



Shelter Cluster Assessment Factsheet – Community Information

Loreto Department, Perú

07 July 2012

BACKGROUND

The data presented in this factsheet represents the preliminary findings of data from community level key informant interviews conducted during a shelter assessment which was completed between the 25th of June and 5th of July 2012 in the Loreto Region as part of an evaluation into the shelter conditions of communities affected by extreme flooding events in early 2012. The assessment aims to inform regional, national, and international actors and stakeholders of the shelter context and needs of the flood affected families. Civil Defence Regional Office data reports that 258.548 individuals were affected, including some 66.907 homes as well as over 27.800ha of cultivated land. A state of emergency covering every province in the region was declared in stages starting from the 29th March 2012 and remains in place. The shelter cluster in partnership with REACH thus activated a shelter assessment in response to these floods which reached record levels of 118.97 m.a.s.l on the 20th April 2012.

REACH partners with the shelter cluster as part of a global agreement to facilitate the deployment of assessment teams following natural disaster emergencies with the objective of contributing to a more informed, relevant, and timely response by actors involved in the shelter sector. REACH tools include reports and factsheets such as this as well as mapping data and the use of remote sensing to track developments in an emergency.

Overall the key informant questionnaires were conducted in the following geographic areas:

Province	District	Village Name / Urban Municipality	Province	District	Village Name / Urban Municipality
Maynas	Belen	Santa Martha	Loreto	Nauta	Firmeza
		Municipalidad de Belen <i>Caserio Nuevo Campeon</i> <i>Caserio Nuevo San Jose</i> <i>AAHH Pueblo Libre</i> <i>AAHH Prolongacion Santa Rosa</i> <i>AH 28 de Julio</i>			Nuevo San Martin
		Fernando Lorres			Lisboa
	Monte Verde	Bagazan			
	Timareo III Zona	Sucre			
	Terrabona	Miraflores			
	Centro America	02 de Mayo			
	Indipendiente	Palizada			
	Pueblo Libre	Pampa Cano			
	Nuevo Amazonas	San Pedro de Tipishca I			
	Tapira Nuevo	20 de Enero			
	San Jorge	Santo Domingo			
	Muyusillo	Las Malvinas			
	08 de Mayo	Las Palmas			
	Mangua				
Iquitos	San Jose de Lupuna				
Punchana	Municipalidad de Punchana <i>AAHH Nueva Venecia</i> <i>AAHH Ivan Vasquez Valeria</i> <i>AAHH Daniel Alcides Carrion</i> <i>AAHH Pilar Nores de Garcia (Ampliacion)</i> <i>AAHH Pilar Nores de Garcia (A,B,C, y D)</i> <i>AAHH Nuestra Señora de la Salud</i> <i>AAHH Delicia Manzur Khan</i>				

Key Informant Questionnaire; Methodology

The aim of the key informant questionnaires was to collect information that would contribute towards developing an understanding of the impact of the floods from a community perspective. Across villages and municipalities targeted for the household assessment, teams completed one key informant questionnaire per village or per neighbourhood area (Asentamiento Humano - AAHH). However, within the semi-urban neighbourhoods the lack of representatives available for the full AAHH meant that questionnaires were conducted with leaders responsible for smaller areas within an AAHH. This in turn meant that multiple key informant questionnaires were conducted in some AAHH whilst others were not covered despite being part of the household survey. Nevertheless the geographic coverage of the questionnaires across AAHH in municipalities provides scope to draw relevant conclusions from the data collected. Key informant questionnaires were completed with the participation of the community leaders (most often the Teniente Gobernador as well as street presidents and other grassroots leaders) as the focus group for the interview.




FINDINGS

The data that contributes to the findings of this factsheet covers an assessment period from the 25th June to the 05th July 2012 and represents 44 surveys (15 in urban areas and 29 in rural areas). In the rural areas the key informant surveys covered 84% of the total number of villages targeted as part of the household survey. Key Informant Questionnaires were completed in 6 districts within Maynas and Loreto provinces.


Key Demographic Data

- Average number of families in rural areas: **55**¹
- Average number of families per shelter in rural areas: **1,35**
- Average number of families per shelter in urban areas: **1,45**

Flood Impact in Communities; DISPLACEMENT PROFILES




- **66%** of communities reported that families within their community had been displaced as a result of the floods. In urban areas **100%** of communities reported that displacement occurred; which may be symptomatic of the fact that access to evacuation centres in urban areas from flooded sites was significantly easier given the high proportion of centres in urban zones.




- Within communities reporting a displacement of families, on average **31%** of families in a given community were displaced. In urban areas this figure increases to **37%**, whilst in rural areas it drops to **22%**.
- **60%** of communities reported that the first displacement occurred only after the floods had reached their village, with families leaving on average **27 days after flooding first started**. This generally fits with the statement that was given in which community leaders mentioned that due to the regular nature of floods, families only decided to move when floodwaters reached above the level of their shelter floors – when the floods began reaching record heights.
- Of the **40%** of communities in which families left before the floods, on average families left **8 days before the waters reached the level of shelter floors**.

