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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>The study of human populations, especially with reference to size and density, distribution and vital statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>An event associated with the impact of a human-induced or natural hazard which causes a serious disruption in the functioning of a community or society, causing widespread human, material or environmental losses which exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using only its own resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally displaced persons (IDPs)</td>
<td>Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations or generalized violence, or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP profiling</td>
<td>A collaborative process in which data on individuals or groups who have been internally displaced is collected, with the purpose of informing advocacy on their behalf, improving protection and assistance interventions and, ultimately, finding a durable solution to displacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Any group or sector of society that is at higher risk of being subjected to discriminatory practices, violence, natural or environmental disasters, or economic hardship, than other groups within the State; any group or sector of society (such as women, children or the elderly) that is at higher risk in periods of conflict and crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>Situation of violence involving protracted armed confrontations between government forces and one or more organized armed groups, or between such groups themselves, arising on the territory of a State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-state actor</td>
<td>Includes organizations and individuals that are not affiliated with, directed by, or funded through the government. These include corporations, private financial institutions, and NGOs, as well as paramilitary and armed groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASG</td>
<td>Abu Sayyaf Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>Armed Forces of the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Evacuation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSIS</td>
<td>Government Service Insurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIS</td>
<td>Islamic State of Iraq and Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHT</td>
<td>Mindanao Humanitarian Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhilHealth</td>
<td>Philippine Health Insurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Professional Regulation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Person with Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Social Security System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive summary

This report presents the findings of the profiling activities conducted from June to August 2018 in communities hosting internally displaced persons (IDPs) of the Marawi conflict and return communities in the provinces of Lanao del Sur, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Oriental and Bukidnon. Data was collected through structured interviews with IDP households using the kobo™ tool. Primary respondents were heads of households and in their absence, any person of legal age in the family. A total of 34,785 heads of households were interviewed in the profiling activity, representing 97,126 IDPs in 56 municipalities and 3 cities.

This report presents data on demographic makeup of the IDPs such as age, sex, number of households, and family size, as well as protection information relating to displacement location, place of origin, resettlement, integration; various vulnerabilities of persons with special needs; educational attainment; income livelihood and skills; access to assistance; access to information; civil documentation; property ownership; intent to return; access to information, assistance received, and sources of assistance. Special focus is given on children and women in separate sections of this report.

A significant number of IDPs continue to experience gaps in assistance related to health, education, shelter and long-term livelihood support. Also, IDPs continue to experience protection risks due to lack of civil documentation due to loss or destruction of birth certificates. A more nuanced and targeted approach that will address specific protection needs of IDPs is needed.
Background

Massive displacement of the civilian population of Marawi City in Lanao del Sur occurred starting 23 May 2017 and continued through the following weeks thereafter, when armed confrontation occurred between government forces and a composite group of ISIS-inspired militants. According to sources, the militants ambushed a military vehicle that reportedly was on a mission to serve a warrant of arrest upon Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) leader Isnilon Hapilon, who was believed to be hiding in the area in the afternoon of 23 May. This began a protracted armed confrontation between the group and the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP). By the same evening, the confrontation spilled over to other barangays in the city as the pro-ISIS group began increasing its forces, reportedly occupying civilian structures, including school buildings, churches, the Philippine National Police Outpost, and a hospital. Killings and hostage-taking of civilians was also reported. In less than 24 hours, the pro-ISIS group was able to control strategic locations in the center of the city, including Government facilities.

The situation prompted President Rodrigo Duterte to place the whole island of Mindanao under Martial Law for 60 days, which was later extended to 31 December 2017 and then again to 31 December 2018. More military troops were deployed and clashes continued over the next several weeks. The AFP launched a combination of mortar shelling and air strikes against the pro-ISIS militants.

Most of the civilians took refuge in Iligan City and other nearby towns within Region 10. An estimated 98 percent of the total population of Marawi City (201,785 individuals in 96 barangays, based on the 2015 census) sought shelter in different evacuation centers or with their relatives outside of Marawi City. The crisis has affected economic and commercial activities in the rest of Lanao del Sur province, triggering further displacement.

