In late March 2014, almost five months after Super Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) hit the Visayas region of the Philippines, the Protection Cluster undertook a Needs Assessment in the most affected municipalities and barangays in order to deepen its understanding of the persons of concern that it had assisted, and be in a position to deliver an effective and targeted response based on their profile and location.

Internally displaced and affected persons in 84 barangays from 34 municipalities in three provinces of Region VIII were assessed.
This assessment was carried out with the method of purposive sampling and the covered areas were selected using a vulnerability criteria.

Three data collection methods were used to gather and triangulate data: Barangay Key Informant Interview, Site Key Informant Interview and Focus Group Discussion.

The results of the assessment were categorized into several themes: Protection Risks; Durable Solutions; Safety and Security; Housing, Land and Property; Access to Services, Documentation and Communication.

The overall result of this assessment shows that Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) face greater protection risks than the affected population, defined as people who had their house destroyed but did not leave it. This is substantiated by both local officials and community leaders.

The majority of the displaced persons in the assessed barangays want to return to their habitual residence. However, because of their dwellings being severely damaged, the lack of financial resources to rebuild, and the location of their houses in No Build Zone, they remain displaced.
Concerns due to the damages occurred to their houses, their location in geo-hazard areas, and occurrence of crime incidents have increased insecurity among the displaced and affected population.

Targeted responses to the needs of these vulnerable groups as well as long-term assistance, in particular the provision of livelihood support, are among the suggested solutions by both the affected and the displaced population in order for them to rebuild their lives.
Introduction

Super Typhoon Haiyan (called Yolanda in the Philippines) made landfall on 8 November 2013 in Eastern Visayas, causing extensive damage to life, housing, livelihoods and infrastructure across three of the Philippine’s poorest regions. Following the disaster, a massive international response was triggered, for what can be considered as the biggest sudden onset disaster since Haiti and Pakistan in 2010.

The first months of the emergency response being over, a comprehensive picture of the situation started to emerge, but further information was needed to monitor the protection environment.

For this reason, the Protection Cluster engaged into a Protection Needs Assessment over a few weeks in late March and April 2014.

The assessment was conducted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the following NGOs: Community Family Services International (CFSI), Help Age International, International Emergency and Development Aid (IEDA).
Purpose

The objectives were the following:

- Get an overview of the protection environment of the concerned population, both the displaced and the affected, in order to be able to deliver an effective and targeted response based on their profile and location;

- Assist the Protection Cluster in prioritizing the affected areas needing further protection monitoring and in-depth assessment;

- Assist the cluster in monitoring the Strategic Response Plan (SRP) and provide an evidence for resource allocation.
Scope

Geographical Scope
• The assessment covered 84 barangays in 34 municipalities in Region 8 (see complete list of assessed areas in the annex). This accounts for 54% of the total 63 affected municipalities in Region 8. The selected 34 municipalities were part of the 171 municipalities prioritized by the government and further identified through protection-related vulnerability indicators (see following slides explaining the methodology).

Assessed Groups
• The assessment covered both the IDPs (in transitional sites, spontaneous settlements and home-based), and the affected population (who had their house destroyed but did not leave it).
Chart 2: Breakdown of 34 municipalities covered per province

- 2 in Samar (6%)
- 5 in Eastern Samar (15%)
- 27 in Leyte (79%)

Chart 2: Breakdown of 84 barangays covered per province

- Leyte, 68, (81%)
- Samar, 8, (10%)
- Eastern Samar, 8, (9%)
Methodology

Sampling Method
• The assessment team used a purposive sampling method because the Protection Cluster already had a good knowledge of the target population through regular protection monitoring. Also, the survey team didn’t want to limit the results to just knowing the protection risks, durable solutions or needs of the affected population, they wanted to know what the risks were for each of the affected group (as a durable solution for an IDP in a transitional site may be quite different than for an IDP in a host family environment for example).

• The unit of measurement was barangay.

Area Selection Process
• Region 8 was prioritized because it is considered the most severely-hit region.
• The 34 municipalities were selected based on the following criteria:
  – % of total IDPs with regards to affected population
  – Conflict-affected areas
  – Presence of indigenous people
  – Part of the 171 government priority municipalities
  – Within the area of responsibility of Protection Cluster members who had committed to do the assessment.
Methodology

Area Selection Process (cont’d)

• The 84 assessed barangays were selected based on the following criteria:
  – Remote and hard-to-reach coastal and upland barangay;
  – Conflict-affected barangay;
  – Without protection monitoring or assistance conducted yet;
  – Presence of indigenous people;
  – Important number of IDPs;
  – Important number of totally damaged houses or infrastructure;
  – Presence of bunkhouses.

