



GSJ: Volume11, Issue6, June 2023, Online: ISSN 2320-9186
www.globalscientificjournal.com

ASSESSING TRANSITIONAL SHELTER AND SOCIAL SERVICES: THE CASE OF IDPS IN SAGONSONGAN TRANSITORY SHELTER, MARAWI CITY

Authors: Nabil C. Balindong
Graduate School Department, Mindanao State University-Main Campus
Jamzian M. Umpa
Graduate School Department, Mindanao State University-Main Campus
College Instructor, Philippine Engineering and Agro-Industrial College, Inc.

Keywords

Transitional Shelter, Social Services, Assessment, IDPS, Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter, Social Services Component

ABSTRACT

This study sought to assess the transitional shelter in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter and its component social services delivered to the IDPs. This study involved 210 respondents, who are housing beneficiaries duly endorsed by the LGU for TFBM. The instrument used in data gathering was a self-structured survey questionnaire consisting of the socio-demographic profile of the respondents, the social services provided to them, their perceptions of the effectiveness of the transitional shelter, and the problems they encountered in the transitional shelter. The significant findings disclosed that the central government's delivery of relief goods, particularly food, medicine, and health care services, had gradually diminished. As to the effectiveness of the transitory shelters, the data showed that the IDPs felt satisfied and comfortable with their transitory shelters in terms of their physical structure, space, and ventilation but vehemently complained about the five-year moratorium period for their right of occupancy of the temporary shelter. The findings disclosed the inadequacy of the potable water supply for the problems encountered by the IDPs in their transitory shelters. Nonetheless, the IDPs expressed the need to dislodge their septic tanks. Lastly, the IDPs felt the area could be better for a livelihood program. Thus, employment opportunities are preferable. The government should provide income-generating assistance to IDPs to help them become self-reliant and independent. They should develop a mechanism to extend the security of tenure, prioritize and intervene in intermittent water supply, and implement programs to provide income to the IDPs.

Introduction

According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has the right to a healthy and comfortable standard of living. In addition, the Urban Development and Housing Act of 1997, the Magna Carta of Women of 2008, the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997, and the Children's Emergency Relief and Protection Act of 2015 provide specific legal requirements and human rights protections under domestic law. Hence, the Philippine government's treaty obligations under human rights treaties and the international standards established by the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in respecting the rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs), which are non-discriminatory, include the right to freedom of movement and choice of residence, the right to an adequate standard of living, and access to essential food and potable water, as well as basic shelter. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights' commitment that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights"—possibly the most poignant and lovely words in any international agreement—is in and of themselves a mighty achievement that refutes the tyranny, discrimination, and disregard for human beings that have characterized human history (United Nations, 1998).

On May 23, 2017, the military engaged in a firefight with an undetermined number of men identified as the Maute group. This "Marawi siege" crisis lasted five months and resulted in massive community displacement, with thousands of Meranaos fleeing to relatives, friends, or evacuation centers in nearby areas. Thus, the Duterte administration issued Administrative Order No. 3, signed on June 28, 2017, creating Task Force Bangon Marawi for the recovery, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of the city of Marawi and other affected localities (Official Gazette, 2017). According to the Bangon Marawi Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Program, the crisis caused 369,196 people to flee their homes (Humanitarian Bulletin, 2018). These IDPs were evacuated mainly to

emergency shelters in Iligan City, Cagayan de Oro City, Lanao del Sur, and Lanao del Norte. Because these emergency shelters were overcrowded, some families preferred staying home with close relatives and friends.

Large-scale disasters require shelters, which are integral to disaster response and recovery. Shelters provide a private and secure environment for people forced to leave or lose their customary living quarters due to a calamity. It not only provides urgent and short-term refuge for disaster victims, but it also aids in their recovery from the stress of the disaster and serves as a starting point for the rehabilitation process. However, a literature review indicates some questions or concerns about the delivery of social services and, in general, the implementation of housing projects in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter. These include issues related to WASH (water, sanitation, and hygiene). Specifically, some housing beneficiaries complain about inadequate water supply, no proper drainage system, issues with dislodging, and limited space in the shelter, not to mention some other significant problems with livelihood, transportation, and education. The Duterte administration vowed to provide temporary shelters for the Marawi IDPs. At the same time, full-blast rehabilitation of the war-torn city is ongoing, but the question is, are the housing projects implemented correctly? This crisis is a challenge to the Task Force Bangon Marawi and the concerned agencies to provide concrete solutions to the abovementioned issues. The goal of conducting this study was to assist in addressing the problems with providing social services to the IDPs at the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter.

Theoretical Framework

Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow first proposed the concept of a hierarchy of needs in his 1943 paper "A Theory of Human Motivation" and the following book, *Motivation and Personality*. According to this hierarchy, people are motivated to achieve their basic wants before moving on to more complex requirements. While several existing schools of thought focused on negative behaviors, Maslow was more interested in learning what makes people happy and what they do to achieve that aim. One of our fundamental wants is shelter; it protects us from the weather, keeps us warm and safe, and encourages us to meet our other needs. The shelter is one of the criteria for meeting our physiological needs, according to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (along with the need for food, water, air, sleep, and sex). Maslow (1943) depicted the physiological needs of humans as the base of a triangle to demonstrate that addressing these needs is an essential thing we can do in our lives. If these needs are unmet, the person may be able to focus solely on completing their physiological needs and lose motivation to pursue self-actualization. A pyramid is the most popular illustration of Maslow's hierarchy. The most basic requirements are at the bottom of the pyramid, while the most complex requirements are at the top. The bottom of the pyramid comprises basic biological needs such as food, water, sleep, and warmth. Once these lower-level requirements have been addressed, people can move on to the next level of demands: safety and security. People's psychological and social needs become more significant as they progress up the pyramid. Over time, love, connection, and closeness become increasingly important.

The Marawi IDPs, especially those from the Most Affected Area/Ground Zero, lost their houses as the battle between the military and the Maute group erupted. With this, one of the main goals they had to prioritize, aside from food and water, was to secure shelter. Some IDPs opted to stay with their relatives; hence, they are called "home-based" IDPs. Others had no choice but to remain temporarily in some evacuation centers in the neighboring places of Marawi, which include Saguiaran, Marantao, and Iligan City, to name a few. However, they had to go through the necessary means just to be included in the list of housing beneficiaries in transitory shelters because their host family, where they evacuated, could not accommodate them anymore. Considering the importance of shelters for survival, the government provided transitory shelters for the Marawi IDPs through the National Housing Authority. At the same time, constructing permanent housing and rehabilitation inside the Most Affected Area is ongoing.

Theory of Social Inclusion

The social inclusion theory is about groups of people requiring assistance due to their circumstances. It is easily related to the "social exclusion" philosophy and may be traced back to the French concept of *Les Exclus* in 1970, with René Lenoir credited with coining the phrase (Robo, 2014). In a socially inclusive society, everyone is valued, and their basic needs are met, according to this view. This, in turn, fosters a sense of community among the people. However, some principles underpin the social inclusion theory, such as that everyone needs help, can learn, participate, and communicate, is ready, and is better together. Social inclusion results from constructive actions to improve people's situations. Social inclusion is the polar opposite of social exclusion theory (The Charity Commission, 2001). Because both theories are "inseparable sides of the same coin," this theory is best understood when understanding social exclusion theory (Robo, 2014). The Social Inclusion Theory is appropriate for this study because it promotes the integration of internally displaced persons into larger society to meet their basic needs and receive other assistance from government and non-government organizations.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, this study aimed to assess the transitional shelter and its component social services delivered to the IDPs in Barangay Sagonsongan, Marawi City. More specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the social services delivered by the government to the IDPs in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter as perceived by them?
2. What are the IDP respondents' perceptions of the effectiveness of the transitory shelter?
3. What are the problems encountered by the IDP respondents in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter in terms of the following factors: a) water supply, b) electric supply, c) sanitation and hygiene, d) safety and security, and e) livelihood?