Government-assisted return started in October 2017 to barangays that are outside the “most-affected areas.” Returned families still face various protection issues relating to shelter and livelihood and were included in this profiling.
Key information

A vast majority of the displaced population have sought shelter with their relatives, instead of going to evacuation centers. The strong sense of honor – or “maratabat” – of the Meranaw, which is the predominant ethnic group in Marawi City, is key to this phenomenon. In response, local governments of host communities such as Iligan City immediately opened evacuation centers in several locations to cater to the humanitarian needs of the displaced population. Also, government established the Regional Command and Coordination Center (RCCC) was transformed into the National Emergency Operations Center (NEOC) upon the activation of the National Incident Command System (NCIS) after the first week of June.

At the early stages, members of the Protection Cluster reported that some IDPs have set up spontaneous collective centers outside of the officially opened evacuation centers. Spontaneous collective centers are existing structures that are used as temporary living accommodations for hosting displaced populations. UNHCR verified 24 of these sites and presented the IDPs’ concerns to government counterparts.

While congestion is the common protection issue faced by IDPs in evacuation centers officially opened by local government units, home-based IDPs face the issue of access and assistance. IDPs in spontaneous collective centers have neither camp managers to whom they could refer their concerns, nor host families who can support their needs while displaced. Information dissemination is an underlying issue cutting across all areas of humanitarian response; IDPs who lack information on the registration procedure and pathways to available services are unable to access assistance.

### Basic data on the 2018 UNHCR IDP profiling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lanao del Sur, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Oriental, and Bukidnon provinces in Mindanao, Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region code</td>
<td>035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total IDP households</td>
<td>77,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of municipalities and cities profiled</td>
<td>56 municipalities 3 cities (Marawi, Iligan, and Cagayan de Oro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of profiling</td>
<td>4-10 June, 1-10 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of households profiled</td>
<td>34,785 (45% of total IDP households registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of IDPs reached by profiling</td>
<td>97,126 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>34,785 heads of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 17,624 men (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 17,152 women (49%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key objectives

The overall objective of the profiling was to improve data consistency, accessibility and quality of date of the IDPs to:

1. Determine the number of IDPs, with sex- and age-segregated data from the Marawi siege
2. Determine the socio-demographic characteristics of the IDP population
3. Identify specific needs in terms of humanitarian assistance, education, education, shelter, property issues, and protection;
4. Track the movement of IDPs from their place of origin to their current location to be able to respond better to their specific concerns
Methodology

Data was collected by UNHCR through volunteers deployed for the activity, in cooperation and coordination with local governments and stakeholders. Preparatory activities were conducted from April to May 2018 which included: meeting with government units at the provincial and municipal level, conduct of a strategic planning meeting with various stakeholders, finalization of questionnaire, and training of field volunteers.

A strategic planning meeting was held with key stakeholders\(^1\) to discuss the above mentioned objectives and expected output of the activity, baseline data (source, location, and number), method of profiling, and data ownership, administration, and sharing protocols. It was also agreed what kind of information will be collected and the tool to be used.

Training for the volunteers were conducted on May 25th and 31st, June 51st for Marawi, Iligan and Lanao del Sur volunteers, respectively. Topics included were: Concept of the IDP Profiling Activity, using the kobo tool and code of conduct. Field data collection was conducted in 4 provinces namely: Lanao del Sur, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Oriental and Bukidnon in June and again in August 2018.

The first wave of profiling activities covered the province of Lanao del Sur and the city of Marawi from June 4-15, whereas the second wave covered areas outside Lanao del Sur. Volunteers used the kobo application\(^2\) for the encoding of the answers given by the IDPs. The application allows for offline use and saving of data, which facilitated the profiling, since most of the areas profiled do not have reliable internet or mobile data signal. After the fieldwork, volunteers were given time to transmit the data on their phones, some of whom had to go to the UNHCR Iligan office to do so.

Data cleaning was done up to three weeks after the activity, where the IM team verified with the volunteer’s names of barangays and various other issues that led to inconsistency in the data.

An initial snapshot was generated out of the data on August 23 which was shared with partners and co-members of the Mindanao Humanitarian Team.

\(^1\) Attended by DSWD regional offices in Region 12 and 10, as well as provincial offices of Lanao del Sur, and Lanao del Sur-A and B, the city government of Marawi. Representative from the World Bank and Task Force Bangon Marawi (TFBM) were also present.

