International Institute of Social Studies

DATA FOR THE DISPLACED: PARTICIPATION IN IDP DATA JUSTICE

A Research Paper presented by:

JOANNA GABRIELLE MORAN TAÑADA
PHILIPPINES

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:
Governance and Development Policy (GDP)
Specialization:
Public Policy and Management (PPM)

Supervisor:
Sonja Fransen
Second Reader:
Nanneke Winters

The Hague, The Netherlands
December 2025

Word count: 17,494

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the authors study programme while at the International Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Inquiries:

International Institute of Social Studies

P.O. Box 29776

2502 LT The Hague

The Netherlands

t: +31 70 426 0460

e: info@iss.nl

w: www.iss.nl

fb: http://www.facebook.com/iss.nl

twitter: @issnl

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12

2518 AX

The Hague, The Netherlands

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

List of Appendices

List of Acronyms

BARMM: Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim of Mindanao
MSSD: Ministry of Social Services and Development
CDP: Center for Disaster Preparedness
CFSI: Community and Family Services International
CCCHP: Center for Crisis, Conflict, and Humanitarian Protection
CHR-CSJHP: Commission on Human Rights - Center for Social Justice and Humanitarian Protection
DOJ-RSPPU: Department of Justice - Refugee and Stateless Persons Protection Unit
DSWD: Department of Social Welfare and Development
DROMIC: Disaster Response Operations Monitoring and Information Center
GPAI: Global Project for Artificial Intelligence
IDMC: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
IDP: Internally Displaced Persons/Populations
IOM: International Organization for Migration
JIPS: Joint IDP Profiling Service
NDCC: National Disaster Coordinating Council
NDRRMC: National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
PJRS: Jesuit Refugee Services Philippines
RA: Republic Act
UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNOCHA: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
HAT: Humanitarian Advisory Team
UNSG: United Nations Secretary General

Abstract

The global rise of internal displacement issues has drawn attention to the need for solutions that are supported by quality data and that engage meaningfully with the internally displaced themselves. Situated within the case study of the Philippines, this research paper explores how norms of participation are conceptualized and operationalized in data processes for internally displaced persons. Anchored in constructivist institutionalism and the data justice pillar of participation, this research applies key informant interviews to engage with government agencies, civil society actors, international organizations and other relevant actors to determine how and to what extent internally displaced persons (IDPs) are empowered in their own data processes. The results of this research reveal both progress and consistent difficulties: (1) there are gaps in how participation is facilitated across different stages of the data life cycle by different institutions; (2) conceptual, operational, and political challenges to IDP data persist; and (3), despite these challenges, policy shifts within the Philippines present opportunities for IDPs to exercise their agency and meaningfully participate in data processes. The findings suggest that meaningful participation in displacement governance is shaped by incremental change that depends on formal normative frameworks, IDP-led initiatives, and broader discourse about whose knowledge and agency count.

Relevance to Development Studies

This research bridges existing literature on data justice, internal displacement, and participation within the lived experiences of those at the forefront of these intersecting themes in the Philippines. It contributes to development studies by examining how participation is constructed and practiced within institutional and data systems that shape the lives of internally displaced populations. It also touches upon the cluster system and whole-of-society approaches to the growing issue of internal displacement, which are key features of humanitarian-development nexus. By positioning participation as a spectrum, the research also advances critical understandings of participation – its risks, limits, and benefits for IDPs, their communities, and surrounding institutions.

Keywords

Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1. Nature of the Problem

Internal displacement is a challenge that is rapidly rising to global attention. The UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (United Nations Representative of the Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, 1998) defines IDPs as "*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 of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have remained living in the country's internationally recognized border*". Each year has shown record breaking numbers of people who are internally displaced; from 2015 when internally displaced persons (IDPs) numbered at 40.5 million, up to the end of 2024, when the internally displaced have more than doubled at an estimated at 83.4 million (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2025a, p.7). As poverty, conflict, and climate change continue to drive movement, existing displaced populations will continue to grow, new groups will be displaced, and more countries will be affected.

In 2019, the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement was established after 57 UN Member States called for a more effective response to internal displacement. This led to the UN Secretary General's (UNSG) Action Agenda on Internal Displacement (2022), and the preparation of a UN System-Wide Approach to Internal Displacement to address a "*phenomenon which cuts across all pillars and virtually all entities in the United Nations system, and the issues are relevant to humanitarian, development, and peace actors*" (UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, 2025). Two aspects that are increasingly critical to any efforts made to address internal displacement include firstly, ensuring that data processes are inclusive and collaborative, and secondly, ensuring the meaningful participation and agency of IDPs in their own solutions (UNSG, 2022). Internal displacement is therefore an issue that needs to be matched by innovative solutions that are supported by quality data and that engage meaningfully with the internally displaced themselves.

Available information on IDPs is gathered, processed, and shared by institutions that monitor displacement, such as national government agencies, civil society, humanitarian actors, and international organizations like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), and the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS). Their collective efforts have significantly advanced the global visibility and understanding of internal displacement, and many institutions have begun to integrate IDPs into humanitarian and development planning and policymaking. Operationally, IDP participation contributes to the effectiveness and sustainability of responses to internal displacement and normatively, participation also strengthens protection of IDP rights (The Brookings Institution, 2008).

However, a lot of gaps remain in how data relating to internal displacement is generated, validated, and used – particularly as top-down approaches to data gathering and interpretation may not effectively incorporate the priorities, agency, and lived realities of the displaced populations themselves. Moreover, participatory approaches to data processes in displacement contexts are comparatively underdeveloped, with limited analysis of how such methods are conceptualized and

operationalized, or what institutional incentives and constraints shape their adoption. This creates a space for this research paper to critically explore how participation is framed by the institutions involved in displacement monitoring, to what extent it is translated into practice, and what consequences these dynamics may hold for justice, accountability, and policy responses to internal displacement in the Philippines.

1.1.1. The Difficulty with Data

As the issue of internal displacement heightens, it underscores the importance and increasing demand for research and policy action in this arena. As stated in the United Nations Secretary General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement,

> *"IDPs are citizens and residents of their country, and States have the primary responsibility to protect their rights and respond to their needs. [...] Action to address internal displacement must recognize the rights and agency of IDPs and host communities and ensure their active and informed participation in decision-making. Approaches should be guided by the knowledge of local communities and address the specific needs of people of different ages, genders, abilities and diversities..."* (2022).

According to the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement, data and evidence can also enhance state commitment and capacity, and that ownership of data can lead to greater accountability towards displacement challenges and responses (2021a; 2021b).

There are many challenges associated with internal displacement data. Cardona-Fox (2020) clusters these challenges into the conceptual, operational, and political: Conceptually, there is a wide variety of IDP definitions, interpretations, and estimates. Operationally, IDPs are difficult to detect and distinguish from other populations, often-times intentionally, as the IDPs themselves may choose to remain anonymous or hide for their own security. Disaggregated socioeconomic data is scarce, and information on IDPs after the emergency subsides or in the cases of protracted and multiple displacements is lacking. Politically, those who have primary responsibility for collecting IDP data, such as government agencies and to a lesser extent humanitarian organizations, are incentivized to control or manipulate data collected and published to influence discourse and opinion surrounding the IDP or the cause of their displacement. Given these challenges, it is clear there is a great amount of information on IDPs that may be considered unavailable and unreliable, from counts of IDPs to the needs and aspirations of the IDPs themselves.

While a definition of IDPs has been provided in the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (1998), in addition to International Recommendations on IDP Statistics (2020), there remain challenges in the interpretation and operationalization of IDP data in policy and programming (Baal & Ronkainen, 2017; Baal, 2021). A study on microdata gaps of those who are forcibly displaced, including both refugees and IDPs, finds that information on labor and employment, finance, and education is particularly scarce for the internally displaced by conflict (Masaki & Madson, 2023). Case studies on durable solutions for diverse internal displacement experiences in Sub-Saharan Africa explained that there are *"multi-dimensional data gaps [preventing] an assessment of socioeconomic conditions among*

displaced populations", specifically citing that despite the large numbers of IDPs and their status as citizens, evidence is lacking (Appler et al., 2019).

The same research stated that both in Nigeria and Sudan, IDPs themselves deeply desire useful and trustworthy information on their own situation and their host areas that would be necessary to understand their vulnerabilities and inform their decision to move, stay in a camp, or return. The case study in Sudan also clearly demonstrates one of Cardona-Fox's operational challenges, reporting that IDPs outside certain camps were excluded from the research. The findings from these case studies indicated various observed flaws and concerns regarding data methodology, reliability and comparability within and across countries, as well as a dearth of micro-level data and information on the host communities for those displaced. The question of whose data, what data, as well as how the data should be managed greatly influences how this data is interpreted through policy and where resources are focused.

Beyond having accurate estimates on the extent of internal displacement, available and high-quality data supports targeted assistance and protection, is the foundation for understanding long-term impact of displacement events, is essential to monitoring for accountability, and pushes progress towards durable solutions (UNSG High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement, 2021a). Data is the basis of policy and legislation on IDPs, and policy and legislation also inform what kind of data is collected (Caterina & Lizcano Rodríguez, 2020). While there has been progress and growing interest towards improving the availability, quality, and coverage of IDP data, it unfortunately remains comparatively fragmented, inconsistent, and politically contested. And in the context of rising need for humanitarian aid (Farber, 2025), budget cuts for humanitarian and development activities (IDMC, 2025a, p.24; Donnelly and Dhingra, 2024), and the economic cost of internal displacement itself (Cazabat & Yasukawa, 2020), it becomes even more crucial to have reliable data to support and advocate for IDPs.

1.1.2. The Push for Participation in Addressing Internal Displacement

This research paper examines data processes, focusing specifically on where these processes are on the spectrum of participation. Addressing data challenges in internal displacement requires the involvement of multiple stakeholders, at the international, regional, and local levels; from governments to UN agencies, and civil society organizations – but data processes have only rarely involved IDPs themselves (IDMC, 2025b, p.7). The current context presents an opportunity to advocate for stronger data management processes and collaborative, participatory approaches to improve data quality, transparency, and reliability.

The concept of participation has evolved over time, with a long history in development and humanitarian discourse. Arnstein's (1969) Ladder of Citizen Participation differentiated tokenism from genuine empowerment, Cooke and Kothari (2001) warned that participation can reproduce inequalities if participation is procedural rather than transformative, and Leal (2007) called for a return to those transformative roots not just for institutional development practice but for society at large. Meaningful participation entails active involvement in decisions that affect one's life and community

(Hickey & Mohan, 2004), and it may also be understood as a spectrum with increasing levels of engagement, as illustrated in the table below (The Brookings Institution, 2008).

Table 1. Participation Spectrum

Passive participation	Affected population is informed but not heard.
Information Transfer	Affected populations provide information but are not involved in decision-making and do not influence the process.
Consultation	Affected populations are invited to share opinions and suggestions but are not involved in decision-making and no guarantee that shared views will influence the process.
Collaboration	Affected population is directly involved in project activities and may contribute with labor and other skills.
Decision-making / Representation	Affected populations are involved in planning, evaluation, and decision-making.
Owned / Led	Affected populations take initiative in conceiving and running projects, potentially with support of agencies.

Adapted from The Brookings Institution (2008).

In the context of data processes, participation aligns clearly with data justice and the idea that fairness in data systems requires equitable participation in how data is produced, interpreted, and used (Taylor, 2017). Applying that to internal displacement, meaningful IDP participation translates to active engagement and involvement of displacement-affected people in action and decision-making towards displacement (UNHCR, 2025, pp.40-42). JIPS, an inter-agency body known as the global hub for internal displacement data and durable solutions for IDPs, promotes meaningful participation and community engagement as essential to IDP-centered approaches (JIPS, 2024). Participation thus represents a form of epistemic justice in how power over data can be shifted and shared from institutions to affected populations (GPAI, 2022).

International frameworks affirm that participation is both a right and a condition for durable solutions. The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement guarantee IDPs the right to participate in decisions affecting their return, resettlement, and reintegration, while UNHCR's Strategic Plan for Protection and Solutions for IDPs 2024–2030 commits to ensuring that IDPs are *"empowered to play an active role in their own community protection"* (2024a, p.5). Yet, institutionalizing participation in data systems remains rare, limiting both the inclusivity and legitimacy of data used to guide humanitarian and policy action. Progress towards this goal will require greater action towards more meaningful engagement of IDPs, by involving IDPs in identifying, gathering, and using the data they produce, which currently remains marginal in most global displacement monitoring practices (UNHCR, 2024a; UNHCR Evaluation Office, 2025).

Participation of those who are most affected by displacement events in their own data systems and processes is more than a normative ideal, it also has substantive and practical consequences for the quality of the data and the effectiveness of humanitarian response. IDP participation is relevant to ensuring justice and accountability among state agencies (UNSG High Level Panel on Internal

Displacement, 2021b), in addition to improving sustainability and satisfaction of IDP communities with the program or intervention (The Brookings Institution, 2008). In the Philippines for example, the case study of this research, various participatory interventions were implemented, such as collaborative data collection and analysis processes. These activities influenced local policies and the provision of government assistance, uncovered a significantly larger number of IDPs than estimated, and strengthened IDP communication and collaboration with involved institutions (GP2.0, n.d.; JIPS, 2023).