Scope and Limitation

The coverage of this study includes only the assessment of the transitory shelter and its component social services delivered to the IDPs in Barangay Sagonsongan, Marawi City. It is only limited to the six areas of the Sagonsongan Transitional Shelter under the NHA project. The respondents were given ample time to answer the survey questionnaires at one point in time. The subject of this study focused only on the selected Marawi IDP housing beneficiaries in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter since the researcher serves as the NHA's focal person and field worker in the said area and has direct contact with the respondents and could access firsthand information directly. Due to several restrictions amid the pandemic, only the household heads of every family, based on the NHA's official master list, were used as respondents in this study. The purpose is to gather the needed data while observing necessary health protocols such as maintaining a distance, wearing of face mask, and less exposure to some members of the respondent's family. This research was limited to 210 household head respondents only.

Related Literature

UN Guiding Principles on IDPs

The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement include principles that describe IDPs' rights and the responsibilities of national governments to protect and assist them. They spell out the guarantees for IDPs' safety and assistance while displaced until they can return, reintegrate, or relocate to another place. They also have protections in place to prevent arbitrary displacement. The principles emphasize that national authorities' primary obligation is to safeguard and assist all IDPs, regardless of the reason for their displacement (Global Protection Cluster, 2021). The 30 Guiding Principles are divided into times of displacement. Protection against displacement (principles 5–9), protection during displacement (principles 10–23), the humanitarian aid framework (principles 24–27), and protection during return, local integration in displaced areas, and resettlement in a different part of the country are all addressed (principles 28 to 30). IDPs share the same rights and freedom as other citizens of their country under international and local law, without discrimination, according to the Guiding Principles. According to the principles, IDPs must never be discriminated against because of their displacement or other comparable factors. The principles restate the right not to be forcibly displaced and ban relocation based on ethnic, religious, or racial grounds. This way, they explicitly articulate what international law suggests, filling substantial gaps in IDP protection. The principles emphasize that national authorities' primary obligation is to guarantee the IDPs' rights to their basic needs. They should accept foreign aid when they cannot support and protect IDPs. IDPs also have the option of seeking asylum in another country. The principles underline the significance of a voluntary and safe return in dignity throughout the return phase and the need to aid the displaced in reclaiming their property and belonging.

Internal Displacement

Globally, there are about 40 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) due to violence, nearly doubling the number of refugees. Conversely, IDPs are only protected at the global level by the soft-law Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (Orchard, 2019). The scale of the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) social phenomena is a tremendous humanitarian problem. IDPs, who vary from refugees in that they are displaced within their country of origin, are estimated to number around 26 million people today (UNHCR, 2001). Furthermore, such figures do not consider that counting the displaced is not always straightforward due to the stigma associated with displacement; many IDPs hide to avoid the registration procedure. Because of this crisis's internal character, the internally displaced's research and difficulties are less well recognized than those of other displaced populations, such as refugees or asylum seekers. As a result, the multifaceted challenges of IDPs have frequently been examined as stand-alone topics, employing frameworks such as the legal framework (Deng, 1999), the commercial framework, and the psychological. Although piecemeal, these standalone stories of internal displacement have successfully brought to light specific facets of this multi-pronged phenomenon. Internally displaced persons are rarely precisely counted, partly because of conflicts about defining who is internally displaced (UNHCR, 2001).

According to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, internally displaced persons (IDPs) are people and groups coerced or compelled to leave and stay away from their homes while remaining inside their country's borders (Deng, 1999). The second distinguishes them from refugees, who are similarly relocated against their choice but across internationally recognized state borders. Internal relocation is frequently triggered by armed conflict, persecution, conditions of widespread violence, natural and man-made disasters, and, more recently, large-scale development initiatives. However, the problem's scope and the response's character have grown significantly in the last two decades. It is worth noting that the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement were the first international attempt to build a comprehensive normative framework for IDP protection (Smit, 2012).

New occurrences of conflict displacement were registered in 50 countries in 2019, according to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center. Most new displacements occurred in poor countries, each recorded for millions of people. The region with the highest percentage was Sub-Saharan Africa. Escalating violence and general security degradation in the Sahel, particularly in Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger, have resulted in many new displacements. Due to persistent conflict in Somalia and South Sudan, hundreds of thousands have been forced to escape their homes. Internal displacement can be disastrous for IDPs and the communities that host and accommodate them. While the act of displacement may violate the human rights of those affected, the subsequent loss of essential resources can impair IDPs' ability to assert and enjoy a wide range of fundamental rights (Mooney, 2005). IDPs depend entirely on others for basic requirements such as shelter, food, and water. At the same time, limits on livelihood, source of income, and health access in their shifted areas may worsen their plight. Furthermore, the longer IDPs are displaced, the higher the chance of conventional family and societal institutions breaking, leaving them vulnerable to economic and sexual exploitation and dependent on outside assistance. As a result of this reliance, the odds of long-term solutions and permanent reintegration into society are diminished once political and security situations permit such solutions. To ensure that the displaced do not lose their human rights, nations must give special aid to IDPs tailored to their specific vulnerabilities, ensuring that IDPs are treated similarly to non-IDPs. The Geneva-based Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) has looked at the notion of "home" from the perspective of those who have been internally displaced (Achieng, 2003), where the house is perceived to embody material, cultural, social, and economic characteristics of those who have been displaced.

Concept of Transitory Shelter

The shelter is essential for several purposes, especially in post-disaster scenarios. Following emergency response, public and private organizations and other disaster responders must make critical decisions on developing temporary shelter options that address urgent risks and long-term reconstruction and recovery requirements. Temporary accommodation may be required for years until a permanent solution is discovered. Groups working on shelter in such circumstances create much of the grey literature on strategies for transitional shelter in post-natural disaster scenarios in developing countries, as well as a few academic studies and independent evaluations. Transitional shelter, rather than a multi-phased approach, is defined by the Transitional Shelter Guidelines as "an incremental procedure that supports the shelter of families affected by conflicts and disasters as they strive to preserve choices for their recovery". They emphasize that the approach should only be part of a long-term, comprehensive shelter, settlement, and reconstruction strategy. The transitional shelter can be utilized to support the affected communities in a range of settlement scenarios. It can take years to complete, and it is exclusively for tenants when they cannot have land rights or a safe place to live close to their sources of income right once and for owners when repairs or reconstruction cannot begin right away (Shelter Centre 2012).

According to USAID, transitional shelter meets disaster-affected households' short- to medium-term needs (up to three years). It is frequently used in conjunction with emergency shelter help. Transitional shelter comprises providing inputs such as salvaged materials where conditions allow. In Haiti and Pakistan, for example, the need for guidance on gradually improving and expanding temporary shelters to become permanent dwellings has been demonstrated. Transitional shelter interventions use disaster risk reduction approaches to reduce the overwhelming impact of future disasters while also considering the needs of the severely affected. The survivors and stakeholders are concerned about pre- and post-disaster shelter needs. In disaster shelters, the overall safety and security of the well-being of the IDPs are considered crucial (IFRC/RCS, 2013). Such shelters are frequently used until displaced people can be re-housed in their renovated original residences or new permanent accommodations. Although providing shelter is widely recognized as an essential part of disaster response and recovery following disasters such as earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunamis, and floods, it is still being determined whether shelter is best given the vast range of circumstances that can occur in practice. As a result, situations such as poorly placed sites and slow delivery of social services and other assistance have hampered the creation and functioning of shelters (Barakat, 2003). Furthermore, shelter design may miss locally accessible skills and resources (Johnson, 2007; Hadafi & Fallahi, 2010), and shelters may not meet an acceptable level of life. Finally, salvaging shelters for future storage and reuse has been challenging in several cases (Arsalan & Cosgun, 2007). The shelter provides a habitable area to persons who reside there between war or natural catastrophes and the construction of a long-term shelter solution (Corsalis & Vitale, 2005).