\(^2\) https://www.kobotoolbox.org/
Key findings

IDP profiling reached (IDP families per region)
A total of 97,126 individuals were reached

The IDP Profiling reached a total of 97,126 individuals in 34,785 households. This accounts for 45.08% of the baseline IDP population of 77,170 households listed in the government’s IDP database for Marawi. Out of this, the biggest segment was inside Autonomous Region for Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), specifically in Lanao del Sur province, where the profiling covered 85% of the listed IDPs.

1.1 Demographic Data

The total number of IDPs profiled (97,126) is composed of 45,060 males (46%) and 52,066 females (54%). The biggest segment of the population is at the 20-24 age bracket, at 16% of the IDP population. The elderly³ comprise 6% of the total IDP population profiled, at 5,638.

For the entire population profiled, there are 87 males for every 100 females, which is lower than the ARMM sex ratio of 99 males for every 100 females.

³ Elderly in the Philippines is defined as those aged 60 years and above, as defined in Republic Act 9257, adapted by Philippine Statistics Authority. http://nap.psa.gov.ph/glossary/terms/indicatorDetails.asp?strIndi=39331365
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The elderly or those belonging to the age group 60 years old and above comprise 5,638 individuals or around 6% of the profiled population. Children comprise 33,367 representing 34% of the population profiled.

More men are heads of IDP households at 17,624 (51%) compared to women who head 49% (17,152) of the profiled IDP households. However, this does not hold true for the age brackets 40 years and above, where there are more women household heads than men.

There are 126 children who are heads of households all of whom are found in the 13-17 age group. However, elderly-headed households comprise 4,301 or 12% of households profiled.

### Profiled IDP population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>4,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>4,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>5,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>6,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>4,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>2,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Age and sex distribution

Heads of households

- **Male head of family**: 49%
- **Female head of family**: 51%
Currently, there are identified livelihood support for persons engaged in farming and traders. However, there is a need to design programmes that will benefit a large segment of the population engaged in transportation, and those professionals and teachers who used to work in private firms and institutions.

1.1.1 Household size

Profiling data would place the average size of the household profiled to be 2.8 members per household, way lower than the ARMM average\(^4\) of 6 members per family. However, a closer look at the profiling data would show that 52% or 18,100 of households are composed of 4-6 members, and 36% (12,303) are composed of 3 members and below. Bigger households (7 members and above) only comprise 12% (485) of the total number of households profiled.

---

The enumerators do not actually count the persons in the household, but only note the number given by the respondents.

### 1.1.2 Displacement situation

#### Displacement location of households

Figure 7: Displacement location – percentages

Around 48% of families profiled are in home-based settings, whereas 5% have identified themselves to be in an evacuation center. Around 44% of household heads did not give an answer to the question. Families in transitory shelters inside Marawi City make up 2% of the families profiled.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) This figure may not reflect the accurate number of households living in transitory shelters, as the IDP Profiling was not able to cover all IDPs inside Marawi City.
1.2 Vulnerabilities

In the questionnaire, heads of household were requested to identify vulnerabilities that are faced by members of their families. Out of all profiled population, 4,429 (4%) persons are considered single head of households. Meanwhile, 3,019 (3%) are female heads of households, 1,907 (1%) are pregnant or lactating at the time of the profiling, and 2,482 (2.5%) are elderly persons. There are 638 persons with disabilities or 0.6% of the IDP population.

Vulnerabilities according to sex

![Vulnerabilities according to sex](image)

Age of vulnerable persons (male) | Age of vulnerable persons (female)

![Age of vulnerable persons (male)](image) | ![Age of vulnerable persons (female)](image)

Figure 8: Vulnerable population by sex

Figure 9: Vulnerabilities of male and female IDPs, by age
1.3 Education

Out of the IDPs profiled, 7% did not attend school, whereas 93% attended some schooling. More women (54%) attended school than men (46%). Similarly, more women are also not in school (56%) than men (54%).

Educational attainment

![Figure 10: Education of IDPs](image)

![Figure 11: Educational attainment of IDPs profiled by sex and age](image)
1.4 Income, livelihood, and skills

Of the household heads profiled, 53% said that they have access to sustainable livelihood, with more men saying yes than women. Those who say no are equally divided between men and women.