Data Collection Methods

• The assessment used three different methods to better understand the needs of target groups and triangulate the data:
  – Barangay Key Informant Interview
    • Interview conducted with the barangay local officials to know the overall situation of IDPs and affected population.
  – Site Key Informant Interview
    • Interview conducted with the IDPs or affected persons themselves to know their specific protection environment situation.
  – Focus Group Discussion
    • Discussion conducted with a group of IDPs or affected persons to have a deeper analysis of their protection situation.
Methodology

Participant Selection Process

• The key informants for the Barangay Key Informant Interview were the local leaders of this barangay. A total of 77 key informants were interviewed.

• For the Site Key Informant Interview, the informants were selected on the basis of recommendations from barangay officials and their strong involvement in community activities. A total of 64 key informants were interviewed.

• For the Focus Group Discussion, the selection of participants was also done in consultation with IDP leaders and local officials. They were composed of male and female community members coming from different households who responded to the local officials’ invitation to discuss. A total of 1,525 participants joined the FGD.

Graph 1: Total site key informants by group per gender

Graph 2: Total FGD participants by group per gender
Limitations of the Assessment

Sampling Method
- The assessment used a purposive sampling so it is not a representative picture of the whole affected and displaced population. The percentages represent only the people assessed and not the whole Yolanda-affected areas in Region VIII.

Geographic Coverage
- The assessment covered only Region VIII due to limited number of enumerators to gather information and the limited presence of cluster members in Regions VI and VII.
- The assessment was also limited to municipalities that were part of the 171 selected by the government as priority, which does not necessarily mean that those municipalities outside this group are no longer at risk/affected.

Data Aggregation
- The aggregation of data was made at the barangay level (instead of the site level as originally planned) due to the limited coverage by the enumerators.
- The processing of the data was done per form (instead of the combination of the three tools) as each form had different degree of coverage/reach. However, the unit of measurement for all three tools remained at the barangay level to ensure equal footing when it came to data analysis. Comparative analysis of these forms then took place to get an overview of the overall situation.

Participants Selection
- Due to the random selection of participants to the Focus Group Discussion, there were no means to verify whether these participants were representative of the target groups.
The assessed displaced and affected population differed in their response regarding the presence of serious protection problems:

65% of the affected people said there were no serious protection problems in their area.

67% the assessed displaced population said that there were serious protection problems in their area.

This result shows that the displaced population remain the most vulnerable of the two assessed groups.
Key Findings: Protection Risk

Both displaced and affected population in assessed barangays share the same major protection problem which is the lack of access to income generating activities (55%). Other protection issues reported by both assessed groups include the lack of access to information, humanitarian assistance, documentation and issues on housing, land and property.

Enforced disappearance, arbitrary arrest and detention, and child labor and physical and sexual violence were not often reported by the respondents.
Respondents representing the IDPs seemed to have a divergence of opinions regarding the trend of protection problems: 33% thought it was stable, 19% expressed it was getting worse and 38% could not answer.

Barangay officials were more positive in their assessment, the majority of them saying that the trend of reported protection problems was stable and almost a third noticing it was getting better.
Key Findings: Protection Risk

IDPs in host families and spontaneous settlements are the groups who face the biggest protection risks according to barangay local officials.

This might infer that humanitarian assistance was allocated in priority to the IDPs in evacuation centers and transitional sites (i.e. bunkhouses), while IDPs in host families received less support.
Key Findings: Protection Risk

The majority of both displaced and affected persons know where to seek assistance in case of physical violence, cases of unaccompanied and separated children, and loss of documentation.
Key Findings: Durable Solutions

A large majority (86%) of the displaced persons in the assessed barangays wanted to return to their habitual residences.
However, because their houses are severely damaged and located in No Build Zones and they lack the financial resources to rebuild their dwellings, they remain displaced.

This result highlights the need to focus on activities that would allow these IDPs to earn an income and start rebuild their lives.
Both the displaced and affected population in the assessed barangays confirmed that consultation on matters affecting them is indeed taking place: 44% of affected populations felt they had been consulted and the percentage is even higher for the IDPs (67%).
A third of the assessed IDPs in the municipalities of Hernani, Ormoc, Basey and Dulag said they were informed on relocation plans, that means that the other two-thirds were not informed or don’t know.