	Urban	Rural	TOTAL
Before	9	1	10
After	5	10	15
Not Sure	1	18	19




- **None** of the communities reported families going to health centres as their destination during the displacement. As options under “other” the following details were given: *unspecified location within a city 40%, higher ground 30%, saw mill 10%, tents 10%, and unspecified 10%*.
- When asked with what information the decisions were taken to select a given location during the displacement, the following reasons were given (see figure below).



¹ Note that average population in urban areas cannot be given due to the fact that key informant interviews were conducted with community leaders with different geographical responsibility (i.e. Teniente Gobernador vs. Street President). The defining urban scope was thus different across surveys and thus cannot be compared.



- Community members reported the following on SHELTER conditions at the locations to which they were displaced




- The majority of communities reported that most displaced families have already returned since more than 3 weeks:




- 44% of communities indicated that their reasons for returning were linked directly to the desire to protect their possessions and shelters, 36% reported economic reasons (to restart their livelihood activities), and 20% reported that they were requested to return.
- 24% of communities reported that there were still families from their locations that had yet to returned, though few could give any indication as to the timeframe for their expected return. In conversation as to the reasons for their continued displacement, in rural villages mostly livelihood issues were cited – indicating that once the next crop would be harvested the remaining families would return.

Impact of Floods

- When asked about the impact of the floods the following issues were mentioned most often as having sustained the greatest damage: **shelters, latrines, and livelihoods.**




- Communities were further asked to report the top three most damaged categories. The graph below shows the prioritisation by rural and urban subset:



- 13% of communities reported new families arriving to their village/ neighbourhood with an **average reported increase of 2,5 families** arriving after the floods that had previously not resided there.
- 20% of communities reported families leaving their village/ neighbourhood permanently, with an **average of 2,4 families** leaving.


Impact on Livelihoods / Vulnerability




- 100% of communities reported that their most important livelihood source had been affected (31%) or significantly

affected (69%) by the floods. This remains high at 91% for the second and third most important livelihoods.

- In terms of expenses, communities reported the following as their top three highest expenditures before and after the floods;




- Communities identified the following categories of persons as the most vulnerable in their community:



- On average respondents identified that 27% of the families within their community fit these criteria of vulnerability.

Shelter Conditions


- On average 27% of shelters were estimated by community representatives as being in need of repairs, 6% as being collapsed and in need of reconstruction, and 11% being in good conditions.
- When asked about the parts of the house that were most often damaged the following information was provided:




- Community leaders were further asked as to what percentage of families could manage the repair/rehabilitation of their shelters of their own accord:

	Urban	Rural	TOTAL
More than 50% of the community	7%	8%	8%
Less than 50% of the community	86%	21%	45%
Nobody	7%	71%	47%



- In 55% of cases it was mentioned that more than 3 months would be required for families who could complete their own repairs to do so. 40% could do so in a period of 1 to 3 months, and 5% within the next 4 weeks.
- 73% of communities acknowledged that there were areas within their communities where it would not be advised to construct shelters.
- 77% of communities further acknowledged that there was a need to improve the construction practices of their homes.




- The type of support that was indicated as being necessary at the community level was the following:



WaSH Conditions



- **52%** of communities treat their water used for consumption purposes.



Disaster Risk Reduction / Information and Communication

- Only **13%** of urban communities feel that their community is prepared for future flooding events, whereas this rises to **24%** in rural communities.
- When those that answered “no” to the question as to whether they felt that their communities were prepared for future flooding events were asked to explain why the following reasons were given:

	% of mentions
Because shelters still require rehabilitation / strengthening	31%
Poverty & lack of economic resources to support preparedness activities	9%
Lack of knowledge of DRR, uncertainty as to what to expect in the future, and lack of capacity to implement necessary changes	41%
Lack of food / seed storage for recovery after floods	3%
Lack of suitable land at a higher elevation where they could move to	13%

- **33%** of communities reported having received some DRR information that could be beneficial to their community.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES

A key part of the assessment mission is ensuring that all information collected by the team is available and shared with all interested actors. As such, as part of the outputs of the mission the following resources will be made available over the course of the coming weeks through the Peru Floods section of the Shelter Cluster website:

www.sheltercluster.org/Americas/Peru/Peru_Floods_2012/Pages/default.aspx

At this site the following resources are available and any updates and subsequent reports will be posted here:

- **Factsheets:** Along with this factsheet, further documents outlining key information related to the key informant questionnaires conducted during the assessment period will be made available for downloading.
- **Reports:** Both primary and secondary data reports will be available along with assessment documents used including the questionnaire formats, and mission Terms of Reference.
- **Maps:** In addition to the maps available through Municipal and Regional Government sources, REACH will produce mapping materials related to the key data from the consolidated assessment data.
- **Interactive Web Map:** In order to support operational planning and coordination, a web map is available that allows users to review data through visual and photographic means. Any interested user can define and select the criteria and information they require.