The transitional shelter program provided a viable shelter option for families waiting for permanent housing. Despite some communication issues, shelter residents were grateful for their temporary accommodations. Transitional shelter residents have a

better chance of regaining their livelihood (IFRC/RCS, 2013). In the early stages of a disaster, having proper shelter is critical for human life. For a space to be habitable, it needs more than just a roof. Shelter residents must have adequate resources such as food and clothing (Ashmore, 2004). DR shelters are safe, sanitary, and habitable structures people can utilize during disasters until they return home. Many disaster relief shelters are designed to be raised, dismantled, and stored for subsequent use (Arsalan, 2007). These shelters can be used for various purposes (AGOTS, 2007). A shelter and a habitation serve different purposes. Shelters provide a safe and secure environment to live immediately after a disaster, whereas houses incorporate regular family tasks and job routines. The appropriate shelter is "an immediate environment for all aspects of family life", according to UN/OCHA/ESB (2006). The lack of suitable shelter throughout the reconstruction period severely impacts health and livelihoods, making rehabilitation and recovery more complex. Regardless of the extent of government and humanitarian support provided, the affected people always put out the most effort, such as through self-help programs. This becomes a big worry when assistance is insufficient to meet demands, and the afflicted population must partly rebuild via their recovery. Nonetheless, temporary shelter is a step-by-step approach to providing temporary refuge to families after a conflict or disaster. It is not a separate response phase because it begins with the initial help provided, such as the distribution of plastic sheeting. Recovered materials plus further support, such as funding or additional material delivery, allow for incremental construction and upgrade (IOM, 2011).

With regards to the housing for Marawi IDPs, it is significant to note that the National Housing Authority – Marawi Project Management Office, established in July 2018, is the lead shelter agency tasked to construct both transitory and permanent housing for Marawi IDPs as part of the government's effort for Marawi Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. Through the NHA, the Task Force Bangon Marawi (TFBM) has already constructed 1,352 units in Sagonsongan, clustered into seven areas – Area 1, 2,3,4,5,6, and 8. As to Area 7, the Xavier University Foundation is responsible for constructing its 100 transitory units under the "Angat Buhay" program of Vice President Leni Robredo (Cepeda, 2018). Here is the breakdown of units in every area of the said shelter site: Area 1 with 102 units; Area 2 with 217 units; Area 3 with 54 units; Area 4 with 150 units; Area 5 with 194 units; Area 6 with 335 units and finally, Area 8 with 300 units, a total of 1,352 units (NHA, 2019).

Livelihood for the Internally Displaced Persons

In a 2020 master thesis by Lazum Htu Tawng entitled "Exploring the Livelihoods of Internally Displaced Persons in Kachin State, Myanmar", accordingly, being an IDP and the lack of livelihoods, lack of income, limited options, and related income-generating possibilities of IDPs were found to be some of the vital challenges (Oxfam, 2016). Livelihoods are essential to reduce shocks and vulnerability and improve people's lives. Livelihood is a holistic concept that includes material and non-material well-being (Gale, 2011), and it helps pass beyond the emergency stage. According to the Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons, everyone has the right to a livelihood. For displaced people, loss of livelihood creates several security problems since it undermines their psycho-social well-being through diminishing self-esteem. Income generated during displacement improves people's quality of life, preventing long-term dependency and further discrimination and abuse. Although livelihood programs may not be sustainable, they should strive to maintain short- and long-term livelihoods to save lives, build resilience, and address vulnerability (Global Protection Cluster, 2010).

Methodology

This study used a quantitative research approach with an Ex Post-Facto research design, specifically a cross-sectional survey design, to collect the primary data needed in the study at one point. It used a survey questionnaire to determine the respondents' responses in assessing the transitional shelter and its component social services delivered to the IDPs in Barangay Sagonsongan, Marawi City. Furthermore, it used basic statistical tools such as frequency count, percentage distribution, and weighted mean.

Locale of the Study

Sagonsongan is one of the ninety-six barangays in the city of Marawi, in the province of Lanao del Sur. Its population, as determined by the 2015 Census, was 500 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2015). This represented 0.25% of the total population of Marawi. Sagonsongan is situated at approximately 8.0094, 124.2473, on the island of Mindanao. Elevation at these coordinates is estimated at 646.2 meters or 2,120.1 feet above mean sea level. Sagonsongan shares a common border with the following barangays:

1. Banga, Marawi, Lanao del Sur
2. Rapasun MSU, Marawi, Lanao del Sur
3. Alinun, Saguwaran, Lanao del Sur
4. Dimaluna, Marawi, Lanao del Sur
5. Beyaba-Damag, Marawi, Lanao del Sur

6. Bubonga Punod, Marawi, Lanao del Sur

Population and Sample of the Study

The total population of the study is 1,052 Marawi IDP households who are housing beneficiaries in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter in Barangay Sagonsongan, Marawi City. However, only twenty percent (20%) of the population was selected for the sample of this study, a total of two hundred ten (210) household heads that underwent random sampling. This total sample of respondents was 20% of the households (1,052) of the six (6) areas of the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter. Area 7 is not an NHA project, while Area 8 still needs to be occupied.

Sampling Technique Used

The researcher used Sloven’s formula to get the study sample, or 20% of the household population per area of the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter. The results were stratified according to the allowable percentage (20%) per total household of the areas considered in the Sagonsongan Transitional Shelter – Area 1 to 6 only. Please find the stratification below.

Areas	No. Of Households (Housing Beneficiary)	Sample Household (20%)
Area 1	102	20
Area 2	217	43
Area 3	54	11
Area 4	150	30
Area 5	194	39
Area 6	335	67
Total	1,052	210

Survey Questionnaire

The study used a survey method for collecting primary data from the field. Furthermore, the research instrument has four major parts. Part I deals with the socio-economic and demographic profiles of the respondents. Part II details the social services that the respondents believed they had received. Part III pertains to the IDP respondents’ perception of the effectiveness of the shelter awarded to them. Lastly, Part IV contains the problems encountered by the IDP respondents in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter.

The finding of the Study

Respondents’ Socio-demographic Profile

This section describes the socio-economic and demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, number of children, highest educational attainment, and livelihood/occupation.

Table 1
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
16-20	4	1.90
21-30	42	20.0
Above 30	164	78.1
Total	210	100.0

The table shows that of the 210 respondents, only 4 (1.90%) were 16–20 years old; 42 (20%) were around 21–30 years old, and 164 (78.1%) were 30 years old and above. The results imply that most respondents (164, or 78.1%) are adults. This finding also means that they can provide accurate answers to the survey questionnaire provided, as they usually serve as interviewees whenever different agencies visit the transitory shelter.

Table 2
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	90	42.9
Female	120	57.1
Total	210	100.0

As reflected in Table 3, most respondents (120, or 57.1%) are female, while only 90 (42.9%) are male. The findings suggest that most of the males were away during the survey since the fathers, who act as household heads, were usually out working for a living to provide for the needs of their families. The finding indicates the increasing number of women who serve as the primary provider for the family and are staying in their homes, taking care of the children. Moreover, it was observed during the conduct of the survey that it is the wives who usually entertain interviews.

Table 3
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Single	14	6.7
Married	141	67.1
Widow/Widower	41	19.5
Separated	14	6.7
Total	210	100.0

As shown in Table 4, the majority (141 or 67.1%) of the respondents were married, while only 14 (6.7%) were single. The remaining respondents were either widows (41 or 19.5%) or separated (14 or 6.7%). The findings imply an increasing number of widows/widowers in the area. Some respondents stressed that their spouses died during the Marawi siege, while others died during their stay in the said transitory shelters.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to the Number of Children

No. of Children	Frequency	Percentage (%)
0	16	7.6
1-2	38	18.1
3-4	61	29.0
Five and above	95	45.2
Total	210	100.0

It is shown in Table 4 that less than half (95 or 45.2%) of the respondents have five and more children, followed by those with 3-4 children (61 or 29.0%) and 1-2 children (38 or 18.1%). The findings imply that Muslims prefer a big family to a small one.

Table 5
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Highest Educational Attainment

No. of Children	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Elementary	56	26.7
High School	79	37.6
College	75	35.7
Total	210	100.0

In terms of the respondents' highest educational attainment, Table 5 reveals that more than one-third (79 or 37.6%) of the respondents completed high school education, closely followed by those with a college education (75 or 35.7%). Meanwhile, 56 (26.7%) of the respondents were elementary level. The respondents' highest educational attainment findings imply that the majority were already at the high school and college level, which means they know their opinions and answers in the survey questionnaire.