However, meaningful IDP participation must also take careful note of the connected obstacles and risks of participatory approaches. In The Brookings Institution report on consultation and participation with displaced populations (2008), various factors affect participatory approaches. For instance, characteristics of the IDP population may influence what type of participatory activities are feasible, with different approaches required for women, children, persons with disability, different cultures and religions, and education levels. Institutions such as civil society organizations and government agencies supporting IDPs may find themselves limited by their mandate, available resources, the relationship with the displaced population, or the absence of local knowledge (ibid.). The report also cited risks involved in participation, such as the entrenchment of existing hierarchies of dominant voices and further marginalization, or when participation is manipulated to serve the purposes of an institution or the local community. Additionally, IDPs may face risks such as violence and persecution if they speak up, bear the burden of representation and advocacy, on top of the psychological toll of displacement (UNHCR, 2025, p.24).

Participation has developed much as a concept in development and humanitarian spaces. International and national frameworks have also increasingly recognized the importance of engaging IDPs as partners and rights-holders. However, efforts to apply participatory approaches and pursue participation across different areas, including data processes, must apply care and sensitivity. As of writing, there are gaps remaining between institutions' normative commitment to participation and its operationalization in practice, which this study will address.

1.2. Justification and Relevance

This research is situated at the intersection of displacement governance, humanitarian and development action, and data justice. It responds to the need for a deeper analysis of data processes in contexts of internal displacement, to critically examine how the participation of IDPs is defined and put into practice by the institutional actors involved. Further, this research explores questions of how participation may be institutionalized as a norm by critical displacement actors, the challenges they face in that process, as well as how they have been influenced by policy and discourse over time.

While the importance of data for displacement response is well documented, less is known about the extent to which the increased interest and push towards participation of IDPs in policy and normative frameworks translates to actual engagement in IDP data collection and usage. Currently, limited data comes directly from IDPs (IDMC, 2025b, p.6); little research has focused specifically on how IDPs themselves can be involved in the governance of their own data ecosystems (Voda, Bortos

and Soitu, 2023) and participate in decision-making and governance of internal displacement (UNHCR, 2025). Empirically, involving IDPs in data collection can lead to more contextually relevant information and greater ownership and agency of IDPs, but also increase their vulnerability or place undue burden on them (The Brookings Institution, 2008; UNHCR, 2025).

This research focuses on the Philippines as a case study. As one of the countries most affected by both disaster- and conflict-induced displacement, it has developed a complex governance landscape involving multiple state agencies, international organizations, and civil society actors engaged in data processes. With growing emphasis on participation, the Philippines offers an opportunity to understand how global participatory and data justice frameworks are interpreted, adapted, or constrained in national and institutional practice. Thus, this research could address a critical gap in how greater collaborative effort between governments, civil society, international organizations, and IDP populations in data processes contribute towards more effective protection, assistance, and durable solutions to internal displacement.

1.3. Research Question and Sub-Questions

My research intends to understand how existing data systems for IDPs operate, how they are shaped by institutional norms and the surrounding context of internal displacement, and the intersection between participation as a human right and participation as a principle of data justice.

As greater participation is promoted as supporting data quality and usability, my research will further explore the tension among and within institutions handling IDP information, as well as the interaction and balance within contexts such as the Philippines, where displacement intersects with disasters, conflict, and development challenges. Thus, my research asks the following:

- How are developing norms of participation conceptualized and operationalized in data processes of internally displaced persons (IDPs) by institutions in the Philippines?
  - In what ways are IDPs involved in, or excluded from, the production and use of data that affects them?
  - What are the challenges and limitations that affect the use of participatory approaches in internal displacement data processes?
  - How have shifts in discourse and policy impacted participatory approaches and IDP data?

Chapter 2 – Theoretical Frameworks

This research is grounded in two interrelated frameworks: constructivist institutional theory and data justice. Both theories offer structural and critical lenses to understand how displacement data is produced and governed by actors at various levels, and on how participation is understood and operationalized. This research is further situated in the broader support observed for IDP participation in realizing durable solutions.

2.1. Constructivist Institutionalism

Institutional theory provides a lens to explore how organizations adopt norms, practices, and structures in response to internal and external pressures and constraints (Scott, 2004). According to Peters (2019, 4th ed.) institutional theory in political science was primarily founded on understanding the nature of governing institutions such as to influence behavior of individuals, and introduced structural, historical, and normative elements of government. This formed the foundation of contemporary institutionalism, which was heavily influenced by the rise of behavioral and rational choice approaches (ibid.).

Various branches have sprouted from the original institutional theory, however key features of all, as identified by Peters, include: (a) structure, formal or informal, (b) existence of stability, a certain level of predictable patterned interactions, (c) influences or constraints on the behavior of the institution's members, and (d) some sense of shared value and meaning. The three dominant branches of institutional theory – historical, rational choice, and sociological institutionalism – each highlight different aspects of it. Historical institutionalism assumes institutions are shaped by path dependency and power asymmetries. Rational choice institutionalism blends formal and informal structures, but largely views institutions are structures with rules and incentives that influence behavior of individuals who aim to maximize their own utilities. Lastly, sociological institutionalism focuses on how institutions socialize actors into adopting culturally appropriate norms and behaviors.

However, in critically examining these theories, there are limitations in how ideas, meaning, and agency interact with structures, in addition to difficulties in explaining complex institutional change that led to the development of constructivist institutionalism (Hay, 2008). Developed by scholars such as Hay (2008) and Bell (2011), constructivist institutionalism is a branch of institutional theory that emphasizes how institutions are continuously interpreted and reshaped by actors. From the lens of this theory, actors are strategic and socialized, seeking to realize complex ideational and normative goals. Hay (2008) explains, *"Constructive institutionalism thus seeks to identify, detail, and interrogate the extent to which – through processes of normalization and institutional-embedding – established ideas become codified, serving as cognitive filters through which actors come to interpret environmental signals. Yet, crucially, they are also concerned with the conditions under which such established cognitive filters and paradigms are contested, challenged, and replaced"* (p.65). Further he adds that institutional change resides in the dynamic relationship between institutional actors and their context.

Within the constructivist institutionalism perspective, institutions are dynamic and social constructed systems of meaning that shape and are shaped by the actors operating within them. Therefore, institutionalization refers to the process through which ideas, norms and practices become embedded in organizations, gradually acquiring stability and legitimacy. Drawing from Lowndes and Roberts (2013), repeated behaviors or rules become normalized over time, turning from deliberate actions to habits, through repetition or routinization. But these practices are further bolstered by legitimation, where the actors within institutions perceive these practices as desirable or morally justified. Furthermore, individuals and organizations act according to a 'logic of appropriateness', what they perceive as appropriate behavior given their role, identity, and context (March & Olsen, 1989).

This provides a normative foundation for institutions, where shared expectations about conduct become institutionalized.

In the context of internal displacement, constructivist institutional theory unpacks how institutions involved in addressing displacement interact with participatory ideals or norms, in addition to how and why they might or might not be adopted in certain areas like data processes. Participation is a socially constructed concept, and its meaning may be interpreted differently by international organizations, national governments, civil society, and internally displaced populations themselves. Institutionalization of participation is both a process and a potential outcome. In the sense that through routinized and legitimate practices, participation can be given meaning and value, then reinforced, and in the sense that the sustained implementation of participatory approaches can pursued as an outcome. Therefore, constructivist institutionalism allows this research to unpack how participation is defined and operationalized, and further whose understandings dominate in shaping data governance and justice.

2.2. Data Justice

The rise of digital technologies and reliance on data in governance, policymaking, and humanitarian response have drawn critical attention to power dynamics embedded in data production and use. Dencik and Sanchez-Monedero (2022) trace the development of the data justice theory to debates around policy and regulation relating to datafication, data ethics, and more recently, AI ethics. Responses to these were criticized as narrow; requiring clearly observable victims to prompt action, assuming solutions for the individual and ignoring the group, mostly fixated on the impacts of datafication in the Global North, and focused on negative rights over positive rights (GPAI, 2022, p.20). As the discourse began to intersect with conversations on social justice concerns and agendas, data justice emerged as a critical framework.

Data justice was first defined by Taylor, as *"fairness in the way people are made visible, treated, and represented as a result of their production of digital data,"* linking the widening use and power of data to social justice (2017, p.1). Furthermore, Taylor also states that the data justice framework is strongly rooted in people's capabilities, such as accessing one's own data, participating in data processes, and inclusion in decision making about data use (pp.8-10). Taylor's proposed framework for data justice visualized in the diagram below is meant to broadly illustrate the necessary rights and methodology that considers how big data systems, new data and technologies have both positive and negative potentials, while recognizing the usability across different social and economic contexts (ibid.)

Figure 1: Taylor's Three Pillars of Data Justice

Visibility	Engagement with Technology	Non-Discrimination
• Access to representation	• Share in data's benefits	• Ability to challenge bias
• Informational privacy	• Autonomy in technology choices	• Preventing discrimination

(Adapted from Taylor, 2017).

Building off Taylor's definition of data justice, the Global Project for Artificial Intelligence (GPAI) proposes six pillars that expand upon and re-orient data justice as a theory, in research and in practice (2022).

Figure 2: GPAI's Six Pillars of Data Justice

(Adapted from GPAI, 2022).

While this research touches upon the different pillars proposed by GPAI, it will primarily focus on participation. Specifically, focusing on what the meaningful participation (Arnstein, 2019) of those affected by internal displacement entails, as well as whether participatory approaches are implemented within data processes. Participatory approaches in development highlight the active involvement of affected populations in shaping the knowledge that directs their lives (Chambers, 1997). GPAI's action points for the participation pillar include: (1) democratizing data and data work; (2) understanding the relations between data subjects, collectors, processors, users; and (3) ensuring meaningful participation

in data processes over participatory practices that reinforce prevailing hierarchies. In the context of internal displacement, participatory approaches provide a critical lens to examine power relations embedded in displacement systems and push for the inclusion and democratization of research and policymaking.

While data justice is primarily focused on digital data, which IDPs may not always produce, the increased datafication and use of technology in displacement governance and surveillance upholds the theory's relevance. The use of data justice theory in this research also moves away from a sole focus on individualist frameworks to include more relational and collective aspects of data governance and justice, as theorized by Dencik et al. (2025, p.945):

> *"[Data governance] thus encompasses the rules and mechanisms that regulate how data about people is collected and used, but also the processes of how those rules are created, based on whose interests, and informed by what imaginaries (Hintz, 2022). A data justice perspective invites us to explore whether, and to what extent, current approaches to data governance restrict or accelerate the exploitation of data from, particularly, marginalised communities; limits or exacerbates problematic uses of data analytics, such as profiling and scoring; and empowers or disempowers citizens and affected communities in their efforts to influence decisions and policies. [...] And it highlights the crucial role of rights and norms that frame governance agendas. Data justice thereby emphasises the importance of establishing governance arrangements that are conducted both for and by the people who are most impacted."*

From the data justice framework, upholding the pillar of participation would entail bringing the different policymakers, practitioners, and IDPs themselves together to collaborate and decide how data should be collected, processed, used, and governed by large. A relational view of data should be taken to understand the social relationships between the IDP as data subject, and the civil society or displacement monitoring organization as data collector or processor, as well as the context they are situated in. Data justice further challenges participation in existing power structures for data management and asks actors involved in addressing internal displacement to question whether participation would reproduce risk or further harm the IDPs. It instead pushes for 'transformational inclusiveness' for IDPs so that the governance of their data is just and participative.

Within this framework, this research also touches on the data life cycle typically used in business operations, which refers to the various stages that make up a data project and covers the path data takes from its origination to its use in practice (Stobierski, 2021). These can be categorized into eight stages: generation, collection, processing, storage, management, analysis, visualization, and interpretation; though different sources may also include a stage for the destruction or disposal of data (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2022).

The call to advance data justice research and practice is ultimately about *"broadening its critical approach to interrogating the social, historical, cultural, political, and economic forces behind manifestations of discrimination and inequity in contemporary ecologies of data collection, governance, and use"* (GPAI, 2022, p.9). Through data justice, the research critically reflects on how power and control shape norms of

participation, exploring individual rights and collective processes in internal displacement over time in the Philippines.

