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INTRODUCTION

The Inter-Agency Common Feedback Project, referred to as the Common Feedback Project (CFP), is an innovative community engagement project, initiated during the response to the Nepal Earthquake 2015. It is funded by UK Aid, and is based in the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office, enabling a strategic connection with humanitarian response and recovery.

CFP is designed to help the humanitarian and recovery communities understand the perceptions of affected people relating to services, respondents’ sense of agency, outcomes and the quality of relations between aid providers and the affected population. CFP is a common service to collect, aggregate, analyze and elevate feedback from disaster affected communities, which can then be used by humanitarian partners. Feedback is collected through a variety of ways, including:

- Community perception surveys
- Focus group discussions
- Aggregation of 3W feedback from partner organizations

The objective of CFP is to ensure that the voices of affected people systematically feed into humanitarian response and recovery, to contribute to a more effective and responsive recovery effort. It provides support to the entire UN Country Team and the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), including all clusters and organizations, the Government of Nepal, donors, development partners, civil society and other actors, to help them understand the issues of affected communities in real time. Consequently, CFP can assist these actors to adapt policies and programmes to strengthen the effectiveness of recovery work to the specific circumstances and concerns of communities, as well as improve communication with affected people.

The project’s model has since been incorporated into Emergency Response Preparedness planning endorsed by the national government and the UN system. In addition, as a response to the historic flooding across Nepal in summer 2017, CFP was able to expand its work into the flood affected districts due to the continued generosity of UK Aid. In 2017, the project received an additional grant from the UN Development Group to pilot its innovative approach to systematic community engagement in the least developed regions of Nepal on key development priorities. As such, CFP’s mandate has expanded, now encompassing the entire humanitarian development cycle: response, recovery, development and preparedness.

CFP is one of the first projects of its kind. Its mandate closely aligns with the future direction of the humanitarian system, particularly the Grand Bargain as it is directly related to the participant revolution.

For more information on the perceptions of earthquake and flood affected communities, please refer to previous reports from the Common Feedback Project found at the following webpage: http://cfp.org.np/reports/
KEY FINDINGS

Over the course of 2018 the Inter-Agency Common Feedback project collected feedback from earthquake affected communities in 17 districts through three rounds of community perception surveys. A total of 7,740 respondents across 118 gaun/nagar palikas were interviewed to collect their perceptions, thoughts and feelings. The questionnaire included thematic questions around reconstruction, food security and livelihood and protection. This quantitative feedback was augmented by 20 focus group discussions with affected communities in Dhading, Gorkha, Nuwakot, Rasuwa, Lamjung, Makwanpur, Ramechhap, Sindhupalchowk, Okhaldhunga and Sindhuli, as well as analysis of feedback submitted by partner organizations.

Throughout the year there has been progress on completed reconstruction, from 36 percent in May to 49 percent in November. This shows more than half (51 percent) have yet to finish the reconstruction process.

Although progress is being made in reconstruction, the percentage of respondents taking loans to finance their reconstruction is also noteworthy. A total of 50 percent of respondents reported taking a loan to finance their reconstruction. A majority of them (65 percent) are borrowed from informal sources with high interest rates. The heavy debt burden also extends to livelihood recovery. 35 percent of respondents feel that they face livelihood constraints, with 24 percent stating that the burden of a loan is a significant constraint. Ultimately, this could lead to a substantial impact on the overall economic recovery of the affected communities for years to come.

Although water supply has been considered communities’ biggest reconstruction need following building houses, this is lessening with only 36 percent of respondents declaring this as their biggest issue, compared to 41 percent previously. However, the need for roads has been an increasing trend, jumping from 16 percent to 23 percent.

There has been a consistent difference in the awareness levels of women and men. Women feel less informed compared to their male counterparts, for example in terms of safe building practices, training information and information on reconstruction support.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Although reconstruction has progressed over the year, 34 percent of earthquake affected people are still living either in temporary shelters or in their original damaged house. It is essential to address the issues of those still living in these types of conditions.

