

DISPLACEMENT TRACKING MATRIX

V2.0 UPDATE

March 16, 2011

SUMMARY

The International Organization for Migration (IOM), in support of the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster, continues to implement the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM). This is a monitoring tool to collect the most updated data on the earthquake affected internally displaced persons (IDP) population living in IDP sites in Haiti. The DTM was initially rolled out in March 2010, and was further revised (DTM v2.0¹) in October 2010 under the supervision of the IOM Data Management Unit with the data collection being undertaken by IOM directly.

This report presents the results of the third round of the DTM v2.0 field assessments conducted between the end of **January and mid-February 2011**. During this period field teams visited 1,152 IDP sites, of which 1,061 were confirmed as having IDP households living on the site.

Results of this recent assessment indicate that the IDP population living in IDP sites continues to decrease. The estimated IDP population in March 2011 is about 680,000 individuals. This indicates a decrease of 56% compared to the estimated 1,500,000 individuals reported living in IDP sites in July 2010. Note that this recent population count includes the population currently located in the surrounding areas of the Corail IDP camp, locally referred to as Canaan and Jerusalem, as well as another identified location near Corail 3 called Ona-ville. This population was first assessed in January 2011 and has now been incorporated in DTM assessments and analysis accordingly.

The Data Management Unit continues to emphasize to partners the importance of understanding the methodology utilized for the DTM in order to effectively interpret the results presented in this report. Particular attention to be paid to the fact that information is collected mainly through informant interviews, observation and physical counting. More information on DTM methodology is available on the CCCM Cluster website (www.cccmhaiti.info).

TRENDS:

- ◆ There is a steady downward trend in IDP population living in IDP sites, albeit at a slower pace when compared to previous reporting periods.
- ◆ Compared to the population reported in July 2010, total IDP figures (individuals) have reduced by 56%. A decrease of 16% from the figures reported in January 2011 (i.e. 810,000) can also be observed.
- ◆ For this period, the largest **decreases** in the IDP population are reported in the communes of **Croix-des-Bouquets, Delmas, and Port Au Prince**.
- ◆ The largest IDP population **decreases** are reported in medium sized IDP sites (sites hosting between 100 – 999 IDP households).
- ◆ The number of small IDP sites (sites hosting between 1 – 19 households) have increased by 17% (41 sites) to a total of 279 sites, making up 26% of the total number of identified IDP sites.



DTM Team interviews camp residents during a field assessment in Carrefour.

¹ DTM v2.0 offers a more concise set of information on the IDP site identification and the fluidity of the IDP population in Haiti.

Graph 1: Total number of displaced individuals from July 2010 to March 2011





Table A	
Overall trend of IDP population (rounded)	
JUL '10	1,500,000
SEP '10	1,350,000
NOV '10	1,050,000
JAN '11	810,000
MAR '11	680,000

Table B: Number of IDP Sites, Households and Individuals assessed through Displacement Tracking Matrix– Total by Month July 2010 to March 2011


Month	Sites	Households	Individuals
JUL '10	1,555	361,517	1,536,447
SEP '10	1,356	321,208	1,374,273
NOV '10	1,199	245,586	1,068,882
JAN '11	1,152	195,776	806,377
MAR '11	1,061	171,307	680,494

Graphs: Number of IDP Sites (Graph 2), Households (Graph 3), and Individuals (Graph 4), assessed through Displacement Tracking Matrix– Total by Month July 2010 to March 2011


Graph 2



Graph 3



Graph 4



METHODOLOGY

The DTM v1.0 began implementation in March 2010 under the leadership of IOM with field data collection conducted by a sub-contracted agency. As of October 2010, IOM began directly implementing the field assessments by utilizing the existing knowledge and capacity within IOM Haiti. The IOM Registration Unit and the DTM team were merged together to form the Data Management Unit of IOM Haiti. Experienced and well trained staffs now work under one unit to compile a comprehensive view of the IDP situation using the relevant data collected.

The Data Management Unit is made up of approximately 230 staff, of which 150 are field staff who conduct daily assessments. During a bi-monthly DTM cycle, assessments of all identified IDP sites are conducted within a 3 week period, which include 2 weeks for assessments and 1 week for verification, followed by another week for data processing and analysis.

The DTM v2.0 makes use of a more compact tool than the previous DTM v1.0, therefore narrowing the focus to allow all existing IDP sites to be assessed on a monthly basis and produce monthly reports. The CCCM cluster aims to collect specific data concerning the IDP site identification and other relevant information to CCCM.