2.3. In Relation to Participation

In this research, the synthesis of these theoretical frameworks guides the analysis of how displacement monitoring institutions in the Philippines conceptualize and operationalize participation, and how these practices shape the data justice of IDPs. Both constructivist institutionalism and data justice provide insights into how power and norms shape participation among institutional actors in the governance of displacement data. Constructivist institutionalism poses that participation is institutionally constructed – defined, operationalized, and legitimized in different ways by governments, UN agencies, and civil society organizations. Examining these varied meanings helps uncover how participation then becomes institutionalized or dismissed in data processes, and how institutional norms shape who is recognized as a legitimate data actor as opposed to a data subject. Data justice, on the other hand, provides a normative grounding to evaluate the implications of these constructions, analyzing the fairness and inclusivity of institutionalized data processes. Following data justice principles, the assumption is that meaningful participation of IDPs in data processes amplifies IDP voices, counters the risks of invisibility, serves as a means of improving data quality and operability, towards realizing data justice. Together, both frameworks illustrate how participation is both a product of institutional norms, and a central principle to realizing data justice in internal displacement contexts.

Chapter 3 – The Philippines Case Study

The Philippines presents a multi-faceted landscape of internal displacement, shaped by the intersection of disaster and conflict. Located in the Pacific Ring of Fire and Pacific Typhoon Belt, the country is particularly prone to disasters such as typhoons, flooding events, and volcanic eruptions that create thousands of new displacements annually. In 2024 alone, there were almost nine million disaster-induced displacements, and more than a million people who remained internally displaced at the end of the year, the highest record since data on disaster displacements became available in 2019 and four times greater than 2023 (IDMC, 2025a; 2025c). Displacements induced by conflict and violence have also been the highest recorded since 2017, with 193,000 new internal displacement events and 123,000 people still displaced at the end of 2024, majority of whom reside in southernmost island group of Mindanao (IDMC, 2025a; UNOCHA, 2025).

The exposure to both disaster and conflict-induced displacement makes the Philippines a compelling case for examining the governance of internal displacement and the evolving role of data systems. Digitalization of all government services is a major priority of the current administration (Cayon 2021; Dharmaraj, 2025). Recent developments demonstrate growing support for policies towards IDP protection (UNHCR, 2024b), including the passing of a regional IDP law – the first of its kind in the Philippines and in Southeast Asia (Bangsamoro Transition Authority, 2024).

Additionally, the country's dynamic humanitarian and development ecosystem, with closely coordinating government agencies, civil society, and international organizations, also offers a unique setting to analyze how participatory approaches are conceptualized and operationalized. This section will discuss specific displacement events in the Philippines, the policies that drove response and arose in response to those events, and the key actors involved.

3.1. Displacement Events

Over the past decade, the Philippines has consistently ranked as one of the countries with the highest numbers of new internal displacements globally. The convergence of frequent disasters and deeply rooted conflicts has created a complex and recurring pattern of displacement that affects millions of Filipinos annually. According to the IDMC Country Profile, the Philippines has experienced peaks in internal displacement in the past decade, with disaster-induced displacement accounting for majority of the movements (2025). To further complicate matters, massive displacements are protracted in nature in many areas of the Philippines, leaving affected communities displaced in some cases for longer than five years (CCCHP, 2024).

In 2013, the Typhoon Haiyan (locally known as Yolanda) was the strongest storm ever recorded at landfall, and it remains one of the most devastating and transformative displacement events in Philippine history. Haiyan damaged or destroyed more than a million homes and displaced around 4 million individuals (Yonetani & Yuen, 2014). The scale of this displacement exposed deep inequalities in the state's disaster preparedness and recovery mechanisms. While efforts focused on reconstruction and return, many of those who returned felt that they had no choice to return despite fear of future disasters (The Brookings Institution, 2015). More than a decade later, affected communities have persisting concerns about access to water, security of tenure, and available opportunities regarding employment and livelihood (Tran & Bermudez, 2022). Some of the affected families remain in danger zones vulnerable to disaster and housing projects remain incomplete. Additionally, while most affected families now reside in permanent shelters, they face persisting issues such as insufficient basic utilities, travel costs, and difficulties with obtaining home ownership due to high processing fees (CCCHP, 2023).

Figure 3: Map of Typhoon Haiyan Affected Population by Region

(MapAction & UNOCHA, 2013)

Violence and conflict-induced displacement is a persistent challenge, particularly for the Mindanao region. The 2017 crisis in Marawi City was one of the most significant conflict-induced displacement events in the Philippines. The armed conflict lasted five months, killed more than a thousand people, and forced 360,000 to evacuate from their homes (Amnesty International, 2017). While most people were able to return, an estimated 80,300 were still displaced as of 2023 and have continuing concerns relating to their rights to food, water and sanitation, transportation, livelihood, and housing, on top of enduring socio-psychological effects and discrimination from host communities (CCCHP, 2023). Displacement in Mindanao has continued since, at smaller scales, due to inter-clan conflicts, locally referred to as 'rido', and sporadic violence. As of May 2025, UNOCHA's Mindanao Displacement Dashboard recorded 116,000 people displaced by the combination of severe weather events and land disputes.

Figure 4: Map of Destroyed Areas in Marawi City, 2018

(Special Committee on Marawi, 2020)

Beyond disaster and conflict, development is also a driver of internal displacement in the Philippines, as large-scale infrastructure projects threaten to relocate indigenous communities from ancestral lands often without robust data or meaningful participation mechanisms. One prominent example is the Jalaur River Multipurpose Project in Iloilo in the ancestral domain of the Tumandok people, which affects an estimated 17,000 individuals through loss of land, environmental risk, livelihood destruction, and displacement (Indigenous Peoples Movement for Self-Determination & Liberation, 2025). There is increasing visibility of arbitrary displacement resulting from development projects, but a lack of formal institutional recognition emphasizes its sensitive nature as these projects are typically led by state or private actors.

Together, these examples demonstrate how internal displacements in the Philippines are not singular, isolated events. Disaster, conflict, and development-induced displacements each generate distinct governance and data practices, but as displacement causes increasingly overlap, there is a call for greater coordination between relevant institutions and more meaningful engagement of IDPs in defining, documenting, and addressing solutions to their own displacement.

3.2. Policies and Actors in Internal Displacement

The Philippines has progressively developed an institutional and policy framework for managing internal displacement—largely shaped by disaster risk governance, conflict recovery, and human rights advocacy. In 2007, the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC), then known as National Disaster Coordinating Council (NDCC), issued Circular No. 5 Institutionalization of the Cluster Approach in the Philippine Disaster System. This established the foundation of support to IDPs and other affected communities in complex emergencies and disasters by mobilizing the strategic response of various institutions (NDCC, 2007). When the Philippine Republic Act (RA) 10121, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act (2010) was passed, it became the cornerstone of the country's disaster governance and humanitarian protection. It established a multi-level disaster response structure under the NDRRMC and its local councils, which is now complemented by the Disaster Response Operations Monitoring and Information Center (DROMIC) of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), which serves as the primary source of disaster-induced displacement data. As recent as September of 2025, the Philippines passed into law the Declaration of State of Imminent Disaster Act (RA 12287), which provides a mechanism for anticipatory action. This allows the communities, local government units, civil society and humanitarian actors to take proactive measures to address disaster, including pre-emptive evacuations (Presidential Communication Office, 2025b), which will undoubtedly have an impact on response to governance of internal displacement.

The Philippine Act on Crimes Against International Humanitarian Law, Genocide, and Other Crimes Against Humanity (RA 9851) applies to situations of armed conflict. Persisting conflict driving displacement in Mindanao has had the attention of government policy and monitoring over the past decades. The Protection Cluster has taken the lead in making sure displacement events and the consequent internally displaced populations are regularly reported in the Mindanao Displacement

Dashboards and Snapshots (UNOCHA, 2025). Other legislation that supports response to internal displacement include the 2016 Children's Emergency Relief and Protection Act (RA 10821) and the 2019 Special Protection of Children in Situations of Armed Conflict Act (RA 11188). Additionally, the 1997 Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (RA 8371) also includes provisions that provide the basis of protection in cases where conflict, disaster, or development projects displace indigenous communities. Furthermore, the Philippine Development Plan for 2023-2028 outlines goals and frameworks for the protection of conflict and disaster-affected communities (pp.208-309).

A key gap in Philippine displacement governance is the absence of a dedicated Internal Displacement Law, though multiple versions of the 'Rights of Internally Displaced Persons Act' have been proposed by policymakers. While these aimed to provide a comprehensive legal framework, consistent with the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, the one closest to being passed as law was vetoed by President Benigno Aquino III in 2013. More recent versions of the bill include the institutionalization of IDP participation in displacement-related programs, though these have yet to pass (UNHCR, 2024b).

One critical development of displacement governance in the Philippines was the passing of the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region Act of 2024, to better support the tens of thousands within the region who have been displaced by conflicts and disasters. The Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) was formally created in 2019 by the Bangsamoro Organic Law (RA 11054), and the region is still under an interim government until elections not later than March 2026 (Presidential Communications Office, 2025a). The Bangsamoro IDP Law clearly states the protection and rights of IDPs that the government should ensure, defining the structure and mechanisms to achieve this, including intergovernmental and inter-agency coordination as well as the inclusion and participation of IDPs in decision-making processes.

The policies that make up the governance of internal displacement were put into place by a complex set of institutions that include national, regional, and local government agencies, UN bodies, civil society, and affected communities. While the Philippine institutions mentioned in the previous paragraphs address internal displacement, it is important to distinguish these mechanisms from those involved in the protection of refugees and asylum seekers. Refugees are covered by the mandate of the Department of Justice–Refugee and Stateless Persons Protection Unit (DOJ-RSPPU), which operates in coordination with UNHCR to implement the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol (Department of Justice website). In contrast, internally displaced persons (IDPs) remain within the country's borders and therefore fall under the jurisdiction of domestic laws and humanitarian coordination frameworks. Though there are many similarities and overlaps in terms of general policy response, such as the need for registration and profiling, this between refugees, stateless, and IDPs highlights a critical gap in protection. Refugee protection has a clear legal and institutional foundation, internal displacement in the Philippines relies on multiple laws and policies without a single comprehensive and normative legal framework.

Chapter 4 – Methodology

This research works within qualitative inquiry and research. Broadly, qualitative inquiry is *"naturalistic, interpretive, and inductive. [...] Qualitative researchers attempt to interpret and make sense of the meaning people attach to their experiences or underlying a particular phenomenon"* (Mayan, 2025, pp.2-3). More specifically, qualitative research is inherently democratic, empowering, and accessible for application by researchers and for understanding by a broad audience (Silverman & Patterson, 2021). Furthermore, this research is inspired by critical approaches in applying the case study approach to explore the case and the political, social, cultural, economic, and geographic contexts it is situated in (Diem, Good, & Walters, 2023). Especially in research rooted in community development, the case study approach prioritizes an in-depth analysis, informed by a diverse set of individuals, rooted in an understanding of the community the research is meant to serve (Silverman & Patterson, 2021). Guided by this qualitative research methodology, this research will thus examine how institutional norms shape participatory approaches to data processes for IDPs in the Philippines.

4.1. Research Methods and Process

The decision to select the Philippines as a case study was made in consideration of its status as a country containing a significant IDP population, currently in the process of incorporating IDPs into legislation and integrating participatory approaches to displacement governance. Gathering preliminary data on how internal displacement issues are governed and addressed in the Philippines revealed a wealth of data relating to monitoring the numbers and movements of IDPs, especially in Mindanao (BARMM authorities, UNHCR, JIPS, 2021). However, limited reports were available on the success and challenges of participatory approaches, especially in relation to data processes. Thus, it was necessary to obtain firsthand accounts from key actors in internal displacement, through the key informant interview method. This method provides for the collection of data through interviews with experts, leaders, community representatives who are posed to give critical insights into their contexts (Akhter, 2022). Within this research, the key informant interview method is necessary to investigate how institutional norms influence the understanding and practice of participation in IDP data processes, featured mainly through the personal experiences and perceptions of institutional actors.

Key informants were identified through a purposive sampling method (Guest, Namey & Mitchell, 2013, pp.48-52), combined with direct searches and email outreach to relevant organizations involved in monitoring and addressing internal displacement in the Philippines. The aim was to reach a diverse pool of government agencies, civil society organizations, international organizations, experts, and academics. Once organizations were selected and contacted, specific key informants were identified from within those organizations, including mid- to high-level officials, program managers, and protection officers with experience working in internal displacement contexts, information management, or policy and advocacy. The reach of this study was broadened through snowball sampling to access a few key informants, including an IDP representative. In total, the participants in

this study include 12 experts in displacement, ten of whom are based in the Philippines, though all were familiar with the country context.