Long term debt resulting from borrowing at high interest rates could have a negative impact on earthquake affected peoples over a long period of time. The issue of access to reasonable finance needs to be taken up seriously by all partners working in the reconstruction and recovery process. We must now determine how to bring sustainable finance options to communities.

From 2016 to 2018, the information gap between men and women does not appear to have improved. Information about the reconstruction is reaching communities, however it does not reach as many women as it does men. To make progress on closing the gap between men and women, women specific communication strategies must be developed.

Trend of information gap between men and women

It is also equally essential to ensure the mainstreaming of women into the reconstruction process. This can be done by producing targeted information, engaging them in training and enabling them to take on reconstruction responsibilities of their own.
PERCEPTION SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In 2018 CFP wanted to expand its survey tool, to ensure the voices and perspectives of all communities with equal levels of damage were being covered. In previous years, the sampling had been contained to only the 14 priority affected districts. With changes in the new federal structure, as well as the recognition that many pockets outside of the 14 priority districts had been severely affected, CFP adapted its methodology to ensure the inclusion of these areas.

To undertake the Community Perception Survey, 40 enumerators were trained over three days on the survey questionnaire and sampling methodology. The enumerators were then deployed across the earthquake affected rural/urban municipalities to collect data over the course of two weeks from a total of 2580 respondents. All data collection is completed with mobile tablets using KoBo Toolbox.

Inclusion criteria

All gaunpalika and nagarpalika in which 50 percent or more of the households are eligible for the housing reconstruction grant (damage grades 3-5 based on the Central Bureau of Statistics damage assessment) were considered heavily affected and included in the survey area. This totaled 118 rural/urban municipalities. These local units were then distributed among three survey rounds to ensure that all heavily affected gaunpalika/nagarpalika would be surveyed over the course of 2018.

Sample frame

In each survey round, three wards are randomly selected for sampling in each rural municipality and four wards in each urban municipality. Twenty household level surveys are collected in each ward. A total of 60 samples are collected from each rural municipality and 80 from each urban municipality, for a total of 1860 households from 31 gaunpalika, and 720 households from nine nagarpalika.

Once the wards have been selected, enumerators travel to the nearest settlement of that ward and begin to identify respondents for the survey. Respondents are randomly selected from within the pool of available, eligible respondents in the given settlement. Enumerators will conduct a household level survey with one respondent before moving on to the next available household.

Once inside the household, enumerators interview an individual above 15 years of age from the pool of eligible respondents present in the home at the time of the survey. The enumerator selects respondents from different age groups and genders at each home, to ensure the sample is demographically diverse and reflects the population from the survey area.
Total of 2580 household surveys were collected across 39 affected Gaun/Nagar palikas in Distribution by Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kavrepalanchok</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhuli</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhupalchowk</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorkha</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhading</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuwakot</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramechhap</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolakha</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solukhumbu</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasuwa</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makwanpur</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamjung</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okhaldhunga</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalitpur</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution by caste/ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhetri</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newar</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magar</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rai</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurung</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janajati</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherpa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution by Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaun Palika (Rural Municipality)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar Palika (Urban municipality)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution by marital status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/Widower</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married but spouse is out of home</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother tongue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newari</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rai</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurung</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherpa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How severely did the earthquake damage your home?

- Heavily damaged (50%)
- Completely damaged (46%)
- Minor damage (4%)

What is the current status of your home?

- 49% Reconstruction completed
- 28% Reconstruction not yet started (planned)
- 12% Repair completed
- 3% Repair started
- 1% Totally damaged, Rubble cleared
- 1% Old house is as it is but built new one
- 2% Totally damaged, Rubble not cleared
- 2% Old house is as it is but built new one

Heavily damaged (50%)
Completely damaged (46%)
Minor damage (4%)
Where is your family currently living?

- In our newly constructed house (47%)
- In a temporary shelter (21%)
- In our original repaired house (16%)
- In our original damaged house (13%)
- With friends/relatives (2%)
- In a rented house (1%)

Is your family in the housing grant beneficiary list?

- Yes (91%)
- No, but we should be eligible (9%)

Have you received any government tranche to date?