For more information regarding the methodology utilized for the DTM, including the tools, please refer to the Displacement Tracking Matrix Strategy – Version 2.0, October 2010 document available at: <http://www.cccmhaiti.info>.

RESULTS

The results presented in this section reflect the DTM assessments conducted between January 2011 and February 2011 in the identified IDP sites including the populations in the surrounding areas of the Corail IDP camp, locally referred to as Canaan, Jerusalem and Ona-ville.

Overview

Between January and March 2011 there was a decrease of 8% in the total number of IDP sites from 1,152 to 1,061 IDP sites. Furthermore, the number of IDP households living in IDP sites reduced by 12%, whereas the number of individuals decreased by 16% between January and March 2011. This decrease is not as considerable as the decrease observed in the previous assessment periods.

Table C: Comparison of number of IDP sites, households and individuals by commune in January and March 2011

Table C						
Commune	Sites January	Sites March	Households January	Households March	Individuals January	Individuals March
CARREFOUR	140	127	16,742	15,658	68,398	64,549
CITE SOLEIL	47	46	6,782	6,348	26,529	25,236
CROIX-DES-BOUQUETS	83	81	24,022	17,805	94,891	70,309
DELMAS	248	231	57,326	51,265	244,068	212,043
GANTHIER	5	4	734	404	2,593	1,998
PORT-AU-PRINCE	167	162	49,880	47,059	207,755	183,804
TABARRE	76	76	11,801	11,289	48,208	45,546
PETION-VILLE	89	77	12,331	10,136	50,781	39,348
GRAND-GOAVE	39	37	1,742	832	6,983	2,285
GRESSIER	36	34	1,415	1,109	5,013	3,147
JACMEL	21	19	1,772	1,241	7,893	4,492
LEOGANE	118	93	6,756	5,553	26,054	18,591
PETIT-GOAVE	83	74	4,473	2,608	17,211	9,146
Total	1,152	1,061	195,776	171,307	806,377	680,494
Difference January - March	Sites	-91	Households	-24,469	Individuals	-125,883
% of January	Found in March	92%	Found in March	88%	Found in March	84%
% of decrease in March		8%		12%		16%

IDP Sites

The decrease in overall number IDP sites and IDP population that was observed in January continues to be seen in March. During the field assessment, a total of 107 IDP sites were found to be empty, while a further 16 sites were either reoccupied or identified, and nine sites have merged with other existing sites during the period. With the exception of Tabarre², all other communes reflect a decrease in the total number of IDP sites since January 2011. Note that though the number of sites did not change in Tabarre, a decrease in IDP population was reported. More details on changes on IDP population are presented in the next section of this report.



Differences by Commune: The most significant decrease can be seen in the commune of Delmas that went from 248 IDP sites in January 2011 to 231 in February 2011 followed by Carrefour with a decrease of 13 IDP sites: from 140 reported in January to 127 sites reported in March 2011. The most notable decrease in the southern regions³ is once again reported in Léogâne, with a decrease from 118 to 93 IDP sites. A considerable decrease is also reported in Petit Goave: from 83 to 74 IDP sites.

Size of IDP sites: It is also interesting to note that the greatest decrease in IDP sites was reported for medium⁴ sized IDP sites. As of March 2011 the total number of medium sized IDP sites decreased by 46, from 332⁵ to 286⁶ IDP sites. Correspondingly, an increase in small sites was reported during this period: DTM assessments indicate that there are 279 IDP sites hosting an IDP population ranging from 1 -19 households; this figure is 17% higher than the figure reported in January (238 IDP sites). IDP sites hosting between 20 – 99 households have decreased by 84 sites (555 reported in January compared to 471 sites reported in March).

At present, smaller sites (IDP sites hosting less than 100 IDP households) make up 70% of the total number of identified IDP sites; while these sites are the majority of IDP sites, they host only about 16% of the total IDP (households) population. No significant changes in the number of large⁷ IDP sites were reported during this assessment period.

² Total number of IDP sites in the commune of Tabarre remains the same as of the last DTM report.

³ The southern regions are made up of Léogâne, Gressier, Petit Goave, Grand Goave and Jacmel.


⁴ IDP sites hosting between 100 – 999 IDP households.

⁵ January report: 278 sites hosting 100 to 499 IDP household and 54 sites hosting 500 to 599 households

⁶ Present (March) Report: 233 sites hosting 100 to 499 IDP household and 53 sites hosting 500 to 599 households

⁷ Sites hosting 1000 or more IDP households.