**Access to sustainable livelihood**

- **Female** 53%
- **Male** 47%

**Monthly household income**

- **With source of income** 73%
- **No source of income** 27%

**Figure 12: Household income**

Farming, transportation and buy-and-sell (trading) of non-agricultural products are the topmost sources of income among IDP household heads. This supports the common notion that Maranaos are traders or self-employed earners. Meanwhile, 1,968 of those household heads profiled are engaged in professional work. Those who generate income from other sources comprise 7% of those IDPs who identified a source of income.
Occupational skills refer to those skills the IDP head of household already possess even before displacement. It may or may not be the source of income at the time of the profiling. As home-based IDPs continue to be the biggest segment of the displaced population, solutions for their return, resettlement, or local integration must be fully customized to the needs and preference of the family concerned.

There are **3,675** who have indicated that they are single heads of families or single parents. There are around **638** persons with disabilities among those covered by the profiling. Existing government programmes geared towards them should prioritize them.

Among those who indicated that they have occupational skills, farming, education, transportation (driving public utility vehicles such as jeepneys, tricycles, and habal-habal) and others are the top most skills. For men, farming and transportation (driving) are the primary skills identified, whereas for women, education (teaching) is the topmost skill. Education has the most number of women skilled workers, whereas for men it is the sector of transportation. The sectors of public administration/social services, Computer/IT, health services fishing, and engineering.
1.5 Civil documentation

Out of the 97,126 individuals reached by the profiling, 14,708 or 42% reported that they do not possess any form of photo-identification, 7,135 or 45.8% of whom are women.

Those who possess valid identification mostly have Phil Health IDs and drivers’ licenses. Males make up 95% of those having driver’s license. This is consistent with the data on Source of Income, where men comprise around 88% of those who are engaged in transportation and 96% of those with occupational skills in this sector. Meanwhile, women make up the majority of ID-holders from the Professional Regulations Commission (PRC), Social Security System (SSS) and Government Service Insurance System (GSIS). This is likewise consistent with the data that it is women who are mostly working in the sectors of education (78%) and health services (77%). Women outnumber male ID-holders in all types of IDs except for passports and driver’s licenses. The prevalence of PhilHealth IDs (8,354 or 41% of all IDs) could be attributed to the extensive PhilHealth ID issuance conducted by UNHCR in November 2017.
Forty-four percent (44%) or 42,661 out of 97,126 individuals do not have birth certificates at the time of the profiling. The main reasons are either the birth is not yet registered, 60%; or the birth certificate was burned or lost during the Marawi Siege, 31%. Around 5% said they are already registered but are still to claim their copy.

### Reason for not having birth certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not yet registered</td>
<td>13,321</td>
<td>12,132</td>
<td>25,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned/lost during the Marawi siege</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered but has not claimed certificate</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Reasons why IDPs do not have birth certificates
Around 83% of household heads stated that they were able to receive assistance whereas 17% said they did not.
A comparison of those able to access assistance and those able to sustain sustainable livelihood shows that while 83% are able to access assistance, only 47% are able to access sustainable livelihood. This means that there are those who are dependent on aid for their subsistence, if they could receive it, and then there are those who neither able to access aid nor engage in sustainable livelihoods.

**Type of assistance received**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of assistance</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>12,963</td>
<td>13,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Livelihood</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>4,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>4,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Type of assistance received

Type of assistance received by the IDPs are mostly on food and livelihood interventions, which could include training. Livelihood may include cash for work programmes.

**Source of assistance in male- and female-led households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of assistance</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>13,333</td>
<td>13,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs/NGOs</td>
<td>4,774</td>
<td>4,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Source of assistance in male- and female-led households

Meanwhile, 57% IDPs profiled attributed most of the support that they received as being provided by the government.
1.6 Access to information

Out of the 34,785 heads of families profiled, 75% or 26,139 indicated that they have access to information, whereas 25% or 8,646 said that they did not.