- Third tranche (42%)
- Second tranche (32%)
- First tranche (16%)
- None (10%)
RECONSTRUCTION
Among 2580 respondents across 40 affected palikas, 72 percent say their main reconstruction needs are being met. An overall increase of 9 percent has been observed over the course of three rounds of community perception surveys conducted in 2018.

Among districts, Solukhumbu is the most dissatisfied, with only 14 percent of respondents saying their main reconstruction needs are being met. Comparatively, the most satisfied districts are Ramechhap (91 percent), Sindhupalchowk (88 percent) and Gorkha (88 percent).

Over 2018 the prioritization of financial resources among those who say their main reconstruction needs are not addressed has remain consistent. The need for building materials has also increased from 11 percent to 53 percent.
Differences by caste/ethnicity

Top unmet reconstruction needs

- Financial resources: 83% (Completely yes)
- Building materials: 53% (Somewhat yes)
- Skilled labour: 12% (Not very much)
- Access to roads/vehicles: 11% (Not at all)

Not at all
Not very much
Somewhat yes
Completely yes

Tamang
Chhetri
Brahmin
Newar
Dalit
Magar
Rai
Gurung
Janajati
BUILDING MATERIALS

DISTRICTS
Sindhupalchowk
Gorkha
Ramechhap
Dhading
Rasuwa
Nuwakot

FEEDBACK SOURCE
Focus group discussion
Survey
Key informant interviews

Communities are concerned about the high cost of building materials, which has resulted in negotiating the standard of safer building practices and delays in the reconstruction process. Because of the market price inflation of building materials, people in the communities are unable to meet the required safety practices necessary to build earthquake resistant houses.

“Everyone in the village has rebuilt now, and just about everyone has received, or is waiting for, the third tranche-- but I know that no house in this village used reinforcing rod more than 12mm, most of them used 8 or 10mm. Heavy rods are just too expensive.”

- Lapa, Dhading
88 percent of respondents said that they have the information they need to access housing reconstruction support.

Over 2018, there has been an increase in those who have information to access reconstruction support from 82 to 88 percent. Additionally, 95 percent of respondents believed that they understand the grant process thoroughly enough to get all the support they require.

Men displayed a greater level of confidence than women, with 20 percent responding completely yes compared to 10 percent of women. When respondents were asked to name a feature of the processes, there was only a high level of understanding with basic concepts, while understanding was much lower when it came to technical aspects of the program. However, analyzing by gender shows that women are just as likely as men to know the basic concepts, such as tranche values, but less likely to understand the process requirements.

“My land is vulnerable to landslide, but I have no other option than reconstructing my house in this land. Where should I go to address this issue?”
- Uttargaya, Rasuwa

Top information needs

- **40 PERCENT**
  When will the grievance file be addressed?

- **37 PERCENT**
  What is the process for getting government support?

- **31 PERCENT**
  How/where can I access a subsidy loan for additional finance?

- **21 PERCENT**
  When do we need to complete the reconstruction process?

- **20 PERCENT**
  How do I get the next tranche?

- **12 PERCENT**
  What will happen to me if I don’t build a house with the grant money?
Do you feel confident that you understand the grant process thoroughly enough to get all support?

- Not very much (5%)
- Somewhat yes (78%)
- Completely yes (17%)

What do you know about the grant process?

- 150,000 second tranche (86%)
- 50,000 first tranche (86%)
- 100,000 third tranche (77%)
- Second tranche after foundation (41%)
- First tranche on enrollment (38%)
- Engineer inspection and sign off for each tranche (30%)
- Third tranche after roof beams (walls) (29%)
- Government approved house design (27%)

Which form of communication do you feel makes it easiest to understand the reconstruction process?

- 54 PERCENT Radio Program
- 41 PERCENT Door to door interaction
- 38 PERCENT Television Program
- 35 PERCENT Public Service Announcement (PSA)
- 21 PERCENT Interaction Program
- 13 PERCENT Radio Jingle
85 percent of respondents have consulted an engineer for their housing reconstruction needs. The majority of respondents received some sort of technical guidance on how to build (60 percent), while others were simply told their house was compliant (34 percent).