Graph5: Comparison of number of IDP sites by commune in January and March 2011



Of the total IDP household population (171,307 households), 144,400 households (84% of the total IDP households) are reported to reside in 311 IDP sites (29% of the total identified IDP sites). Specifically: 61,936 (36%) of the total IDP household population is reported to reside in the 25 IDP sites of more than 1,000 households (see number 5 in tables B and C below) while 82,464 IDP households (48%) are reported to reside in medium sized IDP sites (see numbers 3 and 4 in the tables below). As such, only 16% of the total identified IDP household population resides in the remaining 750 IDP sites.

Table D: Number of IDP sites, Households and Individuals by IDP site size by number of households.

Table E: Percentage of IDP sites, Households and Individuals by IDP site size by number of households

Table D			
Site size by # of Households	Number of sites	Households	Individuals
Total	1,061	171,307	680,494
1) 1 to 19	279	3,043	10,508
2) 20 to 99	471	23,864	87,285
3) 100 to 499	233	46,347	182,829
4) 500 to 999	53	36,117	143,127
5) 1000 plus	25	61,936	256,745

Table E			
Site size by # of Households	Number of sites	Households	Individuals
Total	100%	100%	100%
1) 1 to 19	26%	2%	2%
2) 20 to 99	44%	14%	13%
3) 100 to 499	22%	27%	27%
4) 500 to 999	5%	21%	21%
5) 1000 plus	2%	36%	38%

The communes in the southern regions reported that more than ¾ of all IDP sites have less than 100 households. More specifically, Grand-Goave and Petit-Goave have the highest percentage of IDP sites with less than 100 IDP households, with 97% and 95% respectively. In the Port-au-Prince area, Croix-Des-Bouquets and Ganthier reported the highest percentage of IDP sites with less than 100 IDP households: 77% and 75% respectively.

Large IDP sites (sites hosting 1000 or more IDP households) are concentrated in the communes of Delmas (12 IDP sites), Port-Au-Prince (7 IDP sites), Croix-Des-Bouquets (3 IDP sites), Tabarre (2 IDP sites) and Carrefour (1 IDP site). See Table F below.

Table F: Number of IDP sites by IDP site size by number of households by Commune

Commune	Site size by # of Households					
	Total	1) 1 to 19	2) 20 to 99	3) 100 to 499	4) 500 to 999	5) 1000 plus
Total	1061	279	471	233	53	25
CARREFOUR	127	23	65	31	7	1
CITE SOLEIL	46	10	20	12	4	-
CROIX-DES-BOUQUETS	81	32	30	13	3	3
DELMAS	231	39	111	59	10	12
GANTHIER	4	1	2	1	-	-
PETION-VILLE	77	15	35	20	7	-
PORT-AU-PRINCE	162	17	63	60	15	7
TABARRE	76	14	40	15	5	2
GRAND-GOAVE	37	24	12	1	-	-
GRESSIER	34	17	15	2	-	-
JACMEL	19	8	8	3	-	-
LEOGANE	93	45	34	12	2	-
PETIT-GOAVE	74	34	36	4	-	-

Empty Tents

The latest DTM assessments estimate that, on average, about 15% of tents in the IDP sites are empty. During this assessment period, 712 IDP sites were reported to contain empty tents. The most notable results are in Ganthier with reports of 155 empty tents within 2 sites that host a total population of 58 households. Another notable result is seen in the commune of Croix-Des-Bouquets where 6,525 tents were found empty within 63 IDP sites that host a total IDP household population of 15,276. Assuming that the IDP households remaining in the sites occupy on average one tent each, it can be said that approximately 73% of the tents in the two IDP sites in Ganthier are empty while approximately 30% of the tents in 63 IDP sites in Croix Des Bouquets are empty.

In the southern regions, reports from Grand Goave indicate that 736 empty tents are found in 34 IDP sites that host a total of 753 IDP households, indicating that approximately 49% of tents within these 34 sites are empty. In Léogâne, results show that 1,770 tents in 74 IDP sites are empty, corresponding to some 36% of the tents present in these IDP sites.

Table G: Empty tents as identified by commune with comparison to total IDP site and IDP population (household) figures.