Table 6
Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution of Respondents according to Livelihood/Occupation

Livelihood	Frequency	Percentage (%)
None	70	33.3
Sari-sari store owner	33	15.7
Street food vendor	27	12.9
Tricycle Driver	26	12.4
Government Employee	21	10.0
Tailor	9	4.3
BPAT	6	2.9
Barangay Kagawad	4	1.9
NGO Volunteers	4	1.9
Arabic teacher	3	1.4
RTW	3	1.4
Construction Worker	2	1
Pensioner	1	0.5
Farmer	1	0.5
Total	210	100.0

As disclosed in Table 6, one-third (70 or 33.3%) of the respondents reported no income or jobless. On the other hand, 33 (15.7%) respondents are sari-sari store owners, followed by street food vendors (27 or 12.9%) and then tricycle drivers (26 or 12.4%). These findings showed how the Marawi siege adversely affected the livelihood of the people of Marawi. During the survey, most of the respondents who stated that they currently have no source of income were self-employed before the siege. The findings imply that most respondents live in extreme poverty because they cannot satisfy their basic needs, especially food, due to the lack of income from being jobless.

Social Services Delivered to the IDPs

Table 7
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Social Services Delivered

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Relief goods are still being provided.	8	3.81	67	31.90	87	41.43	48	22.86	2.17	<i>D</i>
Have access to adequate, nutritious, and culturally sensitive food.	12	5.71	57	2.71	107	50.95	34	16.19	2.22	<i>D</i>
Medicines are also being provided, especially during the pandemic.	9	4.29	40	19.05	88	41.90	73	34.76	1.93	<i>D</i>
Have access to safe and quality healthcare services.	12	5.71	79	37.62	85	40.48	34	16.19	2.33	<i>D</i>
The government ensures that IDPs have access to necessities.	10	4.76	107	50.95	79	37.62	14	6.67	2.54	<i>A</i>
Sports facilities are available.	38	18.10	83	39.52	68	32.38	21	10.00	2.66	<i>A</i>
Special attention is given to marginalized groups such as the disabled and senior citizens.	18	8.57	87	41.43	81	38.57	24	11.43	2.47	<i>D</i>
Psychosocial support with due consideration of Islamic beliefs is also provided.	24	11.43	125	59.52	52	24.76	9	4.29	2.78	<i>D</i>

Adequate classrooms are available.	64	30.48	109	51.90	34	16.19	3	1.43	3.11	<i>D</i>
Have access to timely information that can help save lives.	20	9.52	114	54.29	46	21.90	30	14.29	2.59	<i>D</i>
Overall Mean Score									2.48	<i>D</i>

Scaling/Legend: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A), 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), V-Verbal Interpretation

The findings on the social services delivered to the IDPs obtained an overall mean score of 2.48, interpreted as “Disagree”, implying disagreement on most of the statement indicators mentioned above. This can only mean that the provision of social services to the IDPs is insufficient. This is a threat since some of the said services are the basic needs of every human being. According to Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, people are motivated to meet particular wants, and some needs take precedence over others. Individuals must attend to lower-level demands before attending to higher-level requirements (Maslow, 1943). In the transitory shelter, where the majority have no source of income, the assistance of both public and private entities is vital for the IDPs to at least start a new life after almost everything they have was taken away due to the siege.

The statement indicator “Adequate classrooms are available” mainly represents the highest weighted mean score of 3.11. At the same time, the statement indicator “medicines are also being provided especially during the pandemic” has the lowest weighted mean score of 1.93. The findings imply that education was one of the government’s most prioritized assistance among the social services provided to the IDPs. Some schools operating in Sagonsongan include Marawi Central Elementary Pilot School, Dansalan National High School, and Fountain Harvest Islamic Academy. The IDPs believe that the number of classrooms built was sufficient to accommodate their children, primarily grade-schoolers and high school enrollees, especially now that the government is gearing up for the resume of face-to-face classes. Under Article 6 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1998), everyone has the right to education. Meanwhile, a study titled "Access to Medicines among Internally Displaced and Non-displaced People in Urban Areas in Colombia" (Rodriguez, 2019) discovered that IDPs with health problems used fewer health services than the general population, indicating barriers to essential medicines and other services exist. However, there is very little data on the scope of the problem of IDPs’ access to medicine.

It was also found that the majority of the respondents disagreed with the statement indicators “relief goods are still being provided” (87 or 41.43%) and “have access to adequate, nutritious, and culturally sensitive food” (107 Or 50.95%). They believe such assistance was only abundant, especially during their first few months in the transitory shelter and every holy month of Ramadhan. As to the present, as some of the respondents emphasized, the BARMM government sometimes delivers food packs in the form of 10 or 20 kilos of rice, but as for the national government, it has been so long since it provided any assistance. In this regard, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization in 2015 stated that the human right to adequate food, which is essentially a right to feed oneself in dignity, has particular relevance to emergencies not only because it relates to a human necessity but also because it enshrines both immediate subsistence-related commitments and long-term, progressively realizable obligations.

Meanwhile, 85 (40.48%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement indicator “have access to safe and quality healthcare services”. During the early days of the IDPs in the transitory shelter, several free medical missions were being conducted by the Department of Health and their partner agencies for the IDPs, but this did not last long. Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) are considered to have a right to health and other essential services, including a standard of living sufficient to sustain their health and well-being (Asher, 2004). This is also stated in the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and numerous international human rights and humanitarian law instruments. Because the world has stopped due to COVID-19, vulnerable groups such as IDPs have been weakened and are more susceptible to injustice and inequality. They frequently have little or no access to essential services, preventing them from receiving most relief and support. Internally displaced people are being left behind, which is awful. The economic gap between those who can afford good health care and those who cannot, such as IDP families, should be considered. Most internally displaced persons (IDPs) may lack the financial means or even the ability to obtain social and health services (Chu & Michael, 2018; Nassar & Elsayed, 2018). Even if they receive free health care, they may face competition from others, particularly the host community, resulting in social tensions and reduced social networks. Most hospitals are likewise limited in capacity, personnel, and resources. In Sagonsongan, there are clinics in Areas 2 and 4, but not all IDPs living there can avail of free medicines and medical consultations.

Moreover, the finding showed that the statement indicator "sports facilities are available" (83 or 39.52%) was agreeable to most respondents. Children and teens can learn to be attentive to others' needs and values through athletics and how to deal with exclusion and dominance, manage their emotions, and develop self-control. In Sagonsongan, a covered court is located in Areas 2 and 6.

Youths from different areas often flock to the area to play basketball, volleyball, and table tennis. Indeed, sports play a vital role, especially for children and youth, in converting their attention from engaging in different vices into productive recreational activities, considering the number of youth and children in the said transitory site. Without a doubt, the main focus of any early emergency intervention in a conflict or disaster relief is to provide food, shelter, clothing, medical aid, and family reunification. However, in the early stages of an emergency, when the assessment and establishment of response needs are still in progress, the quick re-establishment of simple cultural activities such as sports, play areas, and religious practices in the affected community can make a significant and immediate contribution to the recovery process.

In addition, 81 (38.57%) respondents disagreed with the statement indicator "special attention is given to marginalized groups such as the disabled and senior citizens". Several non-government organizations are actively assisting the IDPs, such as Community and Family Services International (CFSI), City Social Welfare and Development (CSWD), Medicines Sans Frontiers (MSF), and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), among others. However, it can be deduced from the findings of this study that a minimal number of IDPs could avail. Due to the limited number of slots for assistance, the agencies had to lay down specific criteria. Moreover, 125, 59.52%, of the respondents agreed that "psychosocial support with due consideration of Islamic beliefs is also provided". The Community and Family Services International (CFSI), through its Marawi Recovery Project's Psychosocial Support Component, frontlines the conduct of psychosocial-related activities not just in Sagonsongan but in other transitory sites as well, wherein IDP sectors such as the group of mothers, fathers, and youth are engaged in focus-group discussion (FGD). Its strength is that it allows participants to agree or disagree with one another, allowing participants to gain insight into how a group thinks about an issue, the variety of opinions and ideas, and the contradictions and variations that exist in a community's beliefs, experiences, and practices.