97 percent of those who have started reconstruction and 96 percent of those who have completed reconstruction reported having consulted an engineer. Among those who have not consulted, the main reason cited was that they have not started rebuilding their house.

*Engineers charge money for each house consultation, which made reconstruction work even more difficult.*

- Shivapuri, Nuwakot
TECHNICAL GUIDANCE OF ENGINEERS

The communities seek out timely and uniform information from engineers. It helps them to build earthquake resistant houses and saves time, resources and costs. Most of the participants in focus group discussions complained that engineers from the NRA often get transferred from one district to other and contrasting information from engineers resulted in another barrier to accessing the government tranche.

‘When we ask why our houses are not approved, the engineer does not give us clear information’
- Sunapati, Ramechhap

DISTRIBUTED
Sindhupalchowk Dhading
Ramechhap Gorkha
Okhaldhunga Nuwakot
Lamjung Makwanpur

FEEDBACK SOURCE
Focus group discussions
84 percent of respondents have begun to reconstruct their homes, which is nearly double the 43 percent from December 2017. Among those who have not started building, the main reason is not having enough money to start and waiting for grievances to be addressed.

62 percent of respondents reported to having built or are building two-room houses. In the qualitative findings, it indicates that engineers suggested building two-room houses, even though it is insufficient for many respondent’s lifestyles. Most of the participants in focus group discussions revealed that they are using their old house for storage of food and grains or as a kitchen.

“We have constructed according to the NRA housing model. The traditional houses had space to store grains, space for praying/worshiping and extra rooms for friends and relatives. But now it is very difficult to adjust”.
- Molung, Okhaldhunga

“We are farmers, we need space to store grains, we need extra rooms for incoming relatives during festivals. But we don’t have that space”.
- Manthali, Ramechhap

### Difference by settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How big is the house you are building/have built?

- 62% Two room
- 16% Four room
- 10% One room
- 7% Three room
- 5% More than four room

### Are you satisfied with the house you are building/have built?

- 51% Yes

### Why have you not begun to reconstruct your house?

- 33% Waiting for grievances to be addressed
- 3% Concern that my land is vulnerable
- 3% Do not have land
- 3% Do not have enough funds
ONE ROOM AND TWO ROOM HOUSES

FEEDBACK SOURCE
Focus group discussion
Key informant interviews

“After the earthquake we all worked together to rebuild our houses before winter, but that was before the NRA guidelines. We had to build another house just to get the grant, that is why we built only one room”
-Darche, Gorkha

DISTRICTS
Rasuwa
Gorkha
Dhading
Lamjung
Sindhupalchowk
Ramechhap
Okhaldhunga
Makwanpur
Nuwakot

Most of the participants in focus group discussions stated that one-room or two-room houses are commonly constructed in their community. Despite the size being insufficient for families, they constructed one or two-room houses so that they could get the government tranche. They revealed that it is easy to get an engineer’s approval for one or two-room houses. The focus group participants also stated that they use the one-room and two-room houses as a kitchen or for storage.

“We use it (the new one-room structure) as a kitchen/storage. Maybe when the next earthquake comes, if our old house collapses we can shelter in this new one”
-Darche, Gorkha

DISTRICTS
Rasuwa
Gorkha
Dhading
Lamjung
Sindhupalchowk
Ramechhap
Okhaldhunga
Makwanpur
Nuwakot

RECONSTRUCTION
Have you taken a loan to finance your reconstruction?

- Yes (50%)
- No (49%)
- Don’t know/refused (1%)

“I heard that the Government will provide loans at an interest rate of 2 percent. Is that true?”
- Sulikot, Gorkha

50 percent of respondents have taken a loan to finance their reconstruction. The majority of respondents who have completed the reconstruction took a loan (62 percent). It is also cited that people are more likely to take a loan after receiving the third (53 percent) and second tranche (36 percent).

