The most vulnerable IDPs need DURABLE SOLUTION

Provide Durable Solutions by applying Philippine law and human rights standards
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ZAMBOANGA DISPLACEMENT RESPONSE

Fighting between the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) and the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) erupted on 9 September along the coastal barangays in Rio Honda, Sto. Catalina, and Sto. Barbara of Zamboanga City. This conflict was a result of MNLF's attempt to declare independence of Mindanao in the city. Many houses were burned, hundreds of civilians were held captive and around 119,000 persons were displaced. The conflict escalated in nearby island provinces of Basilan and Sulu. On 25 September 2013, the United Nations declared the Zamboanga situation as a humanitarian crisis.

119K IDPS

total displaced persons in Zamboanga City and island provinces of Basilan and Sulu

11,678 PERSONS

EVACUATION CENTER (EC)

38K IDPS

ONE YEAR AFTER THE CONFLICT. 32%

(6,170 families) of the total IDP population remain displaced

38% The large majority of the present IDP population (87% or 4,957 families) resided in the conflict-affected areas (Ground Zero). Some of these areas have been declared ‘no return areas’ and ‘no build zones’, preventing return to a durable solution.

These IDPs owned their dwellings in these ‘no return areas’ and ‘no build zones’ however, the majority of them did not own the land (69% or 3,927 families). They are not being equally prioritised as beneficiaries in the rehabilitation plan of the government. The average claim of living in these areas is more than 6 years.

11,152 PERSONS

TRANSITIONAL SITES (TS)

15,194 PERSONS

HOME-BASED (HB)

These IDPs continue to live in a deteriorating camp-like situation in ECs and TSs. The TSs do not provide adequate protection and all services are below SPHERE standards. Pressing protection concerns monitored are highlighted in Mampang, the largest TS.

 Profile of the Remaining Internally Displaced Persons

Most of the remaining IDPs (87% or 5,719 families) belong to the minority Moro population of Tausug, Sama and Badjao. These minority groups are considered the poorest of the poor and are mostly located in Grandstand, Mampang TS and Barangay Tetuan.

PROFILE OF THE REMAINING INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

ZAMBOANGA CITY ROADMAP TO RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

Z3R

PERMANENT SHELTER ASSISTANCE

235 UNITS COMPLETED OUT OF 7,716 UNITS

HOUSING MATERIAL ASSISTANCE

1,611 FAMILIES REACHED OUT OF 1,861 TARGET

The homes of over 30,000 IDPs were burned, destroyed or now not accessible because of government restrictions. The poorest and most vulnerable IDP population are being moved to a transit site without adequate services and most likely they will remain in this location as there is no clear plan for a durable solution. The longer families remain without a durable solution, the longer they are exposed to serious protection risks especially women and children.

Permanent shelter assistance

Lack of access to community health services and lack of access to education (the majority of children do not have transport to school).

High acute malnutrition risk among 6-11 month old children and chronic malnutrition for half of children 24 months or older.

Poor sanitation due to poor waste disposal (15 lbs. /week garbage collection instead of the standard 2x /week).

Limited water supply with only 8.6 liters per person per day instead of the required 15 liters per person per day.

Limited water facilities inside TSs with only 1 functional water tap to serve 3,779 IDPs (1:292) instead of 1:200. IDPs use water tap whitewash practice of open defecation due to limited toilets (0.35 person per toilet ratio instead of the standard 1:20).

The homes of over 30,000 IDPs were burned, destroyed or now not accessible because of government restrictions. The poorest and most vulnerable IDP population are being moved to a transit site without adequate services and most likely they will remain in this location as there is no clear plan for a durable solution. The longer families remain without a durable solution, the longer they are exposed to serious protection risks especially women and children.

100% IDPs in ECs, TSs and HBs do not have access to drinking water.

IDPs in ECs, TSs and HBs do not have access to sanitation and hygiene.

IDPs in ECs, TSs and HBs do not have access to education.
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RECOMMENDATIONS

Support to Durable Solutions

- Identification of the most vulnerable
- Continued humanitarian or protection support
- Identification of return areas
- Identification of relocation (transit) areas

• The most vulnerable conflict-affected population in need of shelter are those that did not own land in the areas they were forcibly displaced from. Property owners have rights to be protected; however humanitarian action should first address people without resources to help themselves;

• The Z3R plan, while positively addressing infrastructure improvement and longer term reconstruction solutions, for the most vulnerable landless population, it only provides a temporary solution with sub-standard access to basic services for non-land owners;

• Implement the Z3R with the objectives of the RA 7279, the Urban Development and Housing Act, to include the most vulnerable IDPs (the City Z3R and Code of Policies on Beneficiary Selection directly refer to RA 7279);

• Identify persons with special needs through the City Social Welfare and Development Office (CSDWDO) supported profiling, and ensure they are prioritized in the process for durable solutions.

• Pending a durable (permanent) solution, plan and allocate resources for basic services for at least one year for all transitory locations, including transportation to schools and special feeding programmes for children suffering from Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM);

• Support livelihoods focusing on the main activities of IDPs - fishing, seaweed farming and vending;

• Sustain gender-based violence awareness-raising of IDPs, improve protection interventions for women and children in all transitory locations and strengthen local protection mechanisms (CIACAT-VAWC), Barangay VAWC Desks and Barangay Council for the Protection of Children;

• Ensure continuous disease surveillance in transit sites to monitor health conditions particularly illnesses that can potentially cause an outbreak with high mortality.

• All return should be voluntary, respect freedom of movement and the right of a family to choose where it wants to reside in the Philippines;

• Prepare locations for natural hazards and other security risks with reconstruction in areas designated as “no-return” or “no build” zones, in line with the “build back better” approach, but allow an organized, gradual return of previous dwellers.

• The Right to Return should not be prejudiced by the positive rehabilitation of the much needed infrastructure, i.e. roads, drainage and bridges.

• Facilitate small scale return such as the over 200 families from Barangay Mariki and many families from Layag-Layag Island whose homes were not destroyed.

• All relocation should be voluntary and must provide accurate information to IDPs.

• Apply Philippine based lessons and experience –
  • No TS in the Philippines except Mampang has over 2,500 persons living in bunkhouse type accommodation;
  • The largest TS in Taalbaran built by DPMH houses 2,250 individuals. It faces serious infrastructural, socio-economic and protection issues according to the Protection cluster;
  • IOM and the DSWD successfully built bunkhouses and “nipa huts” in Pablob affected areas. As many as 180,000 IDPs are still living in these shelters in not so bad conditions;
  • TS are likely to become longer-term dwellings – all the more reason to make sure they are built to good standards. The higher number of people congregated in one location the more difficult to provide sustainable services;

• Since bunkhouses are a temporary solution, smaller plots of land to rent for 1-2 years may be identified while still looking for other locations to develop for a durable solution;

• Avoid large concentration of IDPs in locations such as Mampang - smaller communities should be identified, planned and applied with SPHERE standards. Access to all services will improve with a smaller population.