HIGHLIGHTS

104 sites hosting 20 or more households were assessed between 23 June and 12 July 2015 in 13 districts.

59,433 people from 11,100 households were living in 104 sites with 20 or more households.

13 sites in 7 districts were hosting over 200 households, representing 4,987 households (28,254 persons).

WHAT IS DTM?

This Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) report is produced by the International Organization for Migration in its role as Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster Lead Agency. The DTM monitors the status and location of displaced populations in temporary displacement sites, gathering information about humanitarian needs and gaps of persons displaced by the earthquake. The data is collected primarily through key informant interviews, observations, small group discussions with both men, women and children.

DTM ROUND 3

From the end of June through to 12 July 2015, the DTM team identified and visited 286 potential displacement sites across the affected districts. Of these, 107 were closed, 75 were hosting fewer than 20 households or dispersed next to their homes and were therefore not included in the assessments. In the 104 sites that remained active, the DTM team found 11,100 households (59,433 people). Of this population, 29,043 were male, 30,390 female and 8,376 were children under 5 years old.

While across the affected districts the number of sites, IDPs and households has dropped, the larger sites are growing in size, as can be seen in the table below for camps hosting 50 households or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of camps, households and persons for camps hosting 50 households or more in DTM Round 2 and Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATORY NOTE

In Round 3 of the Displacement Tracking Matrix assessments were carried out between 23 June and 12 July 2015, visiting 286 locations. This report presents data from 104 active displacement sites hosting 20 households or more.

Note that the denominator used for district-level analysis was the total number of population in displacement sites in the district, unless otherwise stated.

DEMographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIAL Needs

- 1.0% Pregnant women
- 1.9% Breastfeeding mothers
- 0.7% Persons with disabilities
- 0.3% Unaccompanied and separated children
- 1.4% With chronic diseases/serious medical conditions
- 1.7% Single-female headed households
- 0.2% Single-child headed households
- 1.7% Elderly headed households
- 17.9% Marginalized caste/ethnicity

MOBILITY & DISPLACEMENT

7 sites have **increased by at least 50 households** since DTM Round 2. These camps were all located in Kathmandu, Nuwakot, Bhaktapur and Dhading. Of these, 5 sites have more than doubled in size.

107 sites targeted for DTM Round 3 have closed

11 sites in Lalitpur, Kathmandu and Nuwakot host a majority of population from other districts, namely Sindhupalchok, Dolakha and Rasuwa

The majority of residents in 46% of sites live within 10 minutes of their habitual residence, and 23% within 30 minutes. Only 18% are living more than 3 hours away. This proximity to habitual residence is reflected in the dynamic pattern of displacement seen throughout each round of the DTM.

Only 10% of the sites said that they have previously been displaced.

The key factors preventing return were damaged and destroyed houses (61%), as well as fear of landslides and aftershocks (32%).

Out of the 104 sites assessed, 37% intended to return to their place of origin; 18% to their place of habitual residence; 20% intended to relocate to a nearby village; and 4% were thinking to move elsewhere in the country. The remaining 21% currently do not have plan to leave displacement sites.

Please also see Return Intention Survey (CCCM, July 2015) for more in depth information and analysis (www.tinyurl.com/NepalDTM).
SITE MANAGEMENT

Ownership: Of the 104 sites assessed, 55 were on private land while 46 were on public/government land. Across the districts, however, the proportion of private and public land use varied widely.

- **Bhaktapur**: 3 private, 10 public, 13 total
- **Dhading**: 4 private, 1 public, 5 total
- **Dolakha**: 6 private, 3 public, 9 total
- **Gorkha**: 8 private, 3 public, 11 total
- **Kabhrepalanchok**: 8 private, 3 public, 11 total
- **Kathmandu**: 5 private, 9 public, 14 total
- **Lalitpur**: 3 private, 1 public, 4 total
- **Makwanpur**: 1 private, 2 public, 3 total
- **Nuwakot**: 5 private, 4 public, 9 total
- **Okhaldhunga**: 2 private, 2 public, 4 total
- **Ramechhap**: 2 private, 2 public, 4 total
- **Rasuwa**: 3 private, 3 public, 6 total
- **Sindhupalchok**: 10 private, 4 public, 14 total

Ownership: Of the 104 sites assessed, 55 were on private land while 46 were on public/government land. Across the districts, however, the proportion of private and public land use varied widely.

Of the 104 sites assessed, 55 were on private land while 46 were on public/government land. Across the districts, however, the proportion of private and public land use varied widely.