Additionally, the above data indicate whether they can access timely information to help save lives. In this connection, 114 (54.29%) respondents affirmed that the elected area and block leaders often provide updates, particularly on matters concerning their stay in the transitory shelter, their "kambalingan" in the city's ground zero, and most importantly, on the government's provision of assistance, which includes the pending bill on compensation for Marawi IDPs. Moreover, radio stations and the official Facebook pages of different Bangon Marawi partner agencies serve as outlets for reliable and verified information. Given that the people are currently in the recovery stage and there are limited resources, it is significant to note that the DSWD, the government's arm for delivering social services, provided minimal assistance in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter. Meanwhile, the BARMM government, through the Ministry of Social Services and Development, currently serves as the frontline in assisting.

Effectiveness of the Transitory Shelter Awarded to the IDPs

Table 8

Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Effectiveness of the Transitory Shelters

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
The shelters are made of standard and good quality materials, thus long-lasting.	95	45.24	93	44.29	13	6.19	9	4.29	3.30	SA
The awarded housing unit has a well-built comfort room.	170	80.95	34	16.19	5	2.38	1	0.48	3.78	SA
The rainwater collector provided for water storage is handy.	173	82.38	26	12.38	8	3.81	3	1.43	3.76	SA
The shelter is comfortable and convenient.	98	46.67	84	40.00	25	11.90	3	1.43	3.32	SA
The shelter is enough for a family of five.	43	20.48	100	47.62	51	24.29	16	7.62	2.81	A
The shelter is decent and habitable.	47	22.38	146	69.52	12	5.71	5	2.38	3.12	A
A five-year stay in a transitory shelter is acceptable.	16	7.62	31	14.76	65	30.95	98	46.67	1.83	D

								67		
The shelter has sufficient space and privacy.	33	15.71	125	59.52	42	20.00	10	4.76	2.86	A
The shelter is well-ventilated and lighted.	46	21.90	141	67.14	21	10.00	2	0.95	3.10	A
Clean and safe space available for daily prayers.	57	27.14	134	63.81	16	7.62	3	1.43	3.17	A
Overall Mean Score									3.11	A

Scaling/ Legend: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A), 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (SD), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), and VI – Verbal Interpretations

Regarding the effectiveness of the transitory shelters, the overall mean score is 3.11, verbally interpreted as “Agree”. The study disclosed findings that the IDPs in Sagonsongan are satisfied with the transitory shelters provided to them. Notably, the shelters are the first-ever transitory shelters constructed for the Marawi IDPs. Hence, Table 8 shows that the respondents responded positively to nine (9) out of ten (10) statement indicators.

As posited above, 95 (45.24%) respondents strongly agreed that the shelters are made of standard and suitable quality materials, thus long-lasting. Such shelters are constructed in a 40 square meter lot with a 22 square meter floor area. These are single-detached, pre-fabricated units with individual power and water installations. Specifically, the housing units in Areas 1, 2, and 5 are made of hardiflex and steel frame; Areas 3 and 4 are made of the sandwich panel under Korean technology, while the units in Area 6 are made of plywood (NHA, 2018). When discussing housing quality, people cannot help but compare the present government’s housing programs to the previous administrations. Likewise, 170 (80.95%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement “the awarded housing units have a well-built comfort room”. What is unique in this housing program is that every unit has its comfort room where the IDPs have privacy. What has been accustomed in transitory shelters for IDPs is that community latrines are usually provided instead of individual comfort rooms.

Also, 173 (82.38%) respondents strongly agreed that “the rainwater collector provided for water storage is useful and handy”. The said rainwater collectors, with a capacity of 1,000 cubic meters, were provided by the National Housing Authority as part of its intervention for the intermittent water supply in the transitory shelter. The data findings imply that the rainwater collectors ease water woes in the said transitory shelter. The data gathered also revealed that 98 (46.67%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement indicator “the shelter is comfortable and convenient”; 100(47.62%) agreed that “the shelter is enough for a family of five”; 146 (69.52%) agreed that “shelter is decent and habitable”; 125 (59.52%) agreed that “the shelter has sufficient space and privacy”; 141 (67.14%) agreed that “the shelter is well-ventilated and lighted” and 134 (63.81%) agreed that “the shelter has clean and safe space available for daily prayers”. It implies that shelter is a priority on the respondent's list of life-sustaining necessities. The right to appropriate shelter is one component of everyone's right to decent living. This right was first acknowledged in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and has since been incorporated into several international human rights treaties.

Meanwhile, 98 or 46.67% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement “the five-year stay in the transitory shelter is acceptable”. This indicates that the respondents did not accept a five-year stay in the shelter, even though the local government and TFBM assured them before their move to Sagonsongan that they would only be in the transitory shelter for five years. According to UN-Habitat, way back in 2009, housing must meet several criteria, the most important of which is the IDPs' security of tenure. It claims that housing is insufficient if residents do not have a degree of tenure security that ensures legal protection from evictions, harassment, and other dangers. In the case of the IDPs in Sagonsongan, the primary reason why their tenurial status in the relocation site is temporary is the mere fact that the land was borrowed from different lot owners. It will not be granted to the beneficiaries. Hence, the term transitory or temporary housing. Even if some of the IDPs are allowed to return to their place of origin or barangay in Marawi, there is still no guarantee as to the extent of their capacity to shoulder the financial responsibilities in doing such.

Problems Encountered by the IDPs in their Transitory Shelters

A. As to Water Supply

Table 9
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Water Supply Problem

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
There is no adequate water supply in the shelter.	91	43.33	68	32.38	34	16.19	17	8.10	3.11	SA
Lack of access to potable water.	53	25.24	75	35.71	63	30.00	19	9.05	2.77	A
The local government is doing its best to address the shelter of water supply issues.	23	10.95	107	50.95	64	30.48	16	7.62	2.65	A
The scheduling of water delivery per area is being appropriately observed.	16	7.62	54	25.71	82	39.05	58	27.62	2.13	D
Overall Mean Score									2.67	A

Scaling/Legend: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A); 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD); VI – Verbal Interpretation

Regarding the problems encountered by the IDPs to water supply, 91 (43.33%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement “there is no adequate water supply in the shelter”. Access to water for every family has been an issue even before the Marawi siege. The lack of access to clean water worsened due to the destruction of pumping facilities and outdated distribution pipelines serving the city during the war. Everyone has the right to good quality water for personal and home use under the human right to water. Water is a vital human right for life, health, and dignity. During relocation, people need access to water, sanitation, and essential hygiene services as soon as possible to ensure their survival, especially in terms of disease prevention and dignity, until they can return home or find another long-term solution. Water has long been a cause of contention both inside and between communities. This is especially true during displacement when there is frequently a lack of water due to a significant inflow of people. Water, on the other hand, is a life-sustaining resource. People can survive for extended periods without food than they can without water. As a result, water needs to be provided immediately when a displacement emergency occurs. The goal is to ensure enough water is available for adequate distribution and is safe to drink (UNHCR,2003). In Sagonsongan, the inadequate water supply forces some of the IDPs to purchase water from private vendors, a situation that, in the first place, should not be happening, not to mention its risks, particularly on the health of IDPs. Some international and local NGOs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and Action Against Hunger, supplemented the TFBM efforts with additional servicing of tank trucks.

Further, 75 or 35.71% of the respondents agreed that more access to potable water in the area needs to be available. This finding implies that the water supply provided to the IDPs is unsafe for drinking, so they must pay twenty pesos per gallon of water. According to UNHCR (1992), providing an abundant supply of pure and healthy water to beneficiaries is one of the most critical goals of aid programs during the IDP crisis. As a result, the water must be suitable for human consumption, not just potable but also tasty. Hence, some businessmen sell a gallon of drinking water for twenty pesos per 20 litres. Unfortunately, for a big size family, even the said amount is a burden since a single gallon cannot sustain for a day. Only those capable of buying have access to potable water. Providing potable water is the most excellent strategy to control so-called "waterborne" infections in an emergency IDP camp.

