A 5.9 magnitude earthquake struck the south-eastern region of Afghanistan on 22 June 2022, causing widespread destruction, disruption to services, and loss of life, to an already highly vulnerable population across Khost, Paktika and Paktya provinces. As of 7 July 2022, an estimated total of 1,036 people were killed, and 2,924 were injured. At least 4,500 homes were damaged (fully or partially) in Paktika and Khost provinces. Despite reports of severe damage to household shelters and public services, the full extent, and likely cost of the damage caused by the earthquake as well as aftershocks and repeated flash flooding in the weeks following, is still unclear.

In order to address this gap, REACH, in coordination with the ES/NFI Cluster and the UNHCR, conducted an earthquake damage assessment in three south-eastern affected provinces. In order to understand the overall scope and impact of damage, and to inform advocacy and targeting for shelter repair and rebuilding in the affected area, REACH interviewed 1,130 households about their shelter damage, and 525 key informants on damage to service-related key infrastructures for education, health, and markets, more details in methodology note at the end of the document. Data was collected between 02-20 July 2022.

Key Findings

- As many as 14% of HHs (approximately 13,000 HHs) had severely damaged or completely destroyed shelters, while a further 50% (approximately 48,000 HHs) had minor or moderately damaged shelters in need of repair.
- More severely damaged or collapsed shelters were found in districts where they tended to be constructed on hillsides, particularly Spera (82%) and Giyan district (54%), than those constructed on flat or leveled ground. Furthermore, only 13% of HHs reported that shelter materials from destroyed could be reused in rebuilding.
- Major markets were reported to be open and functional, and goods were available. However, 70% of markets reported Non-Food Items to be scarcer.
- The vast majority of HHs were unable to replace or repair their own shelters due to the cost of materials (93%) and labour (90%). Debris was common across the assessed area (30%), particularly in Spera (59%) and Giyan (77%).
- Very few schools (4%) or Health centres (2%) had been severely damaged or destroyed. Only 9% of schools and health centres were reported to have lost functionality.
- Health centers were reported to suffer from a lack of necessary materials and staff, including enough medicine (83%), doctors (47%) and, medical equipment (39%).
**General Info of Affected Shelters**

Approximate number of households of the assessed earthquake-affected area: **96,000**

Approximate number of earthquake-affected number of households by reported level of damage to shelter:

- **No damage**: 35,000
- **Minor damage**: 18,000
- **Moderate damage**: 30,000
- **Severe damage**: 9,000
- **Completely destroyed**: 4,000

Average size of assessed HHs by HH members: **8.8**

**Building Damage**

% of assessed HHs by the reported amount of damage their shelter has suffered:

- **36%** No damage
- **19%** Minor damage
- **32%** Moderate damage
- **10%** Severe damage
- **4%** Completely destroyed

% of assessed HHs by the reported type of repairs their shelter:

- Repairs are needed but have not started: **58%**
- Repairs were needed and are still ongoing or on hold: **1%**
- Repairs were needed and have been completed: **1%**
- No repairs were needed: **41%**

% of assessed HHs by the reported amount of damage their shelter has suffered:

- No damage: **10%**
- Minor damage: **19%**
- Moderate damage: **36%**
- Severe damage: **32%**
- Completely destroyed: **4%**

This indicator combined the reported assessed damage to each of the four parts of the shelter including the wall, roof, floor, and foundation, and then averaged the scores. Due to the importance of walls in overall damage, the final score could not be below that of the walls. Building damage in each level means:

- **No damage**: 0
- **Minor damage**: 0.1-1
- **Moderate damage**: 1.1-2
- **Severe damage**: 2.1-3
- **Completely destroyed**: 3.1-4

- **No visible damage to the building observed**
- **Small cracks but structurally sound**
- **Large cracks or missing pieces, but still support building**
- **Partly collapsed, may no longer support building**
- **Completely Collapsed**

**Building Repair**

**Water and Services**

41% of assessed HHs reported some level of damage to their primary water source.

% of assessed HHs by the top three main sources of drinking water for their shelter used currently:

- Hand-pump (pumped well) - private: **42%**
- Hand-pump (pumped well) - public: **16%**
- Spring, well or Kariz - unprotected: **15%**

99% of assessed HHs reported they had access to electricity before earthquake. Of these HHs, 31% of them reported damage to electricity infrastructure due to earthquake.

**95%** of assessed HHs reported having access to functional toilets/latrines.
Educational Facilities

Number of educational facilities assessed: **380**

Number of the Key Informants (KIs) by the reported type of educational facility building assessed:
- Early Childhood Education (EC): 2
- Primary School: 82
- Middle School: 126
- High School: 114
- Technical Training Centre: 6
- Community Based Education (CBE): 49

% of classrooms in each facility that were functioning (able to hold classes) after the earthquake, according to KIs: **97%**

9.8 classrooms on average in each educational facility were currently functioning (able to hold classes) after the earthquake, compared to 10.1 classrooms on average which had been functioning before that.