Most respondents have taken a loan from an informal source, with neighbors (35 percent) and family/relatives (30 percent) as the highest sources. These informal sources – taken by 65 percent of respondents – carry the highest interest rates and are possibly the most damaging to the long term economic recovery of earthquake affected communities. In the focus group discussions, participants brought forth serious concerns on how to pay back their loans. They stated that they do not have any substantial plans to pay back loans.

“After getting the 3rd tranche I am planning to pay back the loans taken but a delay in receiving the tranche has increased the burden of interest.”
- Sunapati, Ramechhap

Where did you take the loan from?

- Neighbours (35 percent)
- Family/relatives (30 percent)
- Co-operatives (22 percent)
- Bank (14 percent)
- Community groups (10 percent)
Source of loan by caste/ethnicity

- Neighbour
- Family/Relatives
- Co-operatives
- Bank
- Community groups

What is the average interest rate (annually)

- 26% Neighbours
- 22% Family/relatives
- 17% Co-operatives
- 17% Community groups
- 15% Bank

How much do you anticipate needing to finish overall housing reconstruction?

- 6% 1-3 lakhs ($1,000-3,000)
- 50% 4-7 lakhs ($4,000-7,000)
- 25% 8-12 lakhs ($8,000-12,000)
- 11% 13-17 lakhs ($13,000-17,000)
- 7% More than 17 lakhs ($17,000)
85 percent of respondents claim to be aware of how to build using safer building practices. This represents an overall increase from 81 percent in May 2018. It is encouraging that 54 percent of those who have completed reconstruction are aware of how to build using safer building practices.

From the findings we understand that those with a high level of knowledge on safer building practices have an understanding of the banding requirements. However, concerns remain over the low level of knowledge on the selection of suitable land for construction.

Interpersonal communication, whether through an engineer, community member, family member or village council surpasses any other form of communication when it comes to information on how to build. When analyzing by gender on method of learning the information, family member is the only information source that women rely on more than men. Addition to that, door to door interaction to gather information is mostly preferred in rural areas compared to urban areas.
Where did you receive this information?

- Engineer (72%)
- Community member (55%)
- Family member (35%)
- Village Municipality (28%)
- Radio (27%)
- Community leader (20%)
- Television (19%)
- Municipality (16%)
78 percent of respondents are satisfied with the reconstruction support they have received. Overall there has been an increase over the course of 2018 from 70 percent to 78 percent.

Among those who are not satisfied, the insufficient value of tranches, the delays in receipt of tranches and the complicated nature of the process are the top reason for dissatisfaction.

“It is very difficult to reach district headquarters to receive cash support, we would be grateful if the government makes a provision to receive cash support from Gaupalika”
- Likhu pike, Solukhumbu

Why are you not satisfied with the support received?

- Insufficient tranches: 54 percent
- Not received timely: 41 percent
- Complicated nature: 37 percent
- Lengthy grievance process: 30 percent
Only 12 percent of respondents feel their family has completely recovered from the earthquake. An additional 60 percent feel their family has somewhat recovered from the earthquake. Among the 28 percent who did not feel their family have recovered from the earthquake, the greatest constraints are lack of economic opportunities, disaster resilient housing, burden of debt and insufficient current livelihood options.

Do you feel you/your family has recovered from the earthquake?

- Not at all (6%)
- Not very much (22%)
- Somewhat yes (60%)
- Completely yes (12%)

What are the top things constraining your recovery?

- 59% Economic opportunities
- 57% Disaster resilient housing
- 37% Debt
- 19% Insufficient livelihood
- 7% Preparedness and risk reduction capacity
- 6% WASH
Over the past two years water supply has been a top community reconstruction concern. 34 percent of respondents said water supply is the biggest community reconstruction need. This represents a decline from previous rounds, with 41 percent in May 2018. This survey round also saw an increase in the prioritization of roads for communities. For respondents from Gorkha, Kathmandu, Okhaldhunga, Solukhumbu and Sindhuli, roads are of a greater concern to them than water supply.

Besides building your home, what is the biggest reconstruction need of your community?