Table 2. Overview of Key Informants

Category	Key Informants / Organizations	Position	Gender	Geographic Scope
Government Agencies	1. Commission on Human Rights – Center for Social Justice and Humanitarian Protection (CHR-CSJHP)	Division Chief	Female	Philippines (National)
		Development Management Officer	Female	Philippines (National)
	2. Department of Justice – Refugee and Stateless Persons Protection Unit (DOJ-RSPPU)	Chief State Counsel	Male	Philippines (National)
	3. Ministry of Social Services and Development (MSSD) of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM)	Director of Programs and Operations Services	Male	Philippines (Regional)
International Organizations	4. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees-Philippines (UNHCR)	Assistant Protection Officer	Female	Philippines, International
	5. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs – Cotabato/Mindanao Humanitarian Advisory Team (UNOCHA-HAT)	Humanitarian Affairs Officer	Female	Philippines, International
Civil Society Organizations	6. Center for Disaster Preparedness (CDP)	Program Manager	Male	Philippines, Asia-Pacific
	7. Community and Families Services International (CFSI)	Project Coordinator	Male	Philippines, Myanmar, Vietnam
	8. Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society (CBCS)	Project Officer	Female	Philippines (Regional)
	9. Jesuit Refugee Services - Philippines (PJRS)	Project Director	Female	Philippines, International
Experts / Academia	10. Displacement Expert affiliated with IDMC	Information Management Adviser	Female	International
	11. Displacement Expert affiliated with McGill University	Director, Professor	Female	International
Internally Displaced Persons	12. Johary Ayo	IDP Representative	Male	Philippines

While most key informants requested to be referred to as independent experts or representatives of their organizations, the IDP representative Johary Ayo was clear about using his name to advocate for the rights of IDPs and make their voices heard through this research and others. Additionally, most key informants were experienced in working with researchers and media, and some requested to review the findings and the approval and use of direct quotes prior to publication. These

requests were complied with and the quotes used in this research paper are included acknowledging that the opinions expressed by the key informants do not necessarily reflect the views of their organizations.

The interview format was semi-structured, balanced between providing a direction of open-ended questions linked to the research objectives and allowing new themes to arise during the conversation (Silverman & Patterson, 2021). All interviews were conducted virtually via Microsoft Teams, with the aid of recording and auto-transcription tools. On average, the interviews ran for about 40-60 minutes and were conducted in August and September. Verbal and written consent were requested before and during the interviews.

The gathered data and transcriptions were then reviewed and subjected to a thematic analysis to generate the initial codes and to determine themes. As per Braun and Clarke, thematic analysis may also be applied to constructivist theoretical frameworks, in examining *"the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society"* (2006, pp.81), making it an appropriate fit for this research. They further elaborate that theoretical thematic analysis is deductive in nature, when the researcher aims to answer a specific research question and *"examine the underlying ideas, assumptions, [conceptualizations and ideologies] that are theorized as shaping or informing the semantic content of the data"* (pp.81-84). Following the guidelines of thematic analysis (ibid.), the transcribed interviews were linked to initial codes associated with participation, data processes, and internal displacement, the details of which can be found in Appendix C.

Most interviews were conducted in English, but for some key informants based in the Philippines, interviews were conducted in a mix of Filipino and English – languages which both the researcher and participants understood well. Direct quotes in the Findings & Analysis, Discussion, and Conclusion chapters have been translated by me into English and edited for clarity.

4.2. Scope and Limitations

The scope of this research is centered on the Philippines as a case study, while aiming to contribute to broader understandings of displacement governance and data processes in similar contexts. The research includes the perspectives and observations of experts and actors from key institutions engaged in the production, management, and use of displacement data. But it is important to note that the key informants from government agencies are some of the most active agencies advocating for the rights of IDPs and are not representative of the entire Philippine government's approach to displacement.

One limitation stems from the formal nature of the institutions involved and the strict timeframe allotted for the completion of this research. A few of the invited key informants did not respond or responded but were unavailable during the data collection period, which means that some critical views were not included in this research. Several interview participants hold senior or specialized positions and very busy schedules, which necessitated lengthy processes to secure interviews. Fortunately, going through the formal channels allowed the key informants greater discretion in share information on the operations of their organizations.

A noteworthy methodological reflection concerns the paradoxical nature of the research subject and the research participants. While the questions and the content of the research revolve around IDP participation, these questions are directed mostly towards organizations who own and define data processes, rather than focus on IDPs themselves. This reflects the tension in the more top-down institutional dynamics and the bottom-up participatory approaches theorized in the conceptual framework. However, the decision to focus on institutions is deliberate: they hold the authority, resources, and decision-making power that largely determines how IDPs are included or excluded from displacement data processes and policy frameworks (High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement, 2021a).

4.3. Positionality, Reflexivity, and Ethics

A significant motivation behind this research can be credited to my work experience in both government and non-government organizations in the Philippines. My personal interest in information, how it is processed and managed, began with an internship at the UNHCR, where I supported the establishment of the national refugee database for the Philippines, through close collaboration with CFSI and the DOJ-RSPPU – three organizations involved in this study. That interest was further solidified during my time as a knowledge management associate in the development nonprofit, and my work as a monitoring and evaluation officer in a national government agency. Through these experiences, I personally witnessed some of the challenges involved with collecting, processing, and managing data of vulnerable populations, including those who were displaced. I directly observed how beyond mere counts of individuals or families, incomplete and inconsistent socioeconomic data, disaggregated data, and microdata hindered effective policy action and support, which has motivated and strengthened my investment in this research.

These experiences brought me familiarity with the issue of displacement in the Philippines, with the organizations working in it, and with operations like monitoring and evaluation and processing data from beneficiaries of government or development projects. This admittedly eased my access to their representatives, though I never interacted or worked with those tapped as key informants. My positionality as a Filipino with work experience in the public and development sector, as well as my ability to speak Filipino, allowed my Philippine-based key informants to be more comfortable during the interviews and let the conversations flow more naturally. While I was worried that the privilege of studying in a European university and conducting my research virtually might create distance from my key informants, all of them were familiar with the research process, some having been involved in other similar research projects in the past year.

Lastly, I recognize that my positionality may lead to potential biases that I must be conscious of, such as the roles different institutions might play in facilitating IDP participation in data processes, and the relevance this specific area of participation might hold for addressing internal displacement issues. Ultimately, I have attempted to exercise reflexivity throughout this research process, drawing from my key informants' insights to confront my assumptions and build on the broader conclusions of the research.

4.3.1. A.I. Usage Disclosure

During the preparation of this work, I used A.I. tools including ChatGPT, Litmaps, and ResearchRabbit to search and explore relevant literature. I used prompts such as, 'Participation and Participatory Approaches in Internal Displacement', 'Data Justice in Displacement', and 'Constructivist Institutionalism in Social Science'. Suggested literature were then located through the Erasmus University Library databases and Google Scholar, then reviewed for relevance and legitimacy before inclusion as a reference in this research. After using these tools, I reviewed and edited the content as needed, and I take full responsibility for the content of this research.

Chapter 5 – Findings & Analysis

The findings from the interviews revealed each informant's perspective towards participation of IDPs in the collection and management of their own data. The extent to which participation is encouraged and facilitated by these institutions as well as the challenges faced were further examined based on the concepts of constructivist institutionalism and data justice. The results are thus organized based on first, understanding the key actors involved in internal displacement in the Philippines as well as the context that supports their understanding of participation in data processes. Then this chapter will answer each research question, and finally, address any common themes and patterns that were identified.

5.1. Actors Involved in IDP Data Collection

Given the complexity of internal displacement and its prevalence in the Philippines, the ecosystem of institutional actors that have arisen in response is relatively well-established. These actors include government agencies, international organizations, civil society organizations, research organizations and the academe, and of course IDPs themselves. The table below summarizes the roles, responsibilities, data priorities and activities per category of institution, as reported by the key informants.

Table 3. Matrix of Actors/Key Informants in Philippine Internal Displacement Contexts

Institution/Actor	Role & Responsibilities	Data Priorities & Activities
Government Agencies	• Delivery of food and non-food aid, social services, legal services, IDP registration. • Inter-agency coordination and referral (Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of Health, Department of Education, Department of Labor	• Primary data collection of who and how many have been displaced, their respective needs and applicable durable solutions; IDP profiling efforts. • Conduct of monitoring and reporting human rights violations, compliance with national legislation and international commitments.

	and Employment, Philippine Statistics Authority, etc.). • Provision of durable solutions for IDPs.	• Formulation of data into policy and evidence-based decision making. • Coordination, communication, and referral to other actors in displacement management.
Civil Society Organizations	• Direct delivery or support to government agencies in delivering services and aid. • Conduct of capacity building, livelihood training, learning sessions for IDPs. • General advocacy support for IDPs.	• Primary data collection, coordination, and reporting. • Formulation of data into programming and advocacy. • Coordination and communication with other actors in displacement management.
International Organizations	• Primary sources of data and analysis on internal displacement globally. • Coordination with various government agencies, community-based organizations, and other INGOs. • Provision of reports and guidelines on internal displacement.	• Primary and secondary data collection, aggregation, coordination, and reporting. • Formulating data into recommendations for policy and advocacy. • Coordination and communication with other actors in displacement management.
Researchers / Academe	• Conduct and publication of research on IDP experiences, internal displacement events and policy, and related subjects. • Support to other actors through theoretical or empirical evidence.	• Research-dependent. • High-level, macro data to support research and institutional policymaking.
Internally Displaced Persons	• Primary subjects experiencing internal displacement, its consequent vulnerabilities and risks. • Recipients of aid and services.	• Source and generator of data, subjects of IDP profiling. • Support to data gathering activities of other actors. • Need for data or information is focused on the aid or services to be received, the environmental or political context, the social relations between and among IDPs and host communities, potential durable solutions.

There are many institutions involved in internal displacement in the Philippines, coordinating through the cluster approach (NDCC, 2007). According to the key informants and the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement (2021a), government agencies from the national to municipal levels are frontline emergency response and development programs. The Philippine government is also at the forefront of most data initiatives relating to IDPs (ibid). Government actors are closely linked to civil society who also interacts directly with IDPs and engages with their communities, as well as international organizations whose primary and secondary data collection and processing informs

broader policy recommendations and tracking of international commitments. Researchers are also frequently tapped to support the work of government and nonprofits, to provide practical recommendations for policymakers and civil society.

As repeated by multiple key informants, IDPs cannot and should not be left out of the conversation about their own context and data. While IDPs have not held much authority in the realm of their own governance or data management, being embedded in their specific contexts gives them greater understanding (The Brookings Institution, 2008). In the subsequent section, the key informants will share how IDPs are increasingly engaged by institutional actors, participating and representing themselves in data and policy arenas.

5.2. The Extent of Participation in Data Processes

This section answers the first sub-question on the ways are IDPs involved in, or excluded from, the production and use of data that affects them. The extent to which IDPs are engaged by the different institutional actors in the Philippines depends on a few key factors, including the stage of the data life cycle and the role of the institutional actor in supporting IDPs. To structure my findings, I refer to the data life cycle stages which include generation, collection, processing, storage, management, analysis, visualization, and interpretation (Business Insights Blog, 2021). While all stages of the data life cycle are present and can be applied to internal displacement contexts in the Philippines, varying levels of attention were given to each stage, based on the inputs from the key informants.

5.2.1. Data Generation
The beginning of the data life cycle opens with data generation, covering information which may be created at any stage of displacement and by all actors involved in it. From (1) prior to the displacement, (2) its occurrence, (3) developing a durable solution, and (4) afterwards; covering both the experiences of IDPs, their host communities, and the institutional actors trying to solve the internal displacement. Without participatory practices, IDPs are treated as data subjects at the lowest level of the participation spectrum (The Brookings Institution, 2008). The key informants explained that the degree of participation in data generation and what is determined as relevant data may differ.

This discussion begs the question of whether IDPs themselves see data as a priority, and if they do, what kinds of data would they prioritize? According to the displacement expert from McGill University who recently conducted a workshop with IDP leaders on strengthening the participation of IDPs, the institutions are the ones with the 'thirst' for data. The expert added that through their experience engaging with IDPs in the Philippines and elsewhere, the information IDPs request has a different focus and is gathered from different sources as opposed to institutions. The expert affiliated with McGill stated, "*thus, it is primarily the institutions who determine what information gets collected, processed, and shared.*" Adjacent to the previous point, a representative from the Center for Disaster Preparedness (CDP) Foundation, spoke more broadly about ensuring IDP access to information, stating that "*in order to encourage participation among evacuees in a camp or evacuation center, they would need to know their rights,*

have access to information on the services available to them, and you can't [have participation] if you don't divulge this information."

Johary Ayo became a representative for himself and fellow IDPs who were displaced by the siege of Marawi in 2017. He accepted the role after having worked in the humanitarian sector and supporting other IDPs. In Filipino, he says, "*we call [ourselves] 'bakwit',*" *a term which itself is a loanword from 'evacuate'*". Ayo interprets data and data processes through his experiences both as an IDP and a volunteer supporting the profiling of IDPs, identifying how many families and the difficulties in determining IDPs across different contexts, for instance, renters and landowners.

The representative from CDP shared the case of a community-based organization that focused on inclusivity in the data and in the design and roll-out of data initiatives, such as crafting metrics for monitoring and evaluation. This logic also supports rights monitoring, according to the Chief of the Commission on Human Rights - Center for Social Justice and Humanitarian Protection (CHR-CSJHP). The CHR-CSJHP Chief added that, "*the IDP monitoring tool that we have is capable of nuancing how rights are being appreciated by the IDPs and that helps in policy recommendations, policy making, or lobbying from our end; because the IDPs give us the aspects of their rights that must be looked into by the government*". In alignment with participation as a pillar of data justice (GPAI, 2022), IDPs should be included in the identification of metrics and in the definition their needs and priorities.