Commune	Total IDP sites in the commune	No. of sites with empty tents	Total no of IDP households in the commune	No. of IDP Households in IDP sites with empty tents	No. of empty tents	Approximate Percentage of empty tents **
CARREFOUR	127	58	15,658	11,033	1,029	9%
CITE SOLEIL	46	38	6,348	5,191	936	15%
CROIX-DES-BOUQUETS	81	63	17,805	15,276	6,525	30%
DELMAS	231	143	51,265	16,046	2,047	11%
GANTHIER	4	2	404	58	155	73%
PORT-AU-PRINCE	162	92	47,059	18,916	1,055	5%
TABARRE	76	59	11,289	10,450	789	7%
PETION-VILLE	77	49	10,136	7,062	391	5%
GRAND-GOAVE	37	34	832	753	736	49%
GRESSIER	34	24	1,109	671	176	21%
JACMEL	19	9	1,241	313	85	21%
LEOGANE	93	74	5,553	3,143	1,770	36%
PETIT-GOAVE	74	67	2,608	2,150	982	31%
Total	1,061	712	171,307	91,062	16,676	15%

**assuming that of the remaining IDP households, on average 1 IDP households occupies 1 tent in the sites with reported empty tents.

Camp Management Agency Coverage (CMA) of IDP sites:

For this reporting period, feedback from partners indicates that 211 out of 1,061 identified IDP sites have designated camp management agencies. It is of equal importance to note that these 211 sites host about 36% of the total IDP population (61,924 households or 242,486 individuals). The main reason for the decrease in CMA coverage is reported as lack of funding support for this type of support in 2011. Some partner CMAs have reported that capacity building activities are currently being carried out as part of their exit strategy.

Chart 1: CMA Coverage by IDP site





Chart 2: CMA Coverage by IDP Population



IDP Population


The overall population of IDPs reported to be living in the identified IDP sites continues to decline. Between January and March 2011 a 12% decrease in overall IDP households and 16% decrease in IDP individuals was reported. See *Table C*.

IDP Households

Comparing the results across all assessed communes in Port-Au-Prince, the most significant decrease in IDP households, is noted in Croix-Des-Bouquets, with about 6,217 IDP households reported to have moved out of the IDP sites since January 2011. The next notable decrease is seen in Delmas with 6,061 households reported to have moved out of the IDP sites.

In the southern regions, Petit Goave showed the highest decrease in IDP household population, with 1,865 IDP households reported to have left the IDP sites. Léogane reported the second largest decrease of IDP household population in the regions with a decrease of 1,203 IDP households.

Graph 6: Comparison of number of IDP households by commune in January and March 2011




IDP (individuals)

When taking into consideration the total number of individuals per commune (See graph 7) the most significant decrease is reported in the commune of Delmas with a decrease of 32,025 individuals (212,043 individuals reported in March compared to 244,068 individuals reported in January). The second largest decrease in IDP (individuals) population is observed in the commune of Croix-Des-Bouquets with 24,582 IDPs reported to have moved out of IDP sites (70,309 IDPs in March compared to 94,891 individuals in January).

In the southern region, Petit Goave reported the largest decrease in IDP figures with a decrease of 8,065 IDP individuals since January 2011. Léogâne reported the second largest decrease in the regions from 26,054 IDP individuals in January to 18,591 individuals in March (a decrease of 7,463).

Graph7: Comparison of number of IDPs by commune in January and March 2011





ANALYSIS OF POPULATION MOVEMENTS:

The earthquake affected IDP population in Haiti remains a very fluid population and DTM field assessments continue to facilitate the identification and regular update of the IDP sites within this complex context. Results of the March 2011 analysis reflect an overall decrease in the number of identified IDP sites, the number of IDP households and the number of IDPs (individuals).

In semi-urban areas in the communes of Gressier, Petit and Grand Goave, Léogâne and Jacmel the decrease of IDPs in IDP sites is particularly noticeable, with as many as 70 % of IDPs having left the IDP sites between September and October 2010.

At the same time, while it is observed that the number of IDPs living in IDP sites continues to decrease,, this does not necessarily imply that durable solutions have been achieved for all the populations that have left the sites.

As indicated in the following sections, a considerable number of IDPs that have left the sites have moved into precarious and temporary situations in the neighborhoods. Assessments at the neighborhood level, however, are needed to provide more information on the conditions of individuals and households that have left the identified sites.

While the population in the IDP sites continues to decrease, DTM field teams report an increasing number of empty tents remaining in the sites. This occurrence is resulting in considerable challenges for the field teams as well as for other partners, in assessing the IDP population. As of this assessment period, this issue is more apparent in the southern regions.