- **Bhaktapur**: 3 private, 10 public, 13 total
- **Dhading**: 4 private, 1 public, 5 total
- **Dolakha**: 6 private, 3 public, 9 total
- **Gorkha**: 8 private, 3 public, 11 total
- **Kabhrepalanchok**: 8 private, 3 public, 11 total
- **Kathmandu**: 5 private, 9 public, 14 total
- **Lalitpur**: 3 private, 1 public, 4 total
- **Makwanpur**: 1 private, 2 public, 3 total
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Site Committees are composed of representatives of sites residents. While many were spontaneously set up after the earthquake, some District Disaster Relief Committees (DDRCs) had requested that camp committees be formed to act as focal point to coordinate support and assistance.

Of the 44 camp committees identified, 20% had no female members, and half had less than 25% female members.

Site Management Agency (SMA) is an external body that works to support the site committee, coordinate and advocate for assistance and protection in sites, as well as return or alternative durable solutions for the displaced population.

At the time of assessment, the following agencies were carrying out site management activities: China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation, TATA, Dwarika hotel, Indraini Shahakari Sanraj, IOM, Manabiya Aastha Nepal, Ram Hari KC, and the Salvation Army.

The majority of sites in Bhaktapur (92%), Kathmandu (64%), and all sites in Dhading (100%) had site committees. None of the sites in Dolakha, Okhaldhunga and Ramechhap had site committees at the time of assessment.

The identified SMAs were active in only three districts; Bhaktapur, Kathmandu and Sindhupalchok.
URBAN DISPLACEMENT

The figures on housing ownership highlighted a key difference between the situation in displacement sites in rural areas versus those in urban settings. It is only in the urban settings of Dolakha, Lalitpur and Kathmandu that there were sites where a majority of IDPs were renters before the earthquake.

While making up a small portion of the displaced population, urban displacement poses very different policy and programmatic challenges from rural context. Providing long-term shelter solutions for IDPs who are former renters in urban settings is complex. As many do not own land, they may not benefit from distributions of CGIs or other transitional shelter materials as well as longer term reconstruction support.

SHELTER & NFIs

For 61% of the sites, the most common type of shelter was makeshift/tarpaulin shelters, while tents were most common in 24% of the sites (predominantly in Kathmandu Valley). In just 2% of the sites were the majority of people living inside buildings. For 14% of the sites most emergency shelters had been upgraded into temporary shelters using corrugated iron roofing sheets (CGIs).

There was no access to safe cooking facilities in 32% of sites and only in 15% of the sites did more than 75% of the households have access to safe cooking facilities.

The figures on housing ownership highlighted a key difference between the situation in displacement sites in rural areas versus those in urban settings. It is only in the urban settings of Dolakha, Lalitpur and Kathmandu that there were sites where a majority of IDPs were renters before the earthquake.

While making up a small portion of the displaced population, urban displacement poses very different policy and programmatic challenges from rural context. Providing long-term shelter solutions for IDPs who are former renters in urban settings is complex. As many do not own land, they may not benefit from distributions of CGIs or other transitional shelter materials as well as longer term reconstruction support.

**Non-Food Items (NFIs) need**

The table below shows the first, second and third priority needs for NFIs. In more than half of the sites assessed (53%), the first priority remained roofing material, specifically CGI sheeting, reflecting the continuing shelter needs that was likely exacerbated by insufficient supply throughout the affected districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFIs \ Priority</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGI/Roofing</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpaulin</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Net</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Set</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ‘others’ category, the answers included latrines, cooking gas, solar lights, other shelter material such as cement and bamboo, temporary shelter and land for relocation.
**WASH**

**Access to Water**

In 79% of sites, water was either accessible on-site or within 20 minutes walking distance. Among sites with complete data, only 36% had access to 15 litres or more of water per person/day (SPHERE Standard).

![Diagram showing access to water](image)

**Main Source of Water**

Piped water was the main source of drinking water in 40% of the displacement sites followed by spring/river water (16%). A portion of sites still relied on trucked water for both drinking (20%) and non-drinking (13%) purpose. The associated cost implications of trucked water raises concerns about the longer-term sustainability of water provision in these sites.

![Diagram showing main source of water](image)

**Waste Disposal**

The main method for waste disposal in sites was burning (30%) followed by garbage pits (26%), and Municipality garbage collection (16%). Many of the ‘other’ options indicated that garbage was thrown into nearby water ways.

![Diagram showing waste disposal methods](image)

**Latrines and Hand-washing**

Where functioning toilets were available on-site, there was an average of 96 IDPs for every one toilet, which is considerably lower than the SPHERE Standard (1 toilet to 50 persons). This figure, however, did not take into account the number of IDPs accessing facilities off site; 23% of the sites reported IDPs using facilities in at-risk homes or other buildings close by.

![Diagram showing latrines and hand-washing](image)

None of the sites in Kabhrepalanchok, Ramechhap and Rasuwa reported having latrines in ‘good condition’ and all reported evidence of open defecation. The majority of all displacement sites (74%) had no evidence of hand-washing at the time of data collection, raising concerns for disease control.