5.2.2. Data Collection and Processing

Data collection is the stage of the data life cycle where conscious effort begins to focus, and where institutions may differ as they identify which information should be gathered and the best methods to achieve this. Once data has been collected, it can be processed. Processing this data can include activities such as cleaning the data set or digitizing the data, which as mentioned in previous chapters has seen increased use in public service delivery. In the Philippines, government agencies, civil society organizations, international organizations, and researchers are all involved with gathering firsthand quantitative and qualitative data from internally displaced people and communities. This data ranges from their demographic, socio-economic characteristics, immediate needs, to preferred durable solutions. According to the key informants, this is primarily accomplished by local government units, through data collection activities in the form of censuses, surveys, workshops, forums, and more.

Addressing internal displacement is one of the core priorities of the UNHCR in the Philippines, supporting a whole-of-society and cluster approach for IDPs. According to the representative from UNHCR, monitoring IDPs and gathering their data is essential to answer the questions, "*Why are these people fleeing? Where are they coming from and where are they going to? How many families and individuals are they? What are their present protection concerns?*". The representative further emphasized the importance of trust in the process and in the institution before gathering any data: "*So, to ensure meaningful participation, you really have to build their trust and confidence in you, and what we usually do is inject data protection sessions before any data collection undertaking, making sure that confidentiality is really protected*".

The Development Management Officer from the CHR-CSJHP also emphasized an involved approach to data management of IDPs: "*We view IDPs not just as beneficiaries but as rights holders. This applies to every part of the process. Not just included in consultations and meetings, but their needs are actually considered.*"

The CHR-CSJHP primarily gathers information on the rights of IDPs, on whether they have been upheld or if there are violations. The monitoring – which is foundational for policy recommendation, lobbying, and crafting – is made to be responsive to IDP needs, as the vulnerable individuals and communities themselves interpret the rights and the nuances as they apply to their specific contexts. One unique opportunity the CHR-CSJHP uses to gather data is through the conduct of a national inquiry on IDPs in the Philippines, which took the form of a CHR-CSJHP facilitated platform for IDPs as well as government agencies. According to representatives from the CHR-CSJHP, "*that [platform] created a space wherein the IDPs were able to share their insights, influence policies by providing their direct opinions and experiences with existing policies, on internal displacement; and also, for the national government and regional agencies to provide them with real answers to their issues.*" However, there are still limitations, as Ayo discussed, where information on human rights violations suffered by IDPs in evacuation camps is still lacking or overlooked in data gathering and reporting activities.

For the Director of Programs and Operations Services of the Ministry of Social Services and Development (MSSD) of BARMM, IDPs are critical to their data gathering activities. In the operationalization of the Bangsamoro Autonomy Act No. 62 – Protecting the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, the Ministry has developed the IDP Profiling and Response Tracking (iPART) System to strengthen data collection across various municipalities within BARMM. In parallel to the iPART programming, IDPs and members of vulnerable communities are mobilized and trained in data gathering as para-social workers to more effectively engage with IDPs.

According to the key informant from UNOCHA, the organization coordinates data sharing and information management activities among various actors in Philippine displacement contexts, focusing on inter-cluster coordination, to which IDP leaders and representatives are invited to participate at various levels. However, other institutions explained that involving IDPs in their data gathering is limited. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) infrequently works directly with IDPs in data gathering activities; According to one of the experts on displacement and information management, who is affiliated with the IDMC, the organization consolidates and verifies secondary data on internal displacement from local partners around the world to inform policy and operations. For some institutions at this stage of the data life cycle, opportunities for IDP engagement across the spectrum of participation generally range from passive participation with IDPs as sources of data, to more involved consultation, collaboration, and partnership with organizations implementing programs in the field. Both informants from UNOCHA and IDMC shared that there are efforts to strengthen IDP participation here and in other stages of the data life cycle. Comparing to how data is gathered for IDPs, according to Chief State Counsel of the Department of Justice and head of the Refugee and Stateless Persons Protection Unit (DOJ-RSPPU), most data gathering activities for refugees are done through the Philippine Statistics Authority, except for the individuals who approach their office personally to ask for assistance.

In internal displacement contexts, civil society organizations are often tapped by governments to support monitoring and community engagement activities. Such is the case shared by the program officer of the Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society (CBCS), who worked with MSSD in rolling out the iPART system. They also shared concerns about the safety of the IDPs and personnel of

CBCS, especially when gathering data in areas where conflict persists or have not yet recovered from disaster. A representative of the Catholic organization Jesuit Refugee Services-Philippines (JRSP) stated that through their philosophy of 'accompanying IDPs on their journey', IDPs are consulted for every intervention. Another example of engagement in data gathering was the conduct of multiple participatory 3D mapping activities with IDP communities organized by CDP. Yet, the representative from CDP also communicated frustration, as interventions through projects do not allow sustained support over the long-term.

Speaking with Ayo about IDP inclusion and exclusion in the data life cycle, he shared that he volunteered for the rescue team in evacuation camps, consulting with displaced families and host communities about their respective needs and supporting local government's data management efforts. In evacuee and IDP camps, area presidents are chosen from and by the members of the community, who keep track of the displaced individuals and their needs, conveying and communicating with local and national government. He said that from his experience, IDPs have only been involved in data gathering activities in a basic or partial manner.

5.2.3. Storage and Management

Data storage and management refer to the keeping of data gathered and processed in such a manner that it may be organized and retrieved efficiently. As digitization efforts progress in the Philippines and the amount of data generated and handled by these institutional actors increase, it's important to ensure that stored data is effectively protected. Both stages are formal, institutional processes that are dependent on available technological equipment and knowledge. It also involves access to and control over highly sensitive information to which access is and should be highly restricted, for the safety of the data subjects. It is important to note though there may be data sharing agreements with approved organizations. The UNHCR representative explains, "*access is restricted to limited people, and the information management team leader should know and be the one monitoring this access, ensuring there will be no unauthorized use of the data.*" As such, these stages of the data life cycle may be the most difficult for IDPs to participate and were rarely mentioned during interviews with key informants. Additionally, when exploring how other institutions approach participation of communities in data processes, the JIPS Essential Toolkit on Community Engagement in Data Processes Canvas (2022) excludes this stage of the data life cycle.

5.2.4. Analysis, Visualization, and Interpretation

Data analysis refers to uncovering meaningful insights from the data, which may be transformed into graphs and charts to support the interpretation of the data and explore its implications. The analyzed and interpreted data is packaged and reported to institutional stakeholders who can then make informed decisions. At this stage, data is turned into action, feeding into policies and programs of institutional actors in internal displacement. IDPs are then further consulted on what might best respond to their needs, if there are any grievances or redress mechanisms to be pursued.

IDP participation in these stages is highly encouraged by all the key informants. As a result of a municipality protection profiling in Mindanao, UNHCR was able to discover a low rate of birth registration for many displaced individuals, which led to the inclusion of birth registration services in their programming, to ensure IDPs were fully recognized and covered by public assistance and services.

The UNHCR representative also shared that coordination with IDP agencies and consultations with displaced indigenous people revealed these communities felt that they were unseen in the data. Thus, the UNHCR initiated a protracted displacement protection assessment that they conducted together with the internally displaced indigenous people.

As part of the Marawi Recovery Project and Marawi COVID-19 Recovery project, working together with various government agencies and Task Force Bangon Marawi, the nonprofit organization Community and Family Services International (CFSI) supported transitory camps and temporary shelters. They engaged with IDPs through various community sessions which included feedback and grievance/redress mechanisms as well as program planning and solution-making. One of the frequently raised cases for IDP participation in these stages were validation workshops, to determine if the data collected and processed were accurate and comprehensive representations of IDP realities. Another clear example of participation in data interpretation and use being institutionalized is located in a provision of the Bangsamoro IDP Law: local internal displacement councils are established with IDPs as members, which are supported by the IDP profiling system and other relevant datasets to make decisions, elevate issues and concerns and exercise agency in decision making processes.

Overall, the comparison across different stages of the data life cycle reveals that participation of IDPs remains uneven and is largely concentrated in the stages of collection and interpretation. While efforts are being made across governmental, international, and civil society actors to promote more meaningful and sustained engagement, there are certain data processes that are challenging to involve IDPs in without addressing significant barriers such as data protection concerns, unequal technical capacity, and allocation of resources.

It is also important to note that participation in these data processes may differ greatly depending on whether the IDP resides in a camp or evacuation center, as they experience protracted or multiple displacements, or even once a durable solution has been found. Additionally, it is increasingly relevant to collect and explore the data from different stages of displacement (Appler et al., 2019). However, at the height of the displacement event, should the potential emergency which caused the displacement – for example, flooding or armed violence – persist, the research participants largely observed that the timeliness of information and the urgent provision of aid or services is most critical, at the expense of observing certain participatory practices. Nevertheless, all agreed that aid and services provided should be responsive to the genuine needs and lived realities of the IDPs themselves. All interviewees indicated while there may be limits to the extent to which IDPs may participate in certain data processes, broader participation in political processes are being more widely encouraged and pursued.

5.3. Challenges of Participation in Data Processes

This section answers the sub-question: what are the challenges and limitations that affect the use of participatory approaches in displacement data processes? Addressing situations as complex as internal displacement unquestionably has its difficulties for all actors involved. The research participants

shared their opinions on the most critical challenges and limitations they faced in trying to track internal displacement, support IDPs, and provide durable solutions. All of them raised points that echoed the clusters of challenges to IDP data introduced by Cardona-Fox (2020): conceptual, operational, and political.

5.3.1 Conceptual Challenges

While all key informants recognized the importance of IDP data, the same cannot be said for all institutional actors in internal displacement contexts. This lack of prioritization or understanding means less support towards more complex aspects of internal displacement. These manifest as multiple or protracted displacements, tracking those who are located outside of temporary shelters or in residential areas, and understanding the impact internal displacement might have on host communities.

How these conceptual challenges affect participation lies at the root of the term, 'IDP' or 'bakwit'. The trouble with defining a person as internally displaced is that they may not understand the term or prefer to identify themselves as such due to shame or preferring to organize around other aspects such as their faith, gender, or status as an indigenous person. This means that IDP leaders and IDP-led organizations are few, at least in the Philippines, according to the UNHCR representative and the displacement expert from McGill University. Involving IDP representatives in communication and advocacy campaigns, specifically ones aimed at spreading awareness of the plight of IDPs and how they might defend their rights, may address some of these conceptual challenges. This is further supported by the efforts mentioned by the key informants from UNHCR, MSSD, and the Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society, and Ayo.

5.3.2. Operational Challenges

There are numerous challenges in the practice of data processes for internal displacement, some of which are mentioned in the previous section. The lack of a standardized process and a centralized database, combined with different data priorities from institutional actors, leads to different interpretation of displacement events and the needs of IDPs. Additionally, these IDPs are often located in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas, with limited technological capacities and capabilities present, also difficult to reach. Generally, there is a need for greater support, in terms of financial resources and personnel, to support interventions towards addressing internal displacement and finding durable solutions.

While these operational challenges generally create more difficulties in the inclusion of IDPs in data processes, broader IDP participation can help address some other difficulties. Ensuring that representatives of such vulnerable groups are involved in data gathering, analysis, and decision-making activities ensures that they are present in the data itself. It also may be more cost-effective for organizations to utilize members of IDP communities, as they are already familiar with the people and their context (The Brookings Institution, 2008). In these situations, the challenge is to ensure that the IDPs have the capacity and training gather the data, as well as to coordinate with relevant stakeholders and other IDPs with sensitivity. These initiatives are the focus of MSSD's 'Lingkod Pamayanan Para sa Kapayapaan' (Community Servant for Peace) program, which involves para-social workers from

each locality in data gathering for the iPART system. This emphasis on capacity building resonated across all the interviews.

5.3.3. Political Challenges

The political aspect of IDP data and participation was discussed in-depth by all research participants. The lack of national legislation and institutionalized frameworks mean inconsistency and uncertainty in the support provided by government agencies, subject to the whim of the sitting administration. Policymakers who have rarely prioritized internal displacement issues or data management initiatives are unlikely to be supporting participation in either of these areas. One of the challenges that was shared by both the CHR-CSJHP and the UNHCR representatives was that of mindset. According to the two representatives from the CHR-CSJHP, there are policymakers who do not perceive IDPs as self-reliant individuals but as opportunistic people taking advantage of government aid. Conversely, they added, there are also those policymakers who presume the resilience of communities who have survived multiple disasters or conflicts and thus need less support; downplaying the services these IDPs have a right to receive. While there are examples of IDPs who provide incorrect data, people who impersonate IDPs to receive more aid, and as Ayo shared, IDPs who have self-organized their own data processes to better their experiences in evacuation camps and advocate for themselves, this does not invalidate the fact that institutionalized government support to IDP participation is essential.