Changes in average household size within the IDP sites: Based on these most recent DTM results the average household size in the Port-Au-Prince area has decreased to 4.1 compared to average of 4.3 individuals per household reported during Phase 1 of the Registration process. In the southern regions, the average household size is reported at 3.3 compared to the 3.8 reported in Phase 1. Some IDPs have indicated that they have sent their children to the regions or other locations for school, whereas others have stated that some of the household members have returned to the place of origin or relocated to a location of their choosing. These results suggest that is possible that some IDPs have decided to keep some household members in the IDP sites so as to retain access to services in the sites, while other family members return or resettle elsewhere.


IDPs continue to report a reduction of assistance in the IDP sites. As such, IDPs have reported seeking alternative solutions within the community setting. The IDP population continues to demonstrate active engagement in identifying alternative housing options outside of IDP sites.

Reported Movement out of IDP sites

Based on reports from IDP committee members and IDPs remaining in the identified sites reasons for the decrease in population reflect similar trends as stated in previous DTM reports. Of the 604 IDP sites where IDP site based respondents reported population movement out of the IDP site during the DTM field assessments, 85% stated that the primary reason for leaving the site was that the IDPs went “back home”. A further 13% of IDPs noted the primary reason for movement was that IDPs went to another IDP site within the same commune, whereas another 2% stated that IDPs moved to another commune.

It is of importance to emphasize that this data is taken from observations reported by IDPs that have remained in the sites and not by the individuals that have moved out of the site. This is an important parameter that should be taken into consideration when analyzing this information.

Chart: Reported Movement of IDPs out of IDP sites



WHERE DID PEOPLE GO?: COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES

The DTM is a camp-based assessment tool, and as such does not provide information on population movement outside of the IDP sites. Mindful of the need to better understand the modalities and housing situation of those IDPs that have left the sites, IOM and other CCCM partners have conducted the following three complementary reports and assessments, namely:


- i) A Return Survey conducted for 1,000 IDPs that have left IDP sites.
- ii) An Intention Survey carried out jointly by ACTED and IOM conducted on IDPs that remain in IDP sites; and,
- iii) An Evictions report researched by IOM.

i) A **Return Survey⁸ of IDP households that have left IDP sites** was conducted by IOM on a random sample set of 1,033 IDP individuals (heads of households) that had left 22 IDP sites that no longer exist. The sample consisted of IDPs that had left sites between the months of March 2010 – February 2011.

The majority of the respondents (63%) reported that they had returned to their original neighborhoods, while 47% reported relocating elsewhere.. There were no reports of IDPs moving to regions outside of Port-Au-Prince nor were there reports of moving into other IDP sites.


⁸ The full return survey report is available on the CCCM Cluster website.

Graph: Current place of residence after leaving IDP site



Respondents were also asked about the type of shelter they are currently living in and whether they were owners or tenants of their current residence. The following summary results were reported:

Graph: Type of shelters return survey participants report they are currently living in.




Reported type of shelter presently being occupied	Total	Owner	Tenant
House - in need of repair	301	164	137
House - no damage	438	179	259
Makeshift shelter on plot	172	125	47
Other	44	29	15
Tent on plot	78	40	38
Total	1033	537	496

Majority of respondent indicated some state of precarious dwelling: Only 42% of the survey respondents reported that they were currently living in a house with no damages while 29% reported living in a house in need of repairs. 25% of participants reported that they are currently living in a tent or a makeshift shelter within a plot (not within an IDP site).

When asked about their reasons for leaving the site, 34% of survey respondents reported evictions as the main reason for leaving the IDP sites. 16% of participants reported leaving the sites as a result of rain or hurricanes (the majority of the respondents who reported leaving due to rains or hurricanes left between September and December 2010). Poor conditions (14%) within the site and poor security (14%) were also cited as reasons for leaving the site.

Graph: Reported reasons for leaving IDP sites



ii) Although the size of the sample limits the conclusiveness of the data it provides, the above findings are corroborated by the conclusions of the *IOM-ACTED Intention Survey*, which was conducted on a much larger sample.

The preliminary results of the joint **IOM & ACTED Intentions Survey Report**⁹ also help provide insight into the IDP movement trend. The Intentions Survey was conducted through phone interviews with approximately 15,000 heads of households in camps across Haiti and represents the only available large-scale survey of its kind.

The Intention Survey, asked IDPs still residing in IDP sites what alternative housing solutions they would or could access if they were to leave a camp-like setting. The difficulty to fully understand the MPTPC housing determinations were reported as a challenge: 38% of IDPs did not know what category their home has been evaluated (i.e. within the Green, Yellow or Red house framework). Among said group, 40% of renters and 33% of owners did not know the MPTPC-determined structural status of their house. It is understandable that renters may not know the condition of their previous home. However, it is surprising that so many owners indicated not having this information; a lack of communication may account for said inaccessibility of information.