In connection to this, 82 (39.05%) respondents disagreed with the statement indicator “the scheduling of water delivery per area is being observed properly”. It is a fact that the water supply in the shelters is not open 24/7. Every area has its corresponding schedule on a once-per-week basis. Based on the study, Area 4, for example, their schedule is every Monday, but unfortunately, there were times when they were being supplied in the latter days. As a result, some IDPs are forced to fetch water in the nearby mosque in Barangay Emie Punud, while others go to Barangay Rorogagus to do their laundry in the Agus River. Nonetheless, the findings also imply an urgent need for the City Government to complete the water system to provide a sufficient water supply to Sagonsongan Transitory Shelters. It is significant to note that water is a basic physiological need, and its absence or inadequacy will result in grave health-related problems. Fortunately, the City Government had already completed the installation of water pipes in the main highways of Sagonsongan, but the problem is where to get the water source.

B. As to Electric Supply

Table 10
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Electric Supply Problem

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
There is an adequate electric supply in the shelter.	129	61.43	73	34.76	7	3.33	1	0.48	3.57	SA
The government supports paying electric bills.	144	68.57	55	26.19	9	4.29	2	0.95	3.62	SA
The IDPs are allowed to use whatever electric appliances they want.	127	60.48	69	32.86	5	2.38	9	4.29	3.50	SA
There are sufficient street lights in Sagon-songan Transitory shelters.	71	33.81	92	43.81	44	20.95	3	1.43	3.10	A
Overall Mean Score									3.45	A

Scaling/Legend 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A), 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), and VI – Verbal Interpretation

The findings on the encountered problem of the IDPs on electric supply indicated that most respondents “Agree” with an overall mean score of 3.45. A close look at this Table shows that the statement indicator “the government supports in paying the electric bill” represents the highest weighted mean score of 3.62, verbally interpreted as strongly agree. This further implies that the respondents are grateful since their electric bill from LASURECO is free of charge, being subsidized by the government through the National Housing Authority. The first batch of relocation in Sagonsongan was in January 2018, and up to these days, their electric bill was being shouldered by the government. If we analyze this case, it is evident how grateful the IDPs are because we all know that most of them do not have the means to pay their electric bill. If the majority find it hard to provide the basic needs of their family, especially food, how can they even pay for electricity?

In connection to this, the statement indicator “there is an adequate electric supply in the shelter” has the second-highest weighted mean of 3.57, verbally interpreted as strongly agree. This means that the respondents believe that the electric supply in the transitory shelter is sufficient and can accommodate their power needs. 127 (60.48%) respondents strongly agreed that they can use any appliances they want. Some households own a refrigerator, television, rice cooker and electric stoves. Based on the study's findings, the housing beneficiaries in Sagonsongan are not hesitant to use several electric appliances since it is free of charge. This serves as an opportunity for some business owners. Some sell ice, ice candy, and other products using refrigerators or freezers, while others sell street foods such as tempura and fish balls using electric stoves. The IDPs are using this despite frequent interruption/outage that happens occasionally, which usually occurs in Lanao del Sur, despite having the Agus Hydroelectric PowerPlant – a significant source of electricity for the entire Mindanao.

Meanwhile, the statement indicator “There are street lights in Sagonsongan Transitory shelters” was agreeable to 92 (43.81%) of the respondents. However, 44 (20.95%) respondents disagreed with this. This finding implies that not all areas in Sagonsongan were installed with street lights. This is true in Area 3, with only a few street lights. This issue must be brought to the attention of proper authorities for immediate action because it also concerns the security of the IDPs. In addition, the lack of lighting in the transitory shelters raises concerns about safety and gender-based violence. After dark, many residents, particularly women and children, feel unsafe strolling around the neighborhood.

The initial findings of Table 10 imply that the respondents agreed that electricity or power supply is not a big problem in the transitory shelter. All of the said shelters are connected to a local electricity grid. Access to energy is a basic human need, according to Harttman (2020). Cooking, lighting, warmth, and clean water are all provided by energy services. Energy is a priority for basic survival when several people travel inside or across borders. Cooking food and keeping a comfortable house temperature require safe and readily available fuel. Lighting is necessary for protection and safety, assisting households' economic operations, and allowing children to study in the evening hours. Power is also needed to charge mobile phones, which promotes communication with family

members and the free flow of information. Money transmission in cash assistance programs is also aided by providing energy.

C. As to Sanitation and Hygiene

Table 11
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Sanitation and Hygiene Problem

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
There is proper and efficient drainage in the shelter.	52	24.76	107	50.95	43	20.48	8	3.81	2.97	A
The drainage in the area is safe and well-constructed.	47	22.38	111	52.86	48	22.86	4	1.90	2.96	A
Problems with dislodging are being addressed/solved by the concerned agencies.	17	8.10	87	41.43	77	36.67	29	13.81	2.44	D
There is no proper waste and disposal management system in the area.	20	9.52	48	22.86	88	41.90	54	25.71	2.16	D
Garbage trucks regularly pick up garbage and waste materials.	117	55.71	48	22.86	39	18.57	6	2.86	3.31	SA
The government sufficiently provides personal hygiene kits.	10	4.76	37	17.62	109	51.90	54	25.71	2.01	D
Widespread communicable diseases are due to an unhealthy environment.	14	6.67	58	27.62	97	46.19	41	19.52	2.21	D
Overall Mean Score									2.58	A

Scaling: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A), 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), and VI – Verbal Interpretation

Table 11 shows an overall mean score of 2.58, interpreted as "Agree". Notably, the statement indicator “garbage truck regularly picks up garbage and waste materials” represents the highest weighted mean score of 3.31, verbally interpreted as strongly agree. This means the respondents are contented and appreciate the government’s effort to maintain cleanliness in the transitory shelter.

However, the government sufficiently provides the statement indicators “personal hygiene kits” and “problems on dislodging are being addressed/solved by the concern agencies” were disagreed by respondents with a weighted mean of 2.01 and 2.44, respectively. Hygiene kits were critically essential for everybody, especially amid pandemics. These include sanitary alcohol, soap, and face masks, among others. Based on the findings of the study, such hygiene kits were not sufficiently provided to the IDPs in Sagon-songan, knowing that the majority of them have little or worst, no source of income at all, which make them difficult to purchase the items above, not to mention that food becomes the priority over any other things. In the face of the global coronavirus pandemic, IDPs are especially at risk. That is why even hygiene kits serve as beneficial to them. Maintaining a sense of normalcy and preventing disease transmission can be as simple as keeping clean with basic hygiene kits. Selecting and distributing hygiene kits appropriately and effectively is critical to successfully implementing a hygiene promotion campaign. According to the Sphere Minimum Standard 2, IDPs have the right to hygiene kits to maintain health, dignity, and well-being (The Sphere Project, 2011). Coordination is critical for the selection and distribution of hygiene items to ensure that the needs for hygiene kits are met and maximum health benefits are achieved. It safeguards that hygiene kits are consistently distributed throughout the transitory shelters.

Furthermore, the statement indicators “there is a proper and efficient drainage in the shelter” and “the drainage in the area is safe and well-constructed” are agreeable to 107 (50.95%) and 111 (52.86%) respondents, respectively. However, some respondents disagreed with these because there are parts of Sagonsongan wherein the drainage is yet to be covered. Water rushes over the ground during rainstorms in places with poor drainage and sanitation, picking up excrement and contaminating water supplies. This considerably increases the spread of infections, may result in floods, and cause further health issues (Storm, 1998). It is critical to modernize drainage systems across refugee and IDP camps utilizing innovative technology to reach the United Nations 2030 Sustainable Development Goals without leaving vulnerable people behind, such as IDPs.

As to the issues of dislodging, there were claims that septic tanks in several areas have either overflowed or been found to be discharging wastewater into uncovered or open drainage canals. This problem with septic tanks is actual, particularly for the IDPs who first relocated to Sagonsongan in January 2018 and those with large families. The IDPs have raised issues on overflowing septic tanks several times, particularly during IDP consultations with different “Bangon Marawi” agencies and stakeholders. Goal 6 of the Sustainable Development Goals aims to “ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for everyone,” with Target 6.2 stating, “By 2030, achieve access to sufficient and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and eliminate open defecation” (United Nations, 2020).