Multiple key informants communicated that addressing the politicization of participation can be fraught for the actors involved. They face political pressures especially during election periods, as IDPs may also impact population counts, internal revenue allotment, national task allocation, and more. Some key informants implied that aid may be provided to IDPs, if only to promote a specific political agenda and push IDPs to campaign on their behalf. Simultaneously, there may be pressures to exclude certain civil society or community-based organizations who are perceived as opponents or even anti-government.

A vital element to participation that poses its own challenge is building trust between the IDP and the institutional actor. The willingness to participate in any intervention is contingent on trust, which can be difficult for IDPs placed in vulnerable contexts. Ayo spoke about the struggle to speak up when basic services that were promised to IDP camps were never received, when human rights violations were committed by the institutions meant to serve the people, and especially when the military and security agencies were managing camps, and seen as intimidating. He also shared hesitance in sharing information with INGOs, as some IDPs considered them foreign intelligence operatives. The key informants from MSSD, CFSI, JRSP, and CHR-CSJHP shared similar sentiments, that IDPs who speak their grievances or participate might see no results, which damages the trust in these institutions.

The expert from UNOCHA also reflected on the power dynamics between local, regional, national, and international organizations: "*A number of advocacy [efforts] happen in coordination, driven by the clusters and inter-clusters, [who] would really look for the participation, representation of IDPs.*" The UNOCHA key informant added that while coordination occurs at various levels and at different stages of displacement – IDP participation happens mostly at the local level and to some extent at the regional,

with challenges arising due to location and perceived power relations. This echoes the findings in The Brookings Institution report (2008), where a risk to participatory approaches may include further entrenchment of unequal power relations between the agencies holding decision-making power regarding resources and aid. Both international displacement experts offered the perspective of the civil society or international organization, who might face pressure to report positive results as 'best practices' to the donor or decision-maker.

Facing political pressures and a lack of trust in the institutional actors handling their data, people who are internally displaced may opt not to involve themselves in these data processes. While conscious non-participation is also a form of exercising agency (Hirschmann, 1970), there are cases where IDPs push through this barrier like IDP representative Ayo shared: "*That's probably why I'm not afraid, because first, we report what is really happening, it's up to them whether they broadcast it or not, at least we gave them [real information] ... Here in these spaces, though we are a little worried, but we trust the data we are giving them, the situation that's happening on the ground. It's up to them if they use it to fix the system or if they have other plans. So, for us, for those of us at the grassroots, we just want basic services, the security of our community, and for our concerns to be heard by our government.*"

As stated in the previous section of this chapter, the barriers to participation may differ depending on the specific stage of the data life cycle, and distrust can magnify those barriers. However, a few key informants shared that participation may also counter distrust, especially when institutional actors encourage transparency and accountability in data processes. In the interview with the representatives from CHR-CSJHP, the topic of data naturally led to the right of access to information. Without knowledge on what, when, and how aid is coming, and without open and transparent lines of communication, it becomes hard for IDPs to move forward and exercise their agency, and even harder to participate. There are cases where local government units are both proactive and responsive to the needs of IDPs they are hosting, however, this is highly dependent on the individual government unit and is not at all standardized.

Table 4. Summary of Challenges in IDP Data and Participation

Type	Challenge	Impact on Participation
Conceptual	• Difficulty defining what an IDP is, stigma and hesitance around identifying as an IDP.	• Presence of few IDP leaders or IDP-led organizations and associations.
Operational	• Lack of standardized data processes, centralized database. • Remote, hard-to-reach locations. • Limited technical capacities to use digital platforms and tools. • Lack of financial and staff resources	• Creates additional obstacles to participation in data processes. • IDPs excluded from more advanced stages of data management and analysis, dependent on institutional mediaries. • Presents an opportunity to tap IDPs as staff on the ground, with greater access to their own communities, and strengthen their skills through capacity building activities.

Political	• Inconsistent support due to lack of national legislation and non-prioritization of policymakers. • Perception and stigma surrounding IDPs either as greedy for aid or as resilient, thus dismissing their needs. • Political pressures towards IDP interventions and IDP data. • Lack of trust between institutional actors and IDPs.	• IDPs ability to participate in data processes may change over time, depending on the current political agenda and sitting administration. • Participation is made more difficult, perceived by IDPs as tokenistic or uncertainty in the impact of participation. • Participation in data processes may support building trust.

The challenges identified above reveal how systemic barriers at conceptual, operational, and political levels intersect to constrain the participation of IDPs in data processes. Conceptually, ambiguous definitions of who counts as an IDP, what data is relevant, and the presence of stigma prevent full recognition and accurate representation of internally displaced populations in institutional frameworks. Operationally, fragmented data systems, limited resources, and the absence of standardized and inclusive processes hinder sustained and meaningful engagement. Politically, participation is deeply contingent on shifting government priorities, policy gaps, and the uneven distribution of power between the actors involved in internal displacement.

5.2.3. The Impact of Policy Shifts on Internal Displacement

This section answers the third sub-question exploring how the developments of policy and discourse on internal displacement have impacted participatory approaches in IDP data processes. There have been various developments in the discourse surrounding internal displacement in the Philippines, as mentioned in previous chapters. While no national legislation exists, the current framework in the country for supporting IDPs has been built from the ground up and from multiple areas within the country. At the national level, policies in relation to disaster response and reduction have grown increasingly robust as the country remains highly vulnerable to typhoons, earthquakes, and floods. National and local government units are required to collect disaster data, including displacement figures for disaster risk reduction and management. This is supported by the creation of protection clusters for specific emergencies or themes, such as the Task Force for the Special Protection of Children in Armed Conflict (2003) and the Task Force Bangon Marawi (2017). These protection clusters typically include representatives from government agencies, civil society organizations, experts across various fields, and have increasingly been involving and consulting IDPs.

Many advocacy efforts can be credited to the UNHCR, who has been at the forefront of displacement messaging in the country. According to the UNHCR representative, their focus previously was on direct aid but recently made the strategic decision to prioritize legislation and the institutionalization of normative frameworks. To support this, they gather local champions and conduct capacity development sessions for drafting local ordinances and establishing strong legal frameworks addressing internal displacement. The UNHCR also brought IDP representatives like

Ayo to share their experiences with the Bangsamoro Transition Authority and advocate for better protection under law, based on humanitarian principles.

Within the past year, the enactment of the Bangsamoro Autonomy Act No. 62 – Protecting the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons has been the most influential change as reported by all the research participants. Within BARMM, the law informs decision makers through clear provisions on the rights of IDPs – including a right to participation – and a framework on how to organize interventions for addressing internal displacement, assigning responsibilities to specific agencies. MSSD is one agency given multiple responsibilities under the Act, including the protection of IDPs' rights to education, and provision of immediate relief and humanitarian assistance. MSSD has critical responsibilities in ensuring intergovernmental and inter-agency coordination through heading the Bangsamoro Internal Displacement Council, working with Local Internal Displacement Councils that include IDP representatives, and – especially for the focus of this research – managing the Bangsamoro Internal Displacement Management and Monitoring Division. This division functions as the Bangsamoro Government's institutional and administrative focal point, handles the Bangsamoro Internal Displacement Program, and is the main government actor in collecting, storing, and processing IDP-related data.

According to the representative from MSSD, the Bangsamoro IDP law was built on the foundation of decades of advocacy efforts, multiple fraught situations of conflict and disaster, and a critical transition period in the government of the Bangsamoro Region:

> "*It took years of advocating and involving different partners. We built up on the practices and experiences of people being displaced in BARMM and outside areas, and [humanitarian] actors with outside experience who contributed how to shift from needs-based response to rights-based approaches. It took years until the parliament [was formed] and we continued to lobby it at the parliament level. Displacement issues were being raised regularly, and it's intertwined or it intersects with the issues in the [Bangsamoro] peace process. We took advantage of the transition period, where we have progressive minds supporting it, and there were less issues related to development aggression.*"

Similar insights came from the key informants from the civil society sector, stating that the crisis in Marawi City was a pivotal point for many government and civil society actors. One example came from the representative from CFSI, as the organization was involved in the Marawi Compensation Board and recommended that IDPs be engaged in the decision-making on compensation for assets destroyed in the conflict. Ayo was one of those displaced from Marawi City and he observed firsthand the changes in discourse and policy. He noted that more active civilian participation was encouraged during the time of Former President Benigno Aquino, where Former President Duterte was known as the 'iron hand' and his rough attitude was replicated in the treatment of IDPs. Ayo also recognized the significance of the Bangsamoro IDP law, though his appreciation was tempered by the fact that the law's roll out is still in its early days. He mentioned visible progress in how aid is distributed and rationed, and how data is now being collected in a more organized manner.

The representatives from CHR-CSJHP shared persisting feedback from IDPs on the provision of relief services not being responsive to their actual needs but noted small changes in the contents of

aid packages such as the inclusion of sanitary napkins and diapers does demonstrate some progress as people grow more vocal and involved in the design of these interventions. The representative from DOJ-RSPPU shared this opinion from the perspective of government, that an increasing number of policymakers were growing more open to the plight of displaced peoples, and more willing to recognize that the mandates of their respective government agencies also cover IDPs. With years of work on IDPs, one of the experts on displacement noted that a broader societal push towards claims for inclusion, participation, and intersectionality of women, persons with disability, indigenous people, and other vulnerable minorities has bolstered the discourse on internal displacement.

While more humanitarian principles are incorporated into policymaking and programming, there are structural changes that are occurring, as both UNHCR and UNOCHA have downscaled operations, the latter having transitioned from a country office to a humanitarian advisory team. This was also verbalized by the CDP representative, who noted that less aid was being directed to the Global South, and that this pushed civil society actors to grow more resourceful in tapping IDPs based in their communities to create more relevant and effective solutions.

One other influential factor to internal displacement discourse has been the rapid advances in technology and digital innovation. Behind the design of the iPART system in BARMM and the potential to identify IDPs pre-displacement is a constant push towards digitalization wherever possible, though many IDPs reside in remote areas with limited technological capabilities. Thus, the research participants use hybrid approaches to data collection and management. The displacement expert from IDMC shared their excitement about the opportunities in data innovations happening in the private sector, such as Facebook's Data for Good initiative, as well as the automations happening within large internal displacement monitoring institutions that allow faster processing, better translations, and access to greater information overall. As data-driven approaches become increasingly common, it necessitates greater understanding of data justice principles and the greater facilitation of IDP participation.

Ultimately, these shifts in policy and discourse in the Philippines illustrates that while the issue of internal displacement may not have held the limelight in the policy arena, concerns about disaster and conflict have bolstered institutional processes that directly and indirectly address it. Massive displacement events, such as the one resulting from the crisis in Marawi in 2017, brought this to the attention of civil society and humanitarian actors, who have since been advocating for and with IDPs. The changing international humanitarian sphere has also influenced how international organizations are positioning themselves in the Philippines, and trying to support locally driven, sustainable solutions to internal displacement. Though IDP participation in data has not been an explicit focus of policymakers, as technology continues to improve and digitalization efforts ramp up in the country, some awareness of data justice principles have been incorporated into programming and policy.

5.2.4. Understanding Norms of Participation

Now to address the main question of this research: How are developing norms of participation conceptualized and operationalized in data processes of internally displaced persons (IDPs) by

institutions in the Philippines? This question and this section synthesize how participation is understood and put into practice by a range of actors involved in displacement monitoring and response in the Philippines. Drawing from the interviews to explore the various ways in which participation is defined in internal displacement contexts and how these translate into data processes and systems or fall short in advancing the visibility and agency of IDPs.

Participation was interpreted broadly by the interviewees, who mentioned a variety of conceptualizations during the interview. Across the institutions and actors who contributed to this research, I conceptualized that participation can be a spectrum, through three categories of framing that intersect and overlap: narrative and aspirational, instrumental and institutional, transformative and empowering. First, most if not all interviewees defined participation through the normative and aspirational framing, though some highlighted it as a moral imperative and a human right, one that would allow trust to be built between the IDP and the institution. Instrumental and institutional framings were most frequently mentioned by the key informants from government agencies and civil society organizations. This framing interprets participation of IDPs within specific processes such as planning, coordination, and data management activities. Lastly, the transformative and empowerment framing of participation essentially describes participation as empowerment, encouraging the agency of IDPs through the co-production of programs and interventions, the inclusion in decision-making arenas, in addition to representation and leadership in IDP governance.

While all key informants articulated participation as a guiding principle, their ability to operationalize it also varies widely. International and government agencies tend to institutionalize participation through coordination and consultation mechanisms. For example, UNHCR involves IDPs in data collection, validation, and advocacy supported by broader institutional structures that prioritize inter-agency coordination. UNOCHA and DOJ-RSPPU primarily emphasize planning and coordination among institutions to enable IDP participation in data processes. Similarly, internal displacement monitoring institutions like the IDMC promote participation through partnerships but acknowledges that it remains difficult to translate into practice.

