cluster partners contribute into the process. The planning figures are only as robust as the information provided to the cluster.
- According to field experience of Shelter Cluster Partners, and to feedback from other organizations, there are some pieces of information that should be included into the analysis in order to obtain the most accurate result. It is the intention of the cluster to update this analysis as soon as information on these factors can be collected or collated:
 - ✓ Data of shelter needs in those areas where MTPTC carried out assessments in less than 60% of the territory.
 - ✓ Data of people living outside the camps in emergency shelters on their plot of land (reparable or un-reparable residences)
 - ✓ Data of self reconstruction: residence that have been rebuild by the families themselves.
 - ✓ Data from Faith Based Organizations (FBO) that are not part of the Shelter Cluster.
 - ✓ Data from Local NGO's and CBO that are not part of the shelter cluster and do not work in partnership with Shelter Cluster Partners.
 - ✓ Data from governmental projects
 - ✓ Data from Private sector projects
 - ✓ Other projects.