<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>South Asia Earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Type</td>
<td>Earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLIDE No.</td>
<td>EQ-2005-000174-PAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Occurrence</td>
<td>8-Oct-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Muzaffarabad (epicenter), Pakistan Administered Kashmir (PAK), North-West Frontier (NWFP), and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Overview of the Disaster**

At 8:50 a.m. on October 8, 2005, a 7.6 magnitude earthquake struck northern Pakistan causing serious damage in the North West Frontier (NWFP) and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) provinces. Never since its foundation had Pakistan been confronted with a disaster of such magnitude. Compounding the destruction of the initial earthquake were a series of strong aftershocks that continued for weeks. There was significant loss of livelihoods through destruction of arable land, crops and livestock, businesses, and jobs. Despite the resilience of the population, the impact of the disaster was overwhelming and devastating. The timing and geography of the earthquake – which occurred at the onset of the harsh winter and in remote, mountainous terrain – caused serious concern about the vulnerability of the affected populations and their ability to survive.

| Displaced | 3.5 million people |
| Dead | 73,338 people |
| Missing | Not Specified |
| Injured | 128,304 people |
| Housing Destroyed/ Damaged | |
| Total Damage and Losses (in USD) | US$ 5.2 Billion |

**Note**

# Case Studies of Lessons Learned on Post Disaster Recovery

<IRP Kobe>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>PAK-S-001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Subtopic(s)</td>
<td>Land issues, regulations, labor &amp; implementation, and construction materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Lesson Area</td>
<td>Policy/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Pakistan's Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority and United Nations (ERRA-UN) Housing Programmes [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency(s)</td>
<td>ERRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organization</td>
<td>Government (of Pakistan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Objectives</td>
<td>To rebuild approximately 600,000 houses over an area of approximately 30,000 square kilometers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Implementing Strategy

1. Owner-driven strategy – individual families are encouraged to rebuild their houses supported by financial and technical assistance from the government
2. Collaboration strategy – the Government encouraged the Pakistani civil society organizations and the international community to extend support in developing the skills and capacities of those involved in reconstruction

## Achievement

1. Two third (2/3) of the 600,000 destroyed houses were in rebuilding stages as of May 2007. Of those rebuilt, 97,761 houses were at lintel level.
2. **160,906** engineers, sub-engineers, masons, carpenters, steel fixers and home owners were trained.
3. **Over 4,000** village reconstruction committees were created.

## Challenges

1. Limited source for technical assistance and training
2. Delays of financial disbursements
3. Reluctance of donors to provide direct funding for training and technical assistance
4. Unsystematic identification and prioritization of beneficiaries
5. Sanitation and hygienic concerns for rebuilding houses

## Lessons Learned

1. Owner-driven approach to rural housing can make effective use of limited financial resources and enable the remarkable levels of progress of people in rebuilding safer homes.
2. **Enough technical assistance and training at village level** must be provided to match the rate of reconstruction and the speed of financial assistance disbursements.
3. **It is better to support the beneficiaries rather than building their houses:** Even for those I/NGOs who have housing expertise, the earthquake prompted a shift in focus from building houses to supporting beneficiaries to rebuild their own homes in a different and safer way.
4. **International Organizations need to understand how the government works:** Many I/NGOs were unfamiliar with working closely with the Government and the Army.
5. Donors may provide funding directly to I/NGOs for technical assistance: The reluctance by major donors to provide funding directly for I/NGOs for training and technical assistance had an impact on the coverage of equitable technical assistance and thus slowed down the pace of delivery. As a result, the levels of technical support at village level do not currently meet the need for assistance to build safer homes. The ultimate consequence of these challenges is that the rate of compliance for earthquake resistant standards will inevitably be lower than targeted.

6. Financial assistance may be provided for qualified rural landless: Policy has to be made for the purchase of land in addition to receiving the housing grant if the beneficiaries’ houses comply with earthquake resistant standards.

7. Defining the criteria for eligibility is crucial: The Development Authority of Muzaffarabad (DAM) has defined eligibility for shelters based on several criteria including whether the beneficiaries own land in the area, whether that land is cleared of rubble and whether the family belongs to the vulnerable segment of the population.

8. Verification and Prioritization of beneficiaries is also crucial: Families will be prioritized based upon vulnerability, with the most vulnerable, particularly widows, receiving assistance first.

9. Inclusion of sanitation and hygienic concerns in housing reconstruction: IOM is currently working with UNICEF, the global cluster lead for water/sanitation/hygiene, to address this issue throughout the earthquake affected areas.

---

[1] The ERRA-UN Recovery Plan involves coordination of activities related to housing reconstructions, including those initiated by NGOs and the international community.
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Achievement

1. As of October 1, 2007, an accumulated amount of Rs 5 billion was disbursed among the vulnerable households in two phases. In the first phase that was launched in April 2006, some 261,171 families were paid Rs. 3000 for six months amounting to total Rs. 4.689 billion. The programme was extended for another six months for another 22,545 most vulnerable families were given the grant for another six months amounting to a total of Rs. 376.488 million.

2. For reviving the means of livelihood, schemes worth Rs 1.5 billion in agriculture, livestock, and cottage industry was prepared.

3. Micro financing was made available under the Khushhali Bank Program with an amount of Rs. 3 billion.

4. In collaboration with development partners, Food for Work Programme was implemented that covered more than 200,000 individuals.

Challenges

1. The population is scattered and it was quite difficult to organize and ensure participation of all segments. Community organization will take more time.

2. Local partner staff needs to put extra effort and hard work to facilitate the formation of all the targeted village level groups within certain timeframe.

Lessons Learned

1. Cash-for-work and food-for-work activities can significantly improve the conditions of vulnerable population. This is done by injecting cash into the economy while at the same time assisting local people to clear rubble and rebuild infrastructure. This has contributed in fulfilling family needs at a crucial time.

2. Special attention was given to women and vulnerable groups. This includes widows, female-headed households, and the physically disabled.

3. Farm production is usually the source of livelihood in rural areas. Efforts may be focused on increasing farm production, natural resource management, family nutrition, and incomes to replace the lost of services and production assets.

4. Income-generation schemes. This means is important for the most vulnerable groups who lost their source of livelihood.

5. Provision of animal shelter kits. This has contributed in safeguarding the livestock from severe cold during the winter.
### Lessons Learned (cont.)

6. **Provision of tools for artisans and families.** People use these tools for debris clearance and had contributed towards resumption of income generation activities for the skilled workers and helped accelerate the reconstruction process at the village level.

7. **Marketing linkages and outlets for crafts made by women.** There were numerous initiatives centering on embroidery and stitching. These translate into income generation for the beneficiaries by linking them to markets.

### Note

[1] The ERRA-UN Recovery Plan involves coordination of activities related to livelihood recovery, including those initiated by NGOs and the international community.
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