MSSD formalized IDP involvement through local committees and para-social workers particularly in initiatives like the iPART system, supported by legislation that remains limited to the Bangsamoro Region. Key informants from government and UN agencies shared their hopes that the Bangsamoro IDP Law will serve as a pilot and a platform to build up national legislation for IDPs protection. Civil society organizations also demonstrate hands-on and community-centered approaches, directly interacting with IDPs. JRS Philippines' work to support IDPs in the formation of their own government-recognized associations and CFSI's recommendations to engage IDPs in the Marawi Compensation Board are just a few examples of institutions trying to ensure that IDPs are active participants rather than passive informants.

According to Ayo, IDP leaders and representatives have been able to engage directly with policy makers and government bodies, supporting data management initiatives in consultation with other displaced persons – though the scope of this participation is minimal at best. IDP participation is both practical and advocacy-oriented, seeking recognition in law and inclusion in policymaking processes. For IDPs and other institutional actors, there needs to be a concerted effort to expand

beyond localized successes and project-based interventions that lack continuity and are thus unreliable. In Ayo's words:

> "*It seems like meaningful participation is, for me, first of all, that the government pays attention to us [IDPs]. Second, the decisions, that we have dialogue and consultation that is truly with the community or those who understand the situation Although people are participating, the decisions they make don't really include the people who are most affected. [...] So there are grievances of the people that we really don't think the national government and local government have listened to. They just see how they can use funds, and that's what we see. There are consultations, but they are not getting what the people want. So what the people are asking for, meaningful participation, we have not fully achieved yet our desired balance where we can see whether the plans of government are good for us and what it means to us IDPs. Does it help us? Can this reach what they call a durable solution?*"

While participation is widely recognized as essential for legitimate and effective governance in and out of displacement, these discussions reveal that there are many aspects to its conceptualization and unevenness in operationalization across institutions. The variation in institutional logics and priorities results in gaps between participatory rhetoric and data justice in practice, especially as it is obstructed by the challenges covered in the previous sections. Facilitating the participation of IDPs is one thing, doing so in data processes and systems is another.

Chapter 6 – Discussion

The participation of internally displaced populations is, based on the findings, largely assumed as an institutional norm by the actors involved in the broad governance of internal displacement. However, there are significant distinctions between the areas in which participation is encouraged in data processes, and further, a gap between the normative frameworks, realized practices, and lived realities of IDPs. This chapter aims to unpack the perceptions of institutional actors in synthesis with the empirical and theoretical literature.

6.1. Adopting Participation as an Institutional Norm

Constructivist intuitionalism provides a framework to understand how norms become embedded and institutionalized (Hay, 2008), and through the findings of this research, it was clear how institutional actors appreciated the role of normative frameworks in displacement governance. Through the interviews, the key informants echoed Kalin's own sentiments, "*Like other current global challenges, internal displacement cannot be effectively addressed without norms and institutions that facilitate coherent and effective action on the ground*" (2023, pp.314). At the same time, the Philippine context reveals the dynamic and evolving nature of institutional responses to internal displacement. Crises such as the Marawi siege were the catalyst for new forms of collaboration between the government, international organizations and civil society actors, which in turn opened limited but meaningful spaces for IDP engagement in. These include activities identified by The Brookings Institution report (2008) as important for consultation

and participation, from humanitarian assistance to political processes, now gradually expanding to data processes. The Bangsamoro IDP law was passed during a critical transition period for the regional government, and the local ordinances being passed in multiple municipalities around the country to protect IDP rights are significant examples of how participation norms are being institutionalized. These changes reflect how institutional change occurs incrementally, and becomes more strongly embedded, through repetition (Lowndes & Roberts, 2013).

Globally, participation as a norm is heavily rooted in humanitarian and development discourse and is thus attached to humanitarian and development organizations who promote participation in accordance with the "logic of appropriateness" (March & Olsen, 1989). Within the realm of data, this is further supported by the development of policies and tools, such as the Secretary General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement (2022) and the JIPS Essential Toolkit on Community Engagement in Data Processes Canvas (2022). Currently, a few of the key informants are actively involved in advocating for national legislation on addressing internal displacement and protecting the rights of IDPs in the Philippines, including the right of IDPs to participation in decision-making and political processes, which extends to data processes as well.

Despite clear support, it is important to note that norms of participation are built into existing bureaucratic institutional structures, often without fundamentally altering their underlying rules or practices. Institutions incorporating participatory approaches for the sake of compliance or meeting international commitments keep IDP participation superficial. Efforts towards more meaningful participation also frequently see inertia or resistance as operational routines remain guided by technocratic imperatives and donor accountability.

6.2. Progressing Towards Participation in Data Justice

Using the angle of data justice as developed by GPAI (2022), the findings identify inequalities in who defines and controls displacement data, which are being addressed by institutional actors to varying degrees of success in the case of the Philippines. Given the dynamic nature of data innovation, the discourse developing alongside it, and the limited applications within internal displacement thus far, the data justice theory is robust in supporting decades-long conversations about meaningful participation and inclusion of IDPs. It further serves as a warning: because not all vulnerable communities are included or have within data processes, it is even more important to empower and build local capacities to mitigate risk of violations and harms to IDPs and their communities.

Examining the data life cycle reveals that participation is easier to facilitate in stages such as data collection and interpretation, but requires greater resources be expended in others. While the key informants are not wholly representative of the entire displacement regime in the Philippines, the institutional actors represented demonstrate practices that trend towards the middle to upper ranges of the Participation Spectrum across most stages (The Brookings Institute, 2008; JIPS, 2022). However, there are still areas where the lack of transparency and involvement in data processes undermines procedural justice and erodes trust in institutional actors. The conversation with IDP representative Ayo revealed that deeper engagement in data collection and interpretation is necessary,

and that institutions involved in displacement governance generally discount IDP participation in data storage and management processes due to the risk involved with handling highly sensitive data.

In the Philippines, the current administration's push towards the digitalization of all government services necessitates a quicker and more strategic response by institutional actors to ensure that data justice principles are protected. The GPAI (2022) framework placing participation as a pillar of data justice calls for the democratization of data, understanding relational views of data and data practices, challenging approaches that preserve unjust dominating hierarches, and ensuring transformational inclusiveness. To an extent, these have been institutionalized and demonstrated by civil society actors and regional government agencies, such as those within the Bangsamoro region through the Bangsamoro IDP Law (2024) and local ordinances. These enshrine participation by tapping members of the displaced community as social workers, data collectors, representatives to local councils, and decision makers informed by accurate and trustworthy data. This further provides capacity building opportunities to ensure they understand these processes and can participate meaningfully. However, it is important to recognize that these frameworks are still in their infancy, having only began implementation in the past few months. So, while there is an observed shift away from fragmented and project-based participatory initiatives towards more sustainable interventions grounded in normative frameworks, a lot of progress can still be made towards the fair distribution of resources and capacities for data processes among institutions, IDPs, and affected communities.

Chapter 7 – Conclusion

This research set out to examine how institutional norms of participation are conceptualized and operationalized in addressing data processes of IDPs by institutions in the Philippines. It aimed to understand participation in data processes through the broader framework of data justice, and to explore the institutional and policy contexts that enable or constrain meaningful engagement of internally displaced populations. The findings reveal that the collaborative displacement governance ecosystem in the Philippines, led by the government and increasingly including IDPs, collectively push for greater IDP engagement in general and in data processes. Though conceptual, operational, and political challenges in handling IDP data hinders IDP participation, enabled meaningful participation also presents an opportunity to improve program effectiveness and trust between the affected communities.

The results of this research demonstrate that achieving participation in internal displacement is tied to incremental institutional reform. There is growing awareness and appreciation of participation in data processes, as it contributes towards improving the accuracy and efficiency of interventions, as well as opportunities to redistribute power and give agency to the internally displaced. However, participatory approaches will remain limited or contested in some areas unless institutional actors can be pushed beyond compliance-driven inclusion towards genuine co-production and support towards IDP-led initiatives within data processes. Critical explorations of tokenism and asymmetric power relations between institutions and displaced populations need to be situated within

understandings of participation as a spectrum. Here Hay's (2008) constructive institutionalism suggests that transformation requires both structural and ideational change: revising formal mandates and data systems, in addition to shaping the shared understanding of what participation entails and whose knowledge counts. The practices shared by the key informants are important starting points that need to be scaled and sustained to achieve a transformative shift.

7.1. Reflections and Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings from this research pose several implications for both policy and practice, as issues relating to both internal displacement and data processes increase and intersect. Although it is too early to assess the potential outcomes of the Bangsamoro IDP Law, the sentiments expressed by key informants highlight the significance of institutionalizing a normative legal framework that designates a clear mandate, function, and budget for a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach to addressing internal displacement. Without institutional clarity and the support of government resources, displacement issues risk remaining in the peripheries of the policy agenda. Institutionalization through legislation or policy guidelines provides legitimacy and assurance that participation in data processes can be sustained past individual interventions or the goodwill of specific actors.

This research also emphasizes the importance of participation as a principle, more than just a procedure or checkbox (The Brookings Institution, 2008; GPAI, 2022). As presented by the literature on participation and through the findings of this research, meaningful IDP participation and community engagement contribute to more ethical and inclusive data processes, stronger trust between the affected populations and institutions. IDP participation in data processes and political processes will help shift the perception of IDPs relying on aid and interventions to people who are experiencing the troubles of being displaced from their homes, with their own abilities and rights, and agency they can exercise. Participation cannot answer all these challenges, but participation is a right, and it is necessary to ensure the dignity of people who are internally displaced.

Additionally, participation impacts the usability of displacement data, which not only needs to be comprehensive, but trusted, timely, and actionable. When IDPs are recognized and involved as owners of their data, institutions can benefit from insights situated in the context and lived realities of those they aim to assist. Data systems and processes therefore must be two-way: not only collecting data from but also returning value to communities before, during, and after displacement.

This research sought to understand how participation became a critical feature of internal displacement policy and situate it within the rapidly developing arenas of data and digitization. Linking constructivist institutionalism and data justice, this research illustrates that participation is a norm that is constructed and given meaning by institutional actors and their surrounding environments, further institutionalized by practice and repetition. Ultimately, participation is conceptually promoted and pushed at different areas of the participation spectrum operationally in relation to data justice and internal displacement. As one of the key informants asserted, partial participation is still better than

no participation, but it also must be carefully approached to ensure it doesn't reproduce risk or additional harm.

An underlying question that emerged through this research is whether institutionalized norms in formal frameworks can genuinely promote transformative participation and address the issue of internal displacement. The findings imply that institutionalization can create enabling conditions in convergence with critical policy windows, but transformative change depends on how actors interpret and practice these norms. But neither institutional norms nor solutions to internal displacement solely rely on these formal frameworks to answer problems arising from internal displacement. Given the theme of this research, it feels appropriate the refer to the words of the participating key informants.

Ayo illustrated IDP participation in more informal contexts, where the need for an IDP representative arose organically and was initiated by the affected communities. In evacuation centers or temporary shelters, "area presidents" are chosen from and by the members of the community, and their role is to keep track of women, children, persons with disabilities, and more; to respond to their needs, and coordinate with local or national government in addition to nonprofit and international organizations. He shared, "*Because it used to be disorganized when INGOs or national government came, there were too many people to talk to. So, we organized ourselves, spoke to our communities and fellow Filipinos and asked who we want [...] as our area president? Who do we want to be our representative?*"

The displacement expert from McGill University stated: "*Based on empirical work, people solve their own problems for the most part, through their own efforts at the level of their families, their communities, their networks. If you talk to a displaced person about how they managed the process of trying to find a solution [...] it's very rare that they will start by talking about what the UN did or what the government did. I think we lose track of what is most important in terms of actually enabling solutions, when we think about participation only in this kind of narrow and formal sense.*"

7.2. Directions for Future Research

As with any research, answered questions raise many more, and limitations present opportunities to direct other researchers interested in similar areas. The findings here reflect a specific set of institutional and expert perspectives, but there are more within the context of the Philippines that would have provided a more grounded understanding of how participatory approaches are experienced. Future research could build on this by incorporating participatory action research with IDPs. The involvement of DOJ-RSPPU, as an agency primarily focused on refugees and stateless persons would be valuable for research that intends to compare cross-border displacement to internal. Another limitation concerns the private sector, which is not a focus of this study but an increasingly significant actor in monitoring population movements and innovation in technology and data. Comparative case studies across Southeast Asia could also shed light on the differences in how national and regional institutions approach or institutionalize participatory norms. Additionally, research tracing emerging legal frameworks such as the Bangsamoro IDP Law shape participation in data processes over time could offer valuable insights into institutional change.

References

Akhter, S. (2022) 'Key Informants' Interviews', in Islam, M.R., Khan, N.A. and Baikady, R. (eds.) *Principles of Social Research Methodology* Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, pp. 389–403.

Alejandro Leal, P. (2007) 'Participation: the ascendancy of a buzzword in the neo-liberal era', *Development in practice,* 17(4-5), pp. 539–548 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469518. (Accessed: 2025).