In addition to gauging *where* IDPs intended to go upon exit from the camps, the *Intention Survey* also asked *why* IDPs were likely to exit said encampments. One preliminary finding was that eviction was a catalyst for exit with 41% of those surveyed in IDP sites having been told to leave their location. This finding corroborates the 34% eviction rate reported from the *Return Survey*.

It is interesting to note that just over half (51%) of IDPs living in smaller camps (101 to 500 families) have been pressed to leave, in comparison to “only” 36% of IDPs living in larger camps (over 1001 families). It is possible that larger camps offer more protection to IDPs against eviction.

⁹ The full IOM & ACTED Intentions Survey Report will be made available in the coming weeks through the CCCM cluster.

When asked where they would go if they left the IDP sites, 55% of respondents from Port Au Prince and 26% of respondents from the provinces reported that they did not know where they could go. The second most common response was “return home to red/yellow/green houses” 14 % of respondents from Port Au Prince and 26% of respondents from the provinces.

When asked what their biggest need would be in order to move to a new location the two most common responses were “Cash” and “Livelihoods.” The third and fourth most common answers were “shelter” and “food”.

There remains a need to conduct similar queries to gain more recent information on the intentions of IDPs.


iii) In addition the latest results from **IOM’s database on IDP site evictions** show that 247 eviction cases¹⁰ have been recorded¹¹ from June 2010 to 4 March 2011 affecting an estimated 50,528 households (233,941 individuals). The largest number of eviction cases has been recorded in the commune of Delmas with 27% (69 cases) of all reported cases originating from this area. Petion-Ville has the seconded highest reports with 15% (38 cases) of all reported evictions originating from this commune.

Table: Reported eviction cases by commune

TOTAL OF CASES BY COMMUNE	Sites	Households	Individuals
Carrefour	24	6,239	26,623
Port au Prince	21	2,200	10,373
Petionville	38	4,521	18,934
Croix des Bouquets	7	1,247	5,258
Delmas	69	27,542	134,737
Cite Soleil	20	2,817	12,820
Tabarre	19	2,772	11,987
Jacmel	9	380	1,612
Leogane	10	633	2,722
Gressier	3	501	2,180
Petit Goave	23	1,359	5,380
Grand Goave	4	317	1,315
TOTAL	247	50,528	233,941

**Estimated

Graph: Reported eviction cases by commune as percent of total (247)



¹⁰ Eviction cases recorded in the database are categorized as: evictions, partial evictions, in mediation, resolved, temporarily resolved and identified but pending further action. It is of importance to emphasize that eviction cases do not necessarily reflect the number of actual evictions but rather the number of situations where evictions are or have been a potential issue.

¹¹ All information in the evictions database is taken from reports from Camp Management Operations (CMO) teams.

Stories from IDPs:



Homeless Again

Marie Denise Menssou: 'I don't know what to do'

After the earthquake, Marie Denise Menssou, 55, found shelter for her three young children in camp AJTTC at Tabarre. When Hurricane Tomas rains struck Haiti last September the rising waters of the nearby River Grise carried off the tent in which the family lived. Marie found refuge in the courtyard of a friend's house, but now she says she has been told to move.

"I don't know what to do," said Marie, "Thanks to the generosity of a friend, I've been living here with my three kids but now I've got to move on. I don't know what to do. What am I going to do?"

It is not as though Marie's present lodging is safe. The adjoining house has a deep crack and leans precariously into the courtyard where she and her children spend their day.

"The neighbors house has been condemned and its dangerous just to be in the courtyard," she said, "but what can I do?"



From Camp to Condemned House:

Michelot Jean: 'Home sweet Home'

Michelot Jean, a 35-year old unemployed furniture maker decided to return to his original home in Croix de Missions after living in a camp for several months. He sent their four children off to the countryside to live with relatives and he remained with his wife in the family house which was condemned by the Ministry of Public Works as unsafe with 'MTPTC 11' stenciled in red paint on the wall (see photo). Although his house is in danger of collapsing, he still thinks he is better off:

"Home sweet home," Michelot says using the familiar Creole expression "lakay se lakay".

"Our situation here is really terrible. We don't have a toilet so we use the river. Thieves are always around trying to steal from the house which I'm trying to repair, we don't even have safe water to drink."

After spending several months in a camp, Jean said he returned to his condemned house because he feared living in a tent in the midst of hurricane season.