Table 11 also shows that 77 (36.67%) respondents disagreed with the statement indicator “there is no proper waste and disposal management system in the area”. It implies that the IDPs living in the transitory shelters properly handle their garbage. Finding appropriate and long-term waste management solutions for the incoming population, especially in refugee and IDP camps and settlements, is critical to ensure acceptable and sanitary living conditions for displaced people while minimizing environmental and health impacts on the host community. Improper solid waste disposal can endanger people's health, degrade the environment, and cause socioeconomic issues. Without a formal or adequate waste management strategy and support, refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) are prone to turn to uncontrolled burning or burying of their waste. These acts endanger the health and safety of IDP camp residents, visitors, adjacent communities, and the local and long-term environment.

Also, with a weighted mean of 2.21, the respondents disagreed with the statement indicator “there is a widespread of communicable diseases due to unhealthy environment”. Common illnesses nowadays, especially amid pandemics, include cough and fever. It has been a tradition among several Meranao families to employ herbal medicines. Some families find it more effective than the medicines being sold in pharmacies. Nonetheless, it implies that the distribution of hygiene kits and community awareness of proper hygiene practices have proven effective in reducing the spread of communicable diseases. In summary, when the respondents were asked about their general perception of the problems relating to sanitation and hygiene, they drew mixed responses.

D. As to Safety and Security

Table 12
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Safety and Security Problem

Statement Indicators	SA		A		D		SD		\bar{X}	VI
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
The location of the shelter is safe and protected from threats.	78	37.14	121	57.62	9	4.29	2	0.95	3.31	SA
Occurrence of petty crimes like theft and robbery.	5	2.38	29	13.81	67	31.90	109	51.90	1.67	SD
Occurrence of conflict or “rido” among the IDPs.	0	0.00	14	6.67	76	36.19	120	57.14	1.50	SD
The location of the shelter is safe for children to play with.	34	16.19	117	55.71	55	26.19	4	1.90	2.86	A
There is a presence of police and military in the area’s vicinity.	53	25.24	123	58.57	30	14.29	4	1.90	3.07	A
The BPAT assists in se-										A

curing the area.	54	25.71	111	52.8 6	41	19.5 2	4	1.90	3.02	
The location of the shelter promotes a healthy and friendly environment.	33	15.71	137	65.2 4	26	12.3 8	14	6.67	2.90	A
Poor management of the temporary shelter.	18	8.57	39	18.5 7	91	43.3 3	62	29.5 2	2.06	D
Overall Mean Score									2.55	A

Scaling/Legend: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A), 1.76-2.5 – “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), VI-Verbal Interpretation

The findings show that the responses on the statement indicators obtained an overall mean score of 2.55, interpreted as “Agree”. The statement indicator “the shelter’s location is safe and protected from threats” mainly represents the highest weighted mean score of 3.31. This further implies that respondents agreed that they are safe and secure in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter since it is not that far from the city proper, and aside from the shelters for IDPs, several community facilities were also integrated into the area that, includes a mosque, covered court, business establishments, among others. They feel they are not alone and are already used to living in the area. Besides, the IDPs residing in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter had already developed and established a good relationship with their fellow IDPs on the site and their neighbors who happened to be living in the area before the Marawi siege.

Also, 109 (51.90%) respondents strongly disagreed that there is an “occurrence of petty crimes like theft and robbery” in the shelters. Accordingly, it implies that incidents are rare in their area since most IDPs have similar situations and statuses in life. Similarly, 120 (57.14%) respondents strongly disagreed that there is an occurrence of “rido” or family feud among the IDPs. Though it is common among Muslims, especially among the Meranao tribe, the respondents strongly believe with gratefulness that it is not evident in the transitory shelter site. There are also 117 (55.71%) respondents who agreed that the shelter’s location is safe for children to play. This implies that the open spaces in the transitory shelter serve as a haven for the children to enjoy their leisure time. Accordingly, some children can play with their friends within their area, unattended by guardians. In reality, children, as they roam around the transitory site, cannot be attended to by their parents or guardians throughout the day since the latter is usually quite busy earning a living. Some of them have their business outside the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter.

Moreover, 123 (58.57%) and 111 (52.86%) respondents agreed that there are men in uniform and members of BPAT who help secure their area. It can be observed that there is a military checkpoint situated near Area 4, as well as a police station where the IDPs can easily report if something terrible happens. Members of the Barangay Peace Action Team (BPAT) also assist in securing their area, especially during nighttime. The respondents also agreed that the shelter’s location promotes a healthy and friendly environment. However, the respondents disagreed that the temporary shelter is poorly managed. Others believe that the government, particularly the local government of Marawi, is doing its best to address the issues and concerns in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter, hoping that a brighter future for them awaits.

The findings imply that the respondents agreed that safety and security are not a problem. In this connection, as posited in the Post Conflict Needs Assessment of TFBM (2018), compelling and successful rehabilitation interventions and programs should result in the following: An increase in people’s security and their sense of security; people’s resistance to violence, provocations to violence, and adoption of a culture of peace; creation or reform of political institutions to handle the grievances, which drive or trigger conflicts; meaningful improvements in inter and intra- group relations, and momentum for peace by causing individuals and communities to develop their peace initiatives about the critical elements of context analysis.

The fact that some of the IDPs are highly desperate to return to the city’s Most Affected Area (MAA) might also be that the extremists' sympathisers still roam around the city. Most importantly, the IDPs must feel and realize that after the trauma and fear they experienced during the siege, they are now safer than ever. It is significant to note that in Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, safety and security are some of the needs of every human being.

E. As to Livelihood

Table 13
Frequency Count, Percentage Distribution, and Mean Score on the Livelihood Problem

	SA	A	D	SD		
--	----	---	---	----	--	--

Statement Indicators	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	\bar{X}	VI
The location of shelters is not ideal for any livelihood program.	54	25.71	83	39.52	62	29.52	11	5.24	2.86	A
The government does not provide sufficient livelihood programs.	22	10.48	107	50.95	75	35.71	6	2.86	2.69	A
The IDPs depend on the government to provide food and other basic needs.	89	42.38	39	18.57	46	21.90	36	17.14	2.86	A
Some public and private agencies provide livelihood assistance for housing beneficiaries.	41	19.52	144	68.57	24	11.43	1	0.48	3.07	A
Lack of job or employment opportunities.	133	63.33	42	20.00	24	11.43	11	5.24	3.41	S A
Overall Mean Score									2.98	A

Scaling/Legend: 3.26-4.00 – “Strongly Agree” (SA), 2.51-3.25 – “Agree” (A) 1.76-2. “Disagree” (D), 1.00-1.74 – “Strongly Disagree” (SD), VI-Verbal Interpretation

The findings revealed an overall mean score of 2.98, interpreted as “Agree”. Meaning that the respondents are agreeable that they are confronted with livelihood problems. These findings imply that many IDPs in Sagonsongan Transitory shelters were unemployed or only self-employed with minimal income to cover their needs for a living. Moreover, unemployment remains a considerable problem throughout our country. The Philippine unemployment rate as of September 2021 is estimated at 8.9% (PSA, 2021).

Notably, in terms of the livelihood aspect as a problem in transitory shelters, Table 13 reveals that the statement indicator “lack of job or employment opportunities” represents the highest weighted mean score of 3.41, verbally interpreted as strongly agree, wherein 133 (63.33%) respondents strongly agreed that there is a lack of job or employment opportunities in the transitory shelter. Most of the IDPs have no source of income because not all families can avail themselves of various livelihood assistance, particularly capital or financial assistance from different public and private agencies. We know for a fact that the resources of service providers are limited as well.