This finding can be attributed to the fact the most of the assessed IDPs live in remote location and that information on or dissemination of the government relocation plans remain limited.
Key Findings: Safety & Security

Half of the assessed barangays (56%) felt safe and said that there were no more serious security issues.

The rest expressed several reasons for insecurity:
- physical condition of their dwelling (25%);
- location of their house in geo-hazard areas [storm surge (18%), flooding (7%), No-Build Zone (6%)],
- absence of electricity (15%)

With the upcoming rainy season, these IDPs in geo-hazard areas in the municipalities of Dulag, Gen. Macarthur, Hernani, Capoocan, Marabut and Sta. Rita remain vulnerable to further displacement.

Graph 2: Safety and Security concerns of IDPs (FGD)

- Feel safe: 56%
- No more serious issues: 27%
- Unsafe due to unstable and unrepaired dwelling: 25%
- Unsafe because prone to storm surge: 17%
- Unsafe at night because there's no electricity: 15%
- Feel unsafe because area is flood prone: 7%
- Unsafe due to crime incidents: 6%
- Feel unsafe due to reported stealing of properties: 4%
- Feel unsafe as area belongs to No Build Zone area: 3%
- Tension may occur when relief stops: 3%
- Near / located in No Build Zone: 3%
- Feel unsafe living in island at risk of storm surge: 1%
- Unsafe with the presence of foreigners: 1%
Local leaders cited three major housing, land and property (HLP) issues: destruction of crops, destruction of housing property and lack of documentation (i.e. land titles). The latter is considered a serious HLP concern as it aggravates existing issues like land disputes, forced eviction, and secondary occupation which were also identified by the assessed groups.
Key Findings: Vulnerable Groups

Women (24%) and elderly (23%) are identified as the most vulnerable groups within both the displaced and affected population.

The affected population specifically identified pregnant and lactating women as one of the most vulnerable groups.

The assessed displaced and affected population gave the following reasons for this particular vulnerability of women and elderly:

- Their condition makes it difficult for them to access services;
- There is no targeted assistance for these groups;
- They have experienced and still suffer from trauma (*please see graphs in the next slide*).

![Graph 10: Top Vulnerable Group (FGD)](image-url)
Key Findings: Vulnerable Groups

Graph 11: Reason of being vulnerable and status of vulnerability according to affected population

- Presence of malnutrition: 2%
- No targeted response: 28%
- No response: 11%
- No help desk: 2%
- Limited knowledge on forms of abuses: 2%
- Limited access to services due to remote location: 2%
- Limited access to medical assistance: 13%
- Lack of livelihood: 7%
- Lack of family support: 2%
- Experience trauma: 19%
- Cannot easily access services due to condition: 6%
- At risk of and expose to GBV: 7%

Graph 11: Reason of being vulnerable and status of vulnerability according to displaced population

- Vulnerable to illness: 7%
- Presence of malnutrition: 14%
- No response: 7%
- Limited access to services due to remote location: 7%
- Lack of shelter assistance: 14%
- Lack of livelihood: 7%
- Lack of family support: 2%
- Cannot easily access services due to condition: 14%
- At risk of and expose to GBV: 7%
Key Findings: Vulnerable Groups

Proposed solutions to address the vulnerability of women and elderly would be a targeted response as well as the provision of psychosocial support and medical assistance.

Only a few suggested provision of awareness on protection and gender-based violence.
If a third of the assessed affected population said that there were no issues pertaining to child protection, two thirds of the respondents reported the following issues: no available protection services to affected children, affected children not able to go back to school because of financial constraints, presence of malnutrition cases, and children who were traumatized because of the disaster. Most of the last two issues mentioned happened in the municipalities of Basey, Burauen, Marabut, and Sta Rita in Samar province.
For more than a quarter (29%) of the assessed displaced population, child labor is a major concern. Child labor issue is common mostly in the municipalities of Bato, Isabel, Ormoc, San Isidro, Tabon-Tabon and Tunga in Leyte province.

Other issues are financial constraints preventing children from going to school, trauma, exposure to GBV and health issues.
While a third (35%) of the assessed affected population said that there were no women protection issues, 22% said that there were no protection services for women and 11% mentioned the absence of available alternative livelihood as a protection issue.

GBV cases were specifically reported in Sta Rita municipality of Samar province.
Key Findings: Women Protection

For 36% of the assessed displaced population, the main protection issue for the women is the lack of alternative livelihood, which is a way for the women to complement the income of their husbands.