- **36 PERCENT** Water supply
- **23 PERCENT** Roads
- **8 PERCENT** Hospitals/health centres
- **7 PERCENT** Trails/lanes
- **7 PERCENT** Religious/cultural heritage

**Differences by district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Water supply</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Hospitals/health centre</th>
<th>Trails/lanes</th>
<th>Religious/cultural heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kavrepalanchok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhuli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhupalchowk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorkha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuwakot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramechhap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolakha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solukhumbu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasuwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makwanpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamjung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okhaldhunga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalitpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Differences by caste/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Water supply</th>
<th>Roads</th>
<th>Hospitals/health centre</th>
<th>Trails/lane</th>
<th>Religious/cultural heritage</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Community Centre</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhetri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janajati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOD SECURITY
AND LIVELIHOOD
Across 2580 respondents, 94 percent of respondents’ family’s daily food needs are being met. This is a five and six percent improvement from August 2018 and May 2018 respectively. Due to this improvement, six percent, which is half, of respondents said their daily food needs were not being met.

The top two things respondents’ families required to meet their daily food needs were new skills (46 percent) and paid work (35 percent). A consistent finding was that growing their own food (88 percent) and buying most of the food (80 percent) are the top two ways families are adapting to meet daily food needs. However, nine percent mention they engage in cash for work to meet their daily food needs. This demonstrates that cash for work can be an opportunity for those who are in need.

Are your family’s daily food needs being met?

Not at all (1%)
Not very much (5%)
Somewhat yes (42%)
Completely yes (52%)

What are the things your family requires to meet daily food needs?

New skills 46 PERCENT
Paid work 35 PERCENT
Improved seeds 33 PERCENT
Land to farm 29 PERCENT
Cash support 19 PERCENT
Access to water 16 PERCENT

How are you meeting your daily food needs?

Growing own food 88 PERCENT
Buying food 80 PERCENT
Cash for work 9 PERCENT
Borrowing money 4 PERCENT
Has damage from the earthquake impacted your livelihood?

54 percent of respondents feel that damage from the earthquake impacted their livelihood. Among them, 86 percent reported that they have started to recover from those damages and losses. Findings were consistent across gender, districts and municipality/rural municipality.

“Water resource damage is mentioned by 5 percent of the respondents, however, none of them mention if they have recovered from this. This differs from other categories where respondents have noted their recovery, including 89 percent of respondents citing household asset loss, 43 percent who cited food/grain/seed storage loss/damage and 13 percent who cited livestock shelter damage. This demonstrates that water resource damage continues to be a problem in the reconstruction and livelihood efforts of communities. Therefore, interventions are needed for the recovery of water supply.”

What is the main type of damage that has impacted your livelihood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household assets loss</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/grain seed storage loss/damage</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock shelter damage</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock loss</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home base business damage</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming equipment damage/loss</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you begun to recover from these damages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely yes</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What damages have you recovered from?
35 percent of respondents feel that damage from the earthquake impacted their livelihood. This represents a decrease from 45 percent in August 2018 and 52 percent in May 2018. Among those facing constraints, the top three reasons are a lack of jobs (50 percent), no skills (31 percent) and a lack of resources to start a livelihood (27 percent).

29 percent of the respondents mentioned that they have plans to take a loan to cope with livelihood loss. This will increase the economic burden and/or risk of debt cycles as 50 percent of 2580 respondents have already taken a loan with a high interest rate to finance their reconstruction.

“We would be grateful if we could get capacity building and skill-oriented trainings to sustain our livelihood.”

- Hariharpurgadhi, Sindhuli
How do you plan to cope with current loss of livelihood?

- Labour of family members
- Take loan
- Livestock raising
- Searching for alternative livelihood
- Looking for work in other area in Nepal
- Looking for foreign employment
- Selling household assets

Disaggregation by caste and ethnicity

- Tamang
- Chhetri
- Brahmin
- Newar
- Dalit
- Magar
- Rai
- Gurung
- Janajati
- Sherpa

Lack of jobs
No skills
Don’t have resources to start a livelihood
Farmland destroyed
Lack of technical knowledge
Lack of access to market
Burden of loans
65 percent of respondents are aware of training opportunities available in their communities. However, male respondents were more likely to be aware of such opportunities compared to female respondents, at 71 percent versus 60 percent.