![Access to information](Figure 24: Access to information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of information received</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation/Transfer</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>2,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation and recovery plans</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Source of information](Figure 25: Percentage of sources of Information)

1.7 Intent to return

IDPs who signified their intent to return to their residence in Marawi City comprise 86% of the profiled household heads. Meanwhile, 8% provided no answer and 6% said that they do not intend to return anymore. Reasons given were: cannot decide (51%), chose to integrate in the host municipality (31%), and chose to resettle elsewhere (18%). The indecision could be linked to the lack of reliable information regarding the time when IDPs would be allowed to go back.
Intent to return

- Yes: 86%
- No: 6%
- No answer: 8%

Type of information received

- Cannot decide: 51%
- Reintegrate (in the host municipality): 31%
- Resettle (in other community aside from host community and Marawi): 18%

Factors prohibiting return

- None: 2%
- Return is not allowed (MAA): 13%
- No livelihood opportunity/access to assistance: 14%
- No financial assistance for return to Marawi: 14%
- Still subject to clearance procedure: 7%
- Lack/absence of basic services: 7%
- Sharer/renter: 13%

1.8 Property status

Property status of those with intent to return

- House owner; rent-free lot without owner's consent: 459
- Rent-free house and lot without owner's consent: 939
- House owner; rent-free lot with owner's consent: 1307
- House owner and lot renter: 1496
- Rent-free house and lot with owner's consent: 3,376
- House/room and lot renter: 4,448
- House and lot owner: 17,792
**Extent of damage to property**

- Rent-free house and lot without owner’s consent
- Rent-free house and lot with owner’s consent
- House/room and lot renter
- House owner; rent-free lot without consent of the owner
- House owner; rent-free lot with owner’s consent
- House owner and lot renter
- House and lot owner

Figure 30: Extent of damage to property

*Partially damaged – house can still be inhabited even with damages in some occasions.*

### 1.9 Access to sustainable livelihood

**Access to sustainable livelihood**

- Yes
- No
- No answer

Figure 31: Access to sustainable livelihood
1.10 Children

Children comprise 34% of the profiled population. They head 0.4% (124) of the total households profiled.

Observations and discussions with communities also revealed the need to give more attention to nutrition, education must be given, including steps taken to counter the spread of violent extremism among the youth. Profiling data shows that almost 17% of children in ages 5-11 have not attended or started school. There is a need to push for interventions that would remove roadblocks to elementary school enrollment.

Children heads of households, must be identified and prioritized in assistance programmes, especially shelter, food, and livelihood assistance. Programmes geared towards the protection of the elderly, especially when they are the heads of households.

**IDP Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>4,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>4,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 32: Population of IDP Children profiled, by age and sex*

1.11 Children in school

Out of the 24,414 school-age children, 228 or around 2% did not (yet) attend school.

**School attendance**

- Attended school
- Did not attend school

*Figure 33: Children and school attendance*
1.11.1 Vulnerable children

Children with vulnerabilities vis-à-vis adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied/separated child</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single head of family/solo parent</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant or lactating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vulnerabilities faced by children, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied/separated child</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single head of family/solo parent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant or lactating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-head of household</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 136 children with disabilities among those profiled, whereas 53 are single heads of households. At the time of the profiling, there were 20 girls who were either pregnant or lactating. Children who were either separated from their primary care giver or parent are 57.

1.12 Women
Women make up 54% of the profiled population. Areas with large concentration of IDP women are Iligan City and Marawi, following the general IDP population distribution.

Figure 37: Displacement location of households
Gender share in educational attainment

While there are more women who did not attend any schooling, women likewise outnumber men in all levels of education except in elementary and vocational schools. The male-female ratio goes down as the level of education goes up. In high school it is 86 males for every 100 females, 66 males to 100 females in college and 53 males to 100 females with bachelor’s degrees. Postgraduate male students/graduates number 57 for every 100 females in the same group.

Gender share in vulnerable populations

Households that are led by women comprise 9% of the total number of households profiled (3,229 out of 34,785) and 73% of single-headed families (3,229 out of 4,429). Pregnant and lactating mothers constitute 2% (1,907) of the profiled population. Meanwhile female elderly (1,015) comprise 55.76% of the elderly population profiled. There are 312 females with disabilities or 49% of PWDs. All in all, 79% of all instances of vulnerability are carried by women.
Meanwhile, occupational skills of women are largely concentrated in the fields of farming, education, and others. There is also a high concentration of skilled women in the fields of health and social services.

**Occupational skills of women**

![Occupational Skills of Women](image)

*Figure 40: Occupational skills of women*
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