A total of 83 (39.52%) respondents agreed that the location of shelters could be better for any livelihood program. This finding implies that IDPs used to farming find it challenging to make a living since they need land to grow crops, and others need the tools. Some of those who have a sari-sari store also need help because, as observed during the survey, several sari-sari stores are in almost every block in the area. This scenario usually leads to poor outcomes due to close competition with other sari-sari store owners. In connection, 107 (50.95%) respondents agreed that the Philippine government needs to provide more livelihood programs for them. This implies that despite different agencies with livelihood programs, the problem is that it needs to be more inclusive and fairer on the part of IDPs, who consistently fail to be included on the list of livelihood beneficiaries. Some respondents firmly believe that all of them must be treated equally since they are IDPs who suffered greatly from the siege. Despite this realization, 89 (42.38%) respondents strongly agreed that they depend on the government to provide food and other basic needs. Ultimately, this implies that some people have little or no source of income, and most of the time, they depend on the different agencies’ provision of relief goods.

However, livelihoods are essential to reduce shocks and vulnerability and improve people’s lives. Livelihood is a holistic concept that includes material and non-material well-being (Gale, 2011), and it helps pass beyond the emergency stage. This requires the government to take specific actions to support displaced persons in developing a sustainable livelihood during and immediately after their displacement. As to the case of IDPs in Sagonsongan, the government must ensure that all of the households can avail of assistance that they could utilize to start a new life. Most of these people, if not all of them, were all traders in pre-siege Marawi. Meranaos are famous for being seasoned traders if given a well-designed support program.

Conclusion

The sustainability of the social services and goods provided to the transitory shelters in Sagonsongan ensures that the former

have access to the necessities that can help in the rehabilitation program for the IDPs. However, the assessment indicated that the provision of essential services gradually stopped, allegedly due to the need for more government funds allocated to the IDPs. This situation provocatively changed the perspective and views of some IDPs on the government plan for the rehabilitation of Marawi. The findings also showed positive feedback from the IDPs on the effectiveness of the transitory shelters. According to the respondents, the government under the Duterte administration has performed well in constructing transitory shelters. For some IDPs, comparing the current and former administrations' performance is inevitable. However, their tenuous status in Sagonsongan is a challenge for the IDPs. The government has to look for another area where the IDPs could be relocated when the five-year moratorium expires. Another effective measure is to facilitate their return to ground zero so that they can rebuild their destroyed houses with corresponding financial assistance from the government. Moreover, the respondents' perception of the problems they encounter in the transitory shelters implies that there is an urgent need for the city government to complete the water system that will provide a sufficient supply of water, especially potable water, to the IDPs in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter. As to the electricity or power supply, the findings imply that the IDPs feel satisfied with the electric supply's adequacy and unrestricted usage. They also feel secure in the presence of street lights. Regarding sanitation and hygiene, the study's findings imply that most of the septic tanks in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter are already full, which threatens the health condition of the IDPs, particularly the children. In terms of the problems with safety and security, the findings of the study imply that the IDPs in Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter believe they are secure in their area. Finally, as to the livelihood problems, the study's findings suggest that most of the families in the Sagonsongan Transitory Shelter need a stable source of income and could be considered impoverished.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank all individuals who significantly contributed to the success of this study.

References

- [1] Achieng, R. (2003). Home here and home there: Janus-faced IDPs in Kenya. Researching Internal Displacement: State of the Art. Conference Report, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.
- [2] AGOTS. (2007). Temporary Demountable Structures: Guidance on Procurement, Design, and Use. London: The Institution of Structural Engineer
- [3] Arsalan, H., & Cosgun, N. (2007). The Evolution of Temporary Earthquake Houses Dismantling Process in the Context of Building Waste Management. International Earthquake Symposium Kocaeli.
- [4] Asher, J. (2004). The Right to Health: A Resource Manual for NGOs. International Health and Human Rights.
- [5] Ashmore, J. (2004). Tents: A guide to the use and logistics of family tents in humanitarian relief. In: OSHA (Ed.). United Nations.
- [6] Barakat, S. (2003). Housing reconstruction after conflict and Disaster. Newspaper: Humanitarian Policy Group, 43, 1-40
- [7] Chu, E., Michael, K. (2018). Recognition in Urban Climate Justice: Marginality and Exclusion of Migrants in Indian Cities. Environment Urban 31 (1): 131-15.
- [8] Corsalis, T. & Vitale, A. (2005). Transitional Settlement: Displaced Populations. Oxfam.
- [9] Deng, FM. (1999). Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. The International Migration Review, 33 (2): 484-493.
- [10] Gale, F. S. (2011). The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations in the Improvement of Livelihood in South Sudan. Wageningen: Van Hall Larenstein University of Applied Sciences.
- [11] Global Protection Cluster. (2021). Fact Sheet on the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. <https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/gp20/fact-sheet-on-the-guiding-principles-on-internal-displacement/>
- [12] Hadafi, F. & Fallahi, A. (2010). Temporary Housing Respond to Disasters in Developing Countries – Case Study: Iran – Ardabil and Lorestan Province Earthquakes. World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, 66, 1536 – 1542.
- [13] Harttman, J. (2020). Energy Access for Refugees. Energypedia. Energy Access for Refugees - energypedia.pdf
- [14] Humanitarian Bulletin. (2018). Bangon Marawi Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Program. Manila, Philippines. Official United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
- [15] IFRC/RCS. (2013). Post-disaster shelter: Ten designs. Geneva: International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.
- [16] IOM (2011). Version 1. ORS - One Room Shelter Programme Manual.
- [17] Johnson, C. (2007). Impacts of Prefabricated Temporary Housing after Disasters: 1999 Earthquakes in Turkey. Habitat

International. 31, 36 – 52.

- [18] Johnson, C. (2007). Impacts of Prefabricated Temporary Housing after Disasters: 1999 Earthquakes in Turkey. *Habitat International*. 31, 36 – 52.
- [19] Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50 (4), 370- 396.
- [20] Mooney, E. (2005). The Concept of Internal Displacement and the Case for Internally Displaced Persons as a Category of Concern. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24, (3), 9-26.
- [21] Nassar D, Elsayed H. (2018). From informal settlements to sustainable communities. *J* 57:2367–2376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2017.09.004>
- [22] NHA (2018). NHA to turn over 500 temporary shelters for Marawi IDPs. nha.gov.ph/nha-to-turn-over-500-temporary-shelters-for-marawi-idps/
- [23] NHA (2019). Marawi's Rise Begins. <https://nha.gov.ph/marawis-rise-begins/>
- [24] Official Gazette (2017). Administrative Order No. 3. Creating an Inter-Agency for the
- [25] Oxfam. (2016). Cash and Voucher Feasibility Study. Yangon: Oxfam. Retrieved from http://fscluster.org/sites/default/files/documents/oxfam_in_kachin_cash_transfer_program_feasibility_study_2016.pdf
- [26] PSA (2021). Unemployment Rate in September 2021 is Estimated at 8.9 Percent. <https://psa.gov.ph/content/unemployment-rate-september-2021-estimated-89percent>
- [27] Robo, M. (2014). Social Inclusion and Inclusive Education. *Academicus International Scientific Journal*, 181-191.
- [28] Shelter Centre. (2012). *Transitional Shelter Guidelines*. Geneva: Shelter Centre, IOM, DFID & Sida.
- [29] Smit, A. (2012). *The Property Rights of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons: Beyond Restitution*. Abingdon, England; New York: Routledge.
- [30] Storm, K. (1998). *Drainage: An Intermediate Guide to the low-cost evaluation of System Performance*. London. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- [31] Task Force Recovery, Reconstruction, and Rehabilitation of The City of Marawi and other affected localities. Retrieved from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2017/06/28/administrative-order-no-3-s2017/>
- [32] The Charity Commission. (2001). *The Promotion of Social Inclusion*. Design, Charity Commission.
- [33] UN/OCHA/ESB. (2006). *Exploring Key Changes and Developments in Post-Disaster Settlement, Shelter and Housing. Scoping Study to Inform the Revision of Shelter after Disaster: Guidelines for Assistance*.
- [34] UNHCR (1992). *Water Manual for Refugee Situations*. Program and Technical Support Section. Geneva
- [35] UNHCR (2003). *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Sri Lanka: Emerging from the Ruins. The Road to Recovery, Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR. 1 (130).
- [36] UNHCR. (2001). *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2000 Global Refugee Trends - Analysis of the 2000 Provisional UNHCR Population Statistics*.
- [37] United Nations. (1998). *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*. UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).
- [38] United Nations. (1998). *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*. UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).