Building Damage

% of assessed KIs by the reported amount of damage the building has suffered:
- 59% No damage
- 18% Minor damage
- 20% Moderate damage
- 3% Severe damage
- 2% Completely destroyed

Building Repair

% of assessed KIs by the reported status of repairs needed for education facility building since the earthquake:
- Repairs are needed but have not started: 41%
- Repairs were needed and are still ongoing or on hold: 0%
- Repairs were needed and have been completed: 2%
- No repairs were needed: 57%

% of assessed KIs by the reported type of repairs needed:
- Roof: 10%
- Walls: 62%
- Doors/Windows: 25%
- Ceiling: 1%
- Floor: 0%
- Foundation: 2%
- Access to utilities (water, electricity, etc.): 1%

Services affected

% of teachers in each education facility reported to still be teaching, according to KIs: **97%**

10.7 teachers on average in each educational facility were currently teaching after the earthquake, compared to 11 teachers on average who had been teaching before that.

9% of assessed KIs reported that their facility’s access to school materials (textbooks, other teaching items, i.e., pens, notebooks) had been affected by the earthquake.

9% of assessed KIs reported that their facility’s classroom infrastructure (chairs, desks or carpets, whiteboards/blackboards) had been affected by the earthquake.
Number of health facilities assessed: 112

Number of assessed Key Informants (KIs) by reported type of health facility assessed:

- Hospital: 7
- Health Sub-Centre: 35
- Basic Health Centre: 22
- Community Health Centre: 23
- Mobile Clinic: 3
- Health Post: 22

% of assessed KIs by reported top three most urgent concerns regarding healthcare services since the earthquake:

- Medicine: 83%
- Doctors: 47%
- New medical equipment: 39%

% of assessed KIs by reported amount of damage the building has suffered:

- 75% No damage
- 2% Severe damage
- 10% Minor damage
- 13% Moderate damage

Map 4: % of health facilities reported to have suffered minor, moderate, or severe damage, or been completely destroyed by MMI shake zone range, July 2022.

% of assessed KIs by the reported status of repairs needed for the health facility building since the earthquake:

- Repairs are needed but have not started: 23%
- Repairs were needed and are still ongoing or on hold: 0%
- Repairs were needed and have been completed: 1%
- No repairs were needed: 76%

19% of assessed KIs reported damage to the health facility’s water source.

% of the assessed KIs by reported top four facility’s services to not be functioning properly after the earthquake:

- Inpatient services: 40%
- Basic laboratory services: 40%
- Ambulance: 40%
- Surgical care: 40%

% of assessed KIs by current occupancy rate of the hospital:

- 20% Not sure
- 20% 0-25%
- 20% 25-50%
- 20% 50-75%
- 0% 0-25%
- 20% 75-100%
- 20% Over 100%

8. Question was only asked to KIs representing hospitals.
Markets

Number of major markets (with more than 20 shops there) assessed: **33**

Assessed KIs reported the % of shops still functioning in the major markets after the earthquake:

**96%**

19.4 functioning shops on average were currently functioning in each market area after the earthquake, compared to **21.2** functioning shops on average which had been functioning before that.

%% of assessed KIs who reported prices had changed in the major market since the earthquake:

- **50%** Prices have risen
- **0%** Prices have fallen
- **50%** No changes in prices

28% of assessed KIs reported that the availability of food items in the market had changed.

Of those KIs who reported the availability of food item in the market had changed due to the earthquake:

- **22%** Many more goods are available
- **11%** Many fewer goods are available
- **44%** A few more goods are available
- **22%** A few less goods are available

Building Damage

% of assessed KIs reported proportion of shops in each market by the amount of damage they have suffered:

- **78%** No damage
- **14%** Minor damage
- **3%** Moderate damage
- **5%** Severe damage
- **0%** Completely destroyed

Assessment Methodology: To assess health and education facilities, lists of facilities were obtained from their respective clusters. To assess markets, Humanitarian Situation Monitoring data were used for sampling. Household shelters were sampled through a household representative approach and stratified by Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) impact shake zones. Buildings were clustered by village, after which the enumerator would randomly select buildings in the village. Between 02-20 July 2022, REACH conducted 812 stratified random household interviews were used to assess the total affected area. An additional 318 interviews were conducted to provide analysis on 4 additional districts: Barmal, Giyan, Spera, and Tani. The household assessment was representative with 95% confidence and 7% margin of error. As much as 525 purposive interviews with representatives from health, education, and major market infrastructure were conducted. Data were cleaned and analysed by a customized R script for data checking from 02-26 July 2022 by the REACH teams.