Antonelli, F. (2016) 'Politics of numbers: sociological perspectives on official statistics', *International review of sociology,* 26(3), pp. 351–353 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2016.1244922. (Accessed: 2025).

Appler, F.K., Ebrahim, M.F., Iqbal, S.A., Meckelburg, A.B., Nezam, T., Pape, U.J., Petrini, B., Phipps-Ebeler, V., Sharma, A., Udo-Udo, J. and Woodhouse, A.F. (2019) *Using Micro-Data to Inform Durable Solutions for IDPs (Vol. 2 of 3) : Volume B : Country Case Studies.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Available at: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/968141557465726421 (Accessed: 2025).

Arnstein, S.R. (1969) 'A Ladder Of Citizen Participation', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners,* 35(4), pp. 216–224 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225. (Accessed: 2025).

Baal, N. (2021) *Critical gaps and key opportunities in forced displacement data.* Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/media/forced-displacement-data-critical-gaps-and-key-opportunities-context-global-compact-refugees (Accessed: 2025).

Baal, N. and Ronkainen, L. (2017) *Obtaining representative data on IDPs: challenges and recommendations.* UN Refugee Agency. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/media/obtaining-representative-data-idps-challenges-and-recommendations (Accessed: 2025).

Bangsamoro Transition Authority (2024) *BARMM approves bill to protect rights of IDPs | Bangsamoro Parliament.* Available at: https://parliament.bangsamoro.gov.ph/2024/09/27/barmm-approves-bill-to-protect-rights-of-idps/ (Accessed: 2025).

BARMM authorities, U., JIPS (2021) *Profiling of Internal Displacement in the Island Provinces of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (BARMM).* Available at: https://www.jips.org/jips-publication/profiling-of-internal-displacement-statelessness-basulta-sulu-tawitawi-barmm-philippines-2021/ (Accessed: 2025).

Bell, S. (2011) 'Do We Really Need a New 'Constructivist Institutionalism' to Explain Institutional Change?', *British Journal of Political Science,* 41(4), pp. 883–906 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123411000147. (Accessed: 2025).

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3(2), pp. 77–101 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa. (Accessed: 2025).

Cardona-Fox, G. (2020) 'The Politics of IDP Data', *Refugee survey quarterly,* 39(4), pp. 620–633 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdaa020. (Accessed: 2025).

Caterina, M. and Lizcano Rodríguez, A. (2020) 'The Question of Data in Internal Displacement Law-and-Policy-making', *Refugee survey quarterly,* 39(4), pp. 634–646 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdaa036. (Accessed: 2025).

Cayon, M. (2021) 'Bangsamoro government also eyes wider digitalization', *Business Mirror,* Available at: https://businessmirror.com.ph/2021/11/22/bangsamoro-government-also-eyes-wider-digitalization/ (Accessed: 2025).

Cazabat, C. and Yasukawa, L. (2021) *Unveiling the Cost of Internal Displacement: 2020 Report.* Geneva, Switzerland: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. Available at: https://www.internal-displacement.org/publications/unveiling-the-cost-of-internal-displacement-0/ (Accessed: 2025).

Center for Crisis, Conflict, and Humanitarian Protection (2024) *Report on the Human Rights Situation of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the Philippines.*

Center for Crisis, Conflict, and Humanitarian Protection (2023) *Report on the Human Rights Situation of Internally Displaced Communities affected by the 2017 Marawi City Crisis.* Quezon City: Available at:(Accessed: 2025).

Chambers, R. (1997) *Whose reality counts? : putting the first last* London (United Kingdom): Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd (ITP).

Declaration of State of Imminent Disaster Act (PH). Available at: https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2025/09/12/republic-act-no-12287/(Accessed: 2025).

Organic Law for the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (PH). Available at: https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2018/07/27/republic-act-no-11054/ (Accessed: 2025).

Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (PH). Available at: https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2010/05/27/republic-act-no-10121/ (Accessed: 2025).

Philippine Act on Crimes Against International Humanitarian Law, Genocide, and Other Crimes Against Humanity (PH). Available at: https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2009/12/11/republic-act-no-9851/ (Accessed: 2025).

The Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act of 1997 (PH). Available at: https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1997/10/29/republic-act-no-8371/ (Accessed: 2025).

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (2001) *Participation : the new tyranny?* London ; New York: Zed Books.

Dencik, L., Hintz, A., Redden, J. and Treré, E. (2025) 'Collectivity in data governance and data justice', *Information, communication & society,* 28(6), pp. 943–950 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2478096.

Dencik, L. and Sanchez-Monedero, J. (2022) 'Data justice', *Internet Policy Review,* 11(1) Available at: https://doi.org/10.14763/2022.1.1615 (Accessed: 2025).

Dharmaraj, S. (2025) *The Philippines: President Marcos Pushes for Full Digitalisation – OpenGov Asia.* Available at: https://archive.opengovasia.com/2025/05/20/the-philippines-president-marcos-pushes-for-full-digitalisation/

Diem, S., Good, M.W. and Walters, S.W. (2023) 'Toward Critical Approaches to Case Study Research'*Handbook of Critical Education Research.* 1st edn. Routledge, pp. 241–259.

Donnelly, C. and Dhingra, R. (2024) 'Making the 'new normal' of humanitarian funding work for displaced communities', *Financing displacement response* (74, 74), 85–89.

Expert Group on Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons Statistics (2020) 'International Recommendations on Internally displaced persons Statistics (IRIS)', , pp. 114 Available at: https://doi.org/10.2785/18809.

Farber, V. (2025) 'Aid as we know it is changing -- it's time to innovate humanitarian finance', *World Economic Forum,* Available at: https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/07/aid-as-we-know-it-is-changing-it-s-time-to-innovate-humanitarian-

finance/#:~:text=Nilus%20utilizes%20technology%20to%20reduce,efficiencies%20and%20keeping%20it%20afloat. (Accessed: 2025).

Global Compact on Refugees (2025) *Multi-stakeholder Pledge: Inclusion of Forcibly Displaced and Stateless Persons in National Statistical Systems and Surveys.* Available at: https://globalcompactrefugees.org/multi-stakeholder-pledge-inclusion-forcibly-displaced-and-stateless-persons-national-statistical?_gl=1%2As55d89%2A_rup_ga%2AMTAzMDgzNjQ1LjE3NDc2OTUxNjc.%2A_rup_ga_EVDQTJ4LMY%2AczE3NDgzODEyNjQkbzEwJGcxJHQxNzQ4MzgzNzc2JGo1NCRsMCRoMA.. (Accessed: Apr 10, 2025).

GP2.0 *Philippines - Disaster Displacement Data from Preparedness to Recovery.* Available at: https://gp2point0.org/practices-for-prevention-protection-and-solutions-for-idps/data-for-protection-prevention-solutions-evidence-based-policy-making-and-programming/ (Accessed: 2025).

GPAI (2022) *Advancing Data Justice Research and Practice: An Integrated Literature Review.* Available at:(Accessed: 2025).

Guest, G., Namey, E.E. and Mitchell, M.L. (2013) 'Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research', Available at: https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506374680. (Accessed: 2025).

Hay, C. (2008) 'Constructivist Institutionalism', in Binder, S.A., Rhodes, R.A.W. and Rockman, B.A. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* Oxford University Press.

Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (2004) *Participation, from Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development* Zed Books.

IDMC (2025a) *Country Profile - Philippines.* Available at: https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/philippines/ (Accessed: 2025).

IDMC (2025b) *Global Report on Internal Displacement 2025.* Geneva: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. Available at: https://www.internal-displacement.org/publications/2025-global-report-on-internal-displacement-grid/ (Accessed: Apr 5, 2025).

IDMC (2025c) *Sustaining an essential dataset: The global baseline on internal displacement.* Geneva: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. Available at: https://www.internal-displacement.org/policy-analysis/sustaining-an-essential-dataset-the-global-baseline-on-internal-displacement/ (Accessed: Apr 5, 2025).

International Indigenous Peoples Movement for Self Determination, and Liberation (2025) *Land, Water, Life: Resist the Flood of Injustice, Stop the Jalaur Mega Dam.* Available at: https://www.ipmsdl.org/campaign/land-water-life-resist-the-flood-of-injustice-stop-the-jalaur-mega-dam/ (Accessed: 2025).

JIPS (2025) *JIPS Essential Toolkit on Community Engagement in Data Processes Canvas.* Available at: https://jet.jips.org/ (Accessed: 2025).

JIPS (2024) *JIPS Strategy 2024-2030. Durable Solutions to Internal Displacement Begin With Jointly Agreed, Quality Evidence.*

JIPS (2023) *Participatory Data Processes to Benefit Displaced People.* Available at: https://www.jips.org/uploads/2023/08/JIPS-Philippines_BARMM_profiling-Evaluation_Brief-Aug2023.pdf

JIPS (2022) *Community Engagement in Data Processes in Displacement Contexts: Technical Brief with Key Considerations & Case Studies Based on JIPS' Country Support.*

Kälin, W. (2023) *Internal Displacement and the Law* Oxford University Press.

Kibuacha, F. (2024) *Key Informant Interviews: An In-Depth Guide for Researchers - GeoPoll.* Available at: https://www.geopoll.com/blog/key-informant-interviews/ (Accessed: 2025).

Lowndes, V. and Roberts, M. (2013) *Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism in Political Science* Palgrave Macmillan.

MapAction and UNOCHA *Map shows affected population by region* UNOCHA. Available at: https://www.unocha.org/publications/map/philippines/philippines-typhoon-haiyan-yolanda-affected-population-10-nov-2013-6am-utc-0800 (Accessed: 2025)

March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1989) *Rediscovering institutions: the organizational basis of politics* New York, N.Y., London: The Free Press; Collier MacMillan.

Masaki, T. and Madson, B. (2023) *Data Gaps in Microdata in the Context of Forced Displacement.* World Bank Group.

Mayan, M.J. (2023) *Essentials of Qualitative Inquiry.* 2nd edn. Routledge. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/b23331 (Accessed:2025)

Mennicken, A. and Salais, R. (2022) *The New Politics of Numbers : Utopia, Evidence and DemocracyExecutive Politics and Governance.* 1st edn. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) *Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2023-2028.*

NDCC (2007) *Institutionalization of the Cluster Approach in the Philippine Disaster Management System, Designation of Cluster Leads and their Terms of Reference at the National, Regional, and Provincial Level.*

Peters, B.G. (2019) *Institutional Theory in Political Science.* 4th ed. edn. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Peterson, J.S. (2019) 'Presenting a Qualitative Study: A Reviewer's Perspective', *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 63(3), pp. 147–158 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219844789. (Accessed: 2025).

Presidential Communications Office. (2025) 'Bangsamoro Transition Authority remains governing body in BARMM', Oct 30.

Presidential Communications Office. (2025) 'PBBM signs into law an act declaring a state of calamity before actual calamity strikes', Sep 18.

Scott, W.R. (2004) 'Institutional Theory: Contributing to a Theoretical Research Program'*Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 460–484.

Share (2020) *Share Network.* Available at: https://www.share-network.eu/articles-and-resources/toolkit1-IrIlw (Accessed: 2025).

Sherwood, A., Bradley, M., Rossi, L., Guiam, R. and Mellicker, B. (2015) *Resolving Post-disaster Displacement: Insights from the Philippines After Typhoon Haiyan.* The Brookings Institution. Available at: https://www.proquest.com/docview/1820816334 (Accessed: 2025).

Silverman, R.M. and Patterson, K.L. (2021) *Qualitative Research for Students and Professionals.* 2nd edn. Routledge. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003172925 (Accessed: 2025).

Soni, S. and del_ad_min (2020) *Data Stewardship – A Taxonomy – The Data Economy Lab.* Available at: https://thedataeconomylab.com/2020/06/24/data-stewardship-a-taxonomy/ (Accessed: 2025).

Special Committee on Marawi (2020) Map of destroyed areas in Marawi City. Available at: https://parliament.bangsamoro.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CR-No.-35-Special_Committee-on_Marawi.pdf (Accessed: 2025).

Stobierski, T. (2021) *8 Steps in the Data Life Cycle | HBS Online.* Available at: https://online.hbs.edu/blog/post/data-life-cycle (Accessed: 2025).

Taylor, L. (2017) 'What is data justice? The case for connecting digital rights and freedoms globally', *Big data & society,* 4(2), pp. 205395171773633 Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717736335. (Accessed: 2025).

The Brookings Institution (2008) *Moving Beyond Rhetoric: Consultation and Participation with Populations Displaced by Conflict or Natural Disasters.* The Brookings Institution. Available at: https://www.proquest.com/docview/1820786563 (Accessed: 2025).

Tran, M. and Bermudez, R. (2022) *Durable solutions for people displaced by Typhoon Haiyan in Tacloban, Philippines.* Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute. Available at:(Accessed: 2025).

UN Secretary General's High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement (2021) *Data Roundtable Summary - The Role of Data in Supporting State Commitment and Capacity on Internal Displacement.*

UNHCR (2025) *Strengthening the Participation of Internally Displaced Persons - Workshop Report.* United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