Among the other issues raised was also the exposure to GBV due to the lack of partition in evacuation centers, spontaneous settlements and transitional sites.

Graph 17: Women protection issues according to assessed displaced population

- Count of Women: No alternative livelihood (36%)
- Count of Women: No issues (29%)
- Count of Women: Exposure to GBV, lack of partition (29%)
- Count of Women: Experience trauma (14%)
- Count of Women: No issue (7%)
- Count of Women: Help desk is present (7%)
- Count of Women: Presence of GBV (7%)
- Count of Women: Worry about their children (7%)
- Count of Women: Difficulty in accessing WASH facilities (7%)
- Count of Women: No Women Friendly Space (1%)
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Key Findings: Access to Services

Affected and displaced people go to barangay captains and local police officers (locally known as tanod) for help. Local police or barangay tanods remain associated with the maintenance of peace and order and are the first ones to be called upon during crises.

Graph 10: Individuals that IDPs and affected population go to for help (SKII)

- Captain: 88%
- Barangay Tanod (local police): 41%
- Relatives: 36%
- Neighbours: 25%
- Family: 22%
- Religious Leaders: 19%
- Women Leader: 16%
- Media: 9%
- Tribal Leader: 9%
- Teacher: 8%
- Town Hall: 8%
- Don't Know: 6%
- No Response: 5%
- Women and Children: 3%
- Police: 2%
- City Social Welfare and: 2%
- City Health Office: 2%
Five months after the disaster, food, non-food items, medical and shelter remain the most commonly provided form of assistance to both displaced and affected population in the assessed barangays. Only a few of them (13%) reported assistance on livelihood.

The majority of both displaced and affected population in assessed barangays don’t know about referral mechanisms and have limited understanding/knowledge of the protection referral system available in their areas. Only 14% of the respondents said that they refer issues to the Women and Children Protection Desk (WCPD).
Key Findings: Access to Services

The majority of the assessed affected population had no response when asked about the type of awareness raising they received. On the contrary, assessed displaced population said that they learned about Anti-Trafficking, Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence.

Based on this result, it can be inferred that the awareness raising activities have only reached the displaced population.

When asked about psychosocial support, the majority of the IDPs and affected population had no response.
38% of both the displaced and affected population said that everybody had already received their Family Access Card (FAC). The rest said that the distribution was still incomplete if not pending.

The FAC in the Philippine context plays a crucial role in identifying the population in need of humanitarian assistance. Failure to receive this document implies difficulty in accessing humanitarian services. And indeed 52% of the respondents think they have not received enough assistance.
During the Focus Group Discussions, while the majority (58%) of the assessed barangays said that they had access to assistance, many had still concerns on limited access to services due to distance, limited supply, and unequal distribution. This finding confirmed that delivery of assistance to remote barangays remains minimal. Out of the 95 covered barangays for this assessment, 37 are in remote location.

Graph 3: Concerns of IDPs and affected population on access to services (FGD)
The most urgent need for the majority of both displaced and affected population is livelihood (80%), followed by shelter (56%).

This shows that both target groups are already looking at long term support rather than short-term assistance in order to rebuild their lives.
Only a third (34%) of the assessed barangays said that majority of the barangay population has civil documents.

But prior to the typhoon, there was already a problem of access to civil documentation in the assessed barangays.
Both displaced and affected population in assessed barangays have problems with civil documentation: they have lost their documents because of Yolanda and don’t have enough financial resources to renew them.

Graph 19: IDP problems on civil documentation (SKII)

- No money to renew: 63%
- Lost all documentation: 48%
- Civil registrar is far: 33%
- Cannot secure supporting documents: 25%
- Don’t know about replacement: 22%
- No Response: 17%
- Don't Know: 5%
IDPs expressed the need to be informed on the following:

- Type and duration of assistance (shelter, livelihood and food)
- Relocation plan (including in No Build Zone)
- Weather
Key Findings: Communications

IDPs mainly rely on local officials for information, through SMS, word of mouth and community meetings.

Graph 11: Communication channels that IDPs and affected population most commonly used (SKII)
Recommendations

• Strengthen protection monitoring, notably in locations where assistance remain limited, e.g. IDPs in host families and spontaneous sites such as those in the municipalities of Basey, Capoocan, Dulag, Giporlos, Hernani, San Isidro, and Sta Rita;

• Sensitize communities on protection concepts and principles such as the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement;

• Encourage projects, notably in livelihood, that will assist the displaced population in achieving durable solutions, making their voluntary return or relocation sustainable.