![Diagram showing evidence of hand-washing](image)
HEALTH

Two thirds (66%) of sites reported having access to functioning health facilities close by (either on-site or within 30 minutes). Of these facilities, 44% were managed by government, 26% by local clinics and 10% by NGOs.

Diarrhea was the most common health problem reported in nearly half of all camps (49%), followed by skin infections (8%).

Over half (58%) of sites reported no access to immunization services in the past four weeks. Only 14% of sites reported receiving some form of psychosocial assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Local Clinic</th>
<th>Local NGO</th>
<th>International NGO</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhaktapur</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhading</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolakha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorkha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabhrepalanchok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathmandu</td>
<td></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>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makwanpur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuwakot</td>
<td></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>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramechhap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasuwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindulpalchok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who is the main provider of health facilities/services (on-site of <30mins off-site)?

- Government: 44%
- Local Clinic: 26%
- Local NGO: 1%
- International NGO: 9%
- Other: 10%
- Don't know: 9%

FOOD SECURITY

There was a considerable variance across displacement sites in terms of the most common source of food. In half of the sites assessed food distribution remained the main source of food for residents.

- Bhaktapur: 44%
- Dhading: 26%
- Dolakha: 10%
- Gorkha: 9%
- Kabhrepalanchok: 9%
- Kathmandu: 1%
- Lalitpur: 10%
- Makwanpur: 9%
- Nuwakot: 1%
- Okhaldhunga: 9%
- Ramechhap: 1%
- Rasuwa: 9%
- Sindulpalchok: 1%

What is the most common source of obtaining food?

- own/cultivated: 44%
- own/cash: 26%
- distribution: 10%
- borrowed/cash: 9%

In over 80% of displacement sites, children had access to education – either on-site or in a formal school setting. In the majority of districts, access to formal and informal education had resumed. However, in three districts there were significant numbers of sites reporting no access to education; Kathmandu (36%), Nuwakot (36%), and Sindulpalchok (36%).

EDUCATION

For many districts, a large portion of the households in sites are still reliant on food distribution. Of particular concern are those in Dhading, Gorkha, Nuwakot, Rasuwa, and Sindulpalchok where the majority are dependent on food distribution or borrowed cash as primary food source. Meanwhile, IDPs in 23% of sites reported not having access to markets - a slight increase from 21% in DTM round 2.

Is there access to a market near the displacement site?

- yes: 77%
- no: 23%
- don't know: 11%

Is there any psychosocial support provided on site?

- yes: 38%
- no: 51%
- don't know: 11%

Have you had access to immunization services/ campaigns in the last 4 weeks?

- yes: 14%
- no: 80%
- don't know: 11%

Is there access to formal/informal education services for children from displaced households?

- yes: 64%
- < 25%: 18%
- < 50%: 14%
- < 75%: 6%
- > 75%: 22%
- don't know: 11%
**PROTECTION**

**Security:** 44% of sites reported that security is provided on site by the following actors:

- Police: 64%
- Military: 16%
- Community leaders: 2%
- Self-organised: 18%
- Other: 2%

**Who provides the main security in the site?**

The most common type of security incidents reported was alcohol/drug related (41%), followed by theft (23%) and internal friction among site residents (12%).

**What is the most common type of security incidents reported?**

- Alcohol/drug related: 41%
- Theft: 23%
- Internal friction: 12%
- Crime (other than theft): 6%
- Other: 6%

**Perception of safety:** small groups of men, women and children were asked whether they feel safe in the sites. Women in 34% of the sites did not feel safe, compared to 26% for men and 30% for children.

**Do men feel safe in the site?**
- Yes: 72%
- No: 26%
- Unknown: 2%

**Do women feel safe in the site?**
- Yes: 63%
- No: 34%
- Unknown: 4%

**Do children feel safe in the site?**
- Yes: 67%
- No: 30%
- Unknown: 3%

---

**Services & Infrastructure**

- 7 out of 104 sites assessed have designated safe / social places for women.
- 24 out of 104 sites assessed have designated safe / social places for children on site.

In 84% of the sites assessed, there were either no or inadequate lighting available in communal areas such as around WASH facilities and public spaces.

- 7 out of 104 sites assessed have designated safe / social places for women.
- 24 out of 104 sites assessed have designated safe / social places for children on site.

**District level data** also shows differences in who these reports of abuse and exploitation were made to.

**Reporting & Assistance**

In many districts there were significant knowledge gaps among those living in displacement sites on how to report incidents of abuse or exploitation.

