

Nepal Earthquake Response Bhaktapur District - Factsheet

SHELTER RECOVERY ASSESSMENT, 17-18 MAY 2015 [Population: 304,651* Households: 68,636*]

*Based on 2011 Nepal census

Summary

On 25 April 2015, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake struck Nepal with its epicenter in Lamjung District, approximately 81 km northwest of the country capital, Kathmandu. Another earthquake of magnitude 7.3 followed on 12 May 2015 in Dolakha District. REACH, through its partnership with the Global Shelter Cluster, was deployed to Nepal to facilitate the development of a comprehensive shelter and settlements recovery strategy for the Nepal Shelter Cluster, and establish a baseline for analysis of the recovery process. The data presented in this factsheet is the result of a stratified, random survey of 122 households, including those with damaged and non-damaged shelters. Findings can be generalised at district level with a 95% level of confidence and a 10% margin of error.




Demographics

6.0 Average household size

Age Distribution

49% Male / 51% Female



20% Female-headed households

3% Households with only one member over the age of 18

16% Households who are renting

9% Households with physically disabled

4% Households hosting separated, orphaned

Displacement

66% of households reported that they are not living in the same shelter as before the earthquakes


1 min Median travel time from current shelter to original house

7% of households are 10 minutes or more from their original house


Households that are 10 minutes or more from their original house are predominantly **with family in a different community**.

Reported reasons for displacement

(Respondents could report multiple reasons)




Intentions of displaced households



Return to original house	12%	32%
Stay in temporary shelter	81%	44%
Move to another shelter	1%	10%
Don't know	5%	14%

Where displaced households are staying




Housing Damage


82% of households reported housing damage as a result of the earthquakes

Reported damage by housing typology

Walls mud-bonded brick/stone
Roof slate / tile
Housing type prevalence 14%




Walls cement-bonded brick/stone
Roof CGI
Housing type prevalence 3%




56% of households reported that they feel unsafe in the shelter they are currently living in

Walls mud-bonded brick/stone
Roof corrugated galvanised iron (CGI)
Housing type prevalence 30%



Walls reinforced concrete cement (RCC)
Roof RCC
Housing type prevalence 46%



Temporary Shelter

Of households that sustained housing damage:

42% reported that they have constructed or are constructing temporary shelters

42% of all households surveyed reported that they have received material shelter assistance


0% reported that they have received cash assistance

Reported emergency shelter needs

	1st need	2nd need	3rd need
Durable construction materials	55%	67%	51%
Shelter materials	18%	15%	25%
Blankets/mats	0%	1%	1%
Tools	3%	1%	1%
Labour	0%	2%	0%
Technical assistance	16%	11%	12%
Other	8%	2%	9%

Top types of material shelter assistance received

(Respondents could report multiple types)




Housing Recovery

Of households reporting housing damage:

- 8%** of households reported that they have started repairing or rebuilding their original house
- 25%** of these **8** households reported that they have received support to repair or rebuild
- 62%** of households that sustained housing damage reported that they need support to remove debris

Top 4 reported repair / rebuild needs

(Respondents could report multiple needs)




Female-headed household recovery

(Due to the small sample size, it should be noted that the information below is not statistically significant)

- 9%** of female-headed households reported that they are repairing or rebuilding their original house
- 0%** of these **2** households reported that they have received support to repair or rebuild
- 77%** of households that sustained housing damage reported that they need support to remove debris


Access to needed repair / rebuild materials



Communication

Top 3 ways of receiving public information

(Respondents could report multiple ways)



- 57%** of households reported knowing of someone in the community who was consulted before aid delivery

Public Services

Reported inability to access to services and primary reason

Of all assessed households:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 10% Health services
Facility destroyed in earthquake | 17% Municipal services
Lack of documentation | 20% Education
Facility destroyed in earthquake |
|--|--|--|

Reported Household Needs

Priority NFI needs

(Respondents' reported top three needs)

	1st need	2nd need	3rd need
Blankets/mats	51%	13%	25%
Hygiene items	14%	11%	22%
Torches	13%	7%	9%
Gas/fuel	8%	13%	16%
Kitchen items	6%	26%	9%

Priority household needs


(Respondents' reported top three needs)

	1st need	2nd need	3rd need
Shelter/Housing	50%	10%	5%
Drinking water	23%	13%	5%
Employment/Jobs	8%	12%	12%
Wastewater disposal system	6%	4%	6%
Food	4%	18%	9%

WASH


- 17%** of households reported that their pre-earthquake source of drinking water was damaged
- 11%** of households reported that their sanitation system was completely destroyed or heavily damaged

Source of drinking water



- 23%** of households reported a decline in water quality
- 29%** of households reported a decrease in water quantity

Type of toilet facility



- 11%** Households sharing toilet facilities with other households
- 3.2** Average # of households per toilet
- 25%**
- 3.7**

Livelihoods

Top 5 reported livelihoods prior to earthquakes

(Respondents could report multiple livelihoods)



- 71%** of households reported a decrease in income immediately after the earthquakes
- 0%** of households reporting a decrease in income said that their income has since been fully restored
- 49%** of households reporting a decrease in income said that their income has since been partially restored

Livestock ownership

- 37%** of households kept livestock prior to the earthquakes
- On average, **7%** of these households' livestock died or were lost as a result of the earthquakes