Among those respondents who did not participate in the trainings but wanted to, women are more eager to be involved than men, with 26 percent and 22 percent respectively. Women cited reasons such as a limited number of spaces, an inability to attend due to household chores and not being informed of the trainings in a timely manner despite their requests to attend. Women are more likely than men to say a lack of timely information was a problem, while male focused trainings are another reason behind their inability to participate. This shows that training opportunities are less targeted to women and there remains a lack gender equality.

“Mason training is necessary for all earthquake families so that they can reconstruct their own house on time”
– Likhu pike, Solukhumbu
A total of 64 percent of respondents feel that their family’s ability to cope with a new emergency has improved since the 2015 earthquake. While 33 percent of respondents state their family’s ability to cope has diminished.

Among those who feel their coping abilities have diminished, they cited no savings, unsafe shelter and reduced livelihood options as underlying causes to their diminished capacity. 84 percent of respondents are still living in unsafe shelters and must complete the reconstruction process in order to be in safe shelters.

Those who feel their coping ability has improved mention earthquake safe homes, preparedness plans and safe storage for food/grain as reasons for this.

**What has diminished your capacity to cope with a new emergency?**

- 62% No savings
- 31% Unsafe shelter
- 55% Reduced livelihood options
- 9% Debt
- 35% Land vulnerability

**What has improved your capacity to cope with a new emergency?**

- 90% Earthquake safe home
- 23% Preparedness plan
- 20% Safe storage for food/grain
- 16% Safe storage for assets
- 16% Safe space for livestock
- 12% Safe storage for seeds
Differences by caste/ethnicity

- Significantly diminished
- Somewhat diminished
- Somewhat improved
- Significantly improved
- Don’t know/refused

FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS
PROTECTION
A total of 31 percent of respondents feel that someone in their community is being excluded or discriminated against in earthquake recovery activities. The perceived reasons include political connections, joint families and a lack of proper documentation related to identification.

Regarding the discrimination, focus group discussion participants also feel that there is a difference in wages between men and women. Moreover, the involvement of women who participated in any trainings is also low.

### Differences by caste/ethnicity

- **Tamang**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Chhetri**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Brahmin**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Newar**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Dalit**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Magar**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Rai**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Gurung**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Janajati**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%

- **Sherpa**
  - Not at all: 42%
  - Not very much: 23%
  - Somewhat yes: 17%
  - Completely yes: 2%
  - Don’t know/refused: 15%
A total of 21 percent of respondents feel that men and women are equally engaged in the reconstruction/recovery process. Reasons given for why they are not equally engaged included low participation in training followed by a lack of women with construction skills and preference given to men on the beneficiary list. It is interesting that there is not a significant difference among female and male respondents for the following statements: women don’t have construction skills, women don’t know how to construct, reconstruction is not women’s role and women are not as strong as men.

**Do you feel that men and women are equally engaged in the reconstruction/recovery process?**

- Not at all (4%)
- Not very much (17%)
- Somewhat yes (57%)
- Completely yes (19%)
- Don’t Know/refused (2%)

**Why do you think they are not equally engaged?**

- Low participation in training (41%)
- Women don’t have construction skills (31%)
- Preference given to men in beneficiary list (24%)
- Lack of proper knowledge on reconstruction process (23%)
- Low engagement in building process (22%)
- Women don’t know how to reconstruct (21%)
- Reconstruction is not women’s role (15%)
- Women are not as strong as men (13%)
Across 2580 respondents, half have provided some form of feedback on the earthquake reconstruction process. Among the 50 percent who have not provided feedback, 61 percent of them do not have a question/complaint/grievance.

What are the barriers for not providing feedback?

- Do not have a question/complaint/grievance: 61%
- Do not feel anyone would listen my concern: 16%
- Do not feel I am able to ask a question: 12%
- Do not think anyone cares about my feedback: 15%
- Don’t know where and how to give feedback: 11%