• Advocate for an active involvement of the displaced population through community meetings to determine the durable solutions they want to pursue and ensure that interventions respond to their needs.

• Assist the government at national and local level in strengthening their housing, land and property policies and guidelines, to ensure that concerned IDPs are better protected;

• Advocate for more targeted responses especially to the identified vulnerable groups (women and elderly) and ensure fair access to services especially for those in remote areas and/or where indigenous people are located;

• Improve access to documentation - not just the restoration of lost birth certificates but the distribution of Family Access Cards;

• Strengthen information channels on the permanent solutions and types of assistance available, relocation plans and weather forecast.
Annex: List of assessed areas

- Eastern Samar Province
  - General Macarthur Municipality
    • Barangay 7
  - Giporlos Municipality
    • Barangay Lawaan
    • Barangay Parena
    • Barangay Sta. Cruz
  - Hernani Municipality
    • Barangay Bataag
    • Barangay Batang
    • Barangay Carmen
  - Lawaan Municipality
    • Barangay Maslog
  - Quinapondan Municipality
    • Barangay Sta. Margarita

- Samar Province
  - Basey Municipality
    • Barangay Guirang
    • Barangay Salvacion
    • Barangay Tingib
  - Marabut Municipality
    • Barangay Amambucale
    • Barangay Amantillo
    • Barangay Tinabanan
  - Mayorga Municipality
    • Barangay Ormocay
    • Barangay Wilson
Annex: List of assessed areas

• Leyte Province
  – Abuyog Municipality
    • Barangay Barayong
    • Barangay Cadac-an
    • Barangay San Isidro
  – Alang-Alang Municipality
    • Barangay Binotong
    • Barangay Bugho
    • Barangay Hubang
    • Barangay Tigbi
  – Barugo Municipality
    • Barangay Balire
    • Barangay Guindaohan
    • Barangay Minuhang
  – Bato Municipality
    • Barangay Dolho
  – Burauen Municipality
    • Barangay Calsadahay
    • Barangay Maabab
    • Barangay Tambis

• Leyte Province cont...
  – Capoocan Municipality
    • Barangay Libertad
    • Barangay Visares
  – Dulag Municipality
    • Barangay Luan
    • Barangay San Jose
    • Barangay San Rafael
  – Isabel Municipality
    • Barangay Kalanggaman
    • Barangay Mahayag
    • Barangay Marvel
  – Jaro Municipality
    • Barangay Kanhandungan
    • Barangay Oguiao
    • Barangay San Agustin
  – Javier Municipality
    • Barangay Casalungan
    • Barangay Guindapunan
    • Barangay Manarog
Annex: List of assessed areas

- Leyte Province cont...
  - Julita Municipality
    - Barangay Jurao
    - Barangay San Andres
  - Kananga Municipality
    - Barangay Tongonan
  - La Paz Municipality
    - Barangay Bungtod
    - Barangay Duyog
    - Barangay Rizal
  - Mac Arthur Municipality
    - Barangay Lanawan
    - Barangay San Vicente
    - Barangay Sta. Isabel
  - Mayorga Municipality
    - Barangay San Roque
  - Ormoc City
    - Barangay Conception

- Leyte Province cont...
  - Palo Municipality
    - Barangay Candahug
    - Barangay Cogon
    - Barangay San Joaquin
  - Pastrana Municipality
    - Barangay Bahay
    - Barangay Colawen
    - Barangay Lanauan
  - San Isidro Municipality
    - Barangay Biasong
    - Barangay Busay
  - San Miguel Municipality
    - Barangay Impo
    - Barangay Libtong
    - Barangay Santol
  - Sta. Fe Municipality
    - Barangay Badiangay
    - Barangay San Isidro
    - Barangay San Miguelay
Annex: List of assessed areas

- Leyte Province cont...
  - Sta. Rita Municipality
    • Barangay Bokinggan
    • Barangay San Juan
    • Barangay San Pedro
  - Tabon-Tabon Municipality
    • Barangay Belisong
    • Barangay Capahuan
    • Barangay Jabong
  - Tacloban Municipality
    • Barangay 35-A
    • Barangay 68
  - Tanauan Municipality
    • Barangay Catmon
    • Barangay Hilagdad
    • Barangay Maghulod
  - Tolosa Municipality
    • Barangay Burak
    • Barangay Malbon
  - Tunga Municipality
    • Barangay Astorga
    • Barangay Banwang