- Do you know who (or where) to report (or seek assistance) when you or your family face any abuse or exploitation?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Do you know who (or where) to report (or seek assistance) when you or your family face any abuse or exploitation?**

- Don't know (Bhaktapur: 5%, Dhading: 1%, Dolakha: 0%, Gorkha: 0%, Kabhrepalanchok: 0%, Kathmandu: 2%, Lalitpur: 2%, Makwanpur: 3%, Nuwakot: 0%, Okhaldhunga: 0%, Ramechhap: 2%, Rasuwa: 0%, Sindhupalchok: 0%)

---
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- 24 out of 104 sites assessed have designated safe / social places for children on site.

In 84% of the sites assessed, there were either no or inadequate lighting available in communal areas such as around WASH facilities and public spaces.

**Is there lighting in the majority of communal point?**

- Yes, adequate (Bhaktapur: 72%, Dhading: 67%, Dolakha: 60%, Gorkha: 75%, Kabhrepalanchok: 70%, Kathmandu: 78%, Lalitpur: 80%, Makwanpur: 76%, Nuwakot: 72%, Okhaldhunga: 76%, Ramechhap: 80%, Rasuwa: 82%, Sindhupalchok: 84%)
- No (Bhaktapur: 0%, Dhading: 0%, Dolakha: 0%, Gorkha: 0%, Kabhrepalanchok: 0%, Kathmandu: 0%, Lalitpur: 0%, Makwanpur: 0%, Nuwakot: 0%, Okhaldhunga: 0%, Ramechhap: 0%, Rasuwa: 0%, Sindhupalchok: 0%)

---
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- No (Bhaktapur: 0%, Dhading: 0%, Dolakha: 0%, Gorkha: 0%, Kabhrepalanchok: 0%, Kathmandu: 0%, Lalitpur: 0%, Makwanpur: 0%, Nuwakot: 0%, Okhaldhunga: 0%, Ramechhap: 0%, Rasuwa: 0%, Sindhupalchok: 0%)
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LIVELIHOOD

The majority of those living in displacement sites (58%) continued to work in agriculture and livestock. Urban settings offered more varieties of job opportunities for the displaced population although it was also where the highest percentage of sites residents with no occupation was reported (21% in Kathmandu). Dhading (80%) and Kathmandu (43%) had a greater proportion of people working as day labour.

Majority of the population in 7% of the sites were receiving remittances. Rasuwa had the highest percentage of population in displacement sites receiving remittances (33%).

49% of the site population assessed reported that they have access to land for cultivation.

The majority of those living in displacement sites (58%) continued to work in agriculture and livestock. Urban settings offered more varieties of job opportunities for the displaced population although it was also where the highest percentage of sites residents with no occupation was reported (21% in Kathmandu). Dhading (80%) and Kathmandu (43%) had a greater proportion of people working as day labour.

Majority of the population in 7% of the sites were receiving remittances. Rasuwa had the highest percentage of population in displacement sites receiving remittances (33%).

49% of the site population assessed reported that they have access to land for cultivation.

34% of the sites stated that their site populations had access to income generating activities.

46% of the sites report that they were also hosting livestock.

COMMUNICATION

The majority of the people living in displacement sites are getting their information from radio/news (27%), mobile phone (25%), local authority/community leader (25%) and friends and families (18%).

Information being requested remain focused on recovery plan (26%) and shelter (19%).

What is the main topic on which the community is requesting information?
METHODOLOGY

This Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) report is produced by the International Organization for Migration in its role as CCCM Cluster Lead Agency. Data was gathered by field staff and analysed by a team in Kathmandu.

Prior to data collection, the DTM team contacts local authorities, humanitarian partners, and key informants to gather information about sites to be targeted for each round of the DTM. Criteria for conducting on-site assessments are as follows:

1. 20 households or more – the number of households living on site exceed 20.
2. Higher density tents/shelters in camp-like setting – excluding villages that have scattered shelter within.
3. Cross-district displacement – Groups of IDPs that have been displaced from another district, even if they do not comply to having 20 households or more
4. IDPs living on site – accessing basic services and infrastructure on site.
   • Accessing toilets/latrines on site, or using a nearby toilet that is NOT their own.
   • Possession of their belongings – look for things like cooking pots and stoves.
   • Clear indications that they are cooking on site (gas cylinders, communal cooking area).

The data is collected primarily through key informant interviews, observations, small group discussions with both men, women and children. For every site, the team completes a standard assessment form (available on link below). The field teams approach each individual camp in a targeted manner, so the method of data collection can vary depending on the situation of the specific site.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES

This report is a short synthesis of top line figures and basic analysis of the DTM database.

Round 3 data upon which this report is based, as well as data from previous rounds, are publicly available at: http://tinyurl.com/NepalDTM. (note: sensitive data on protection at site level is available through protection cluster)

The web page also provide links to the following:

• A Site Profile document giving all basic information of all sites assessed in the DTM is available in the form of a Site Profile PDF from

• A google map showing the location and basic demographics information of all displacement sites in Nepal is available at http://tinyurl.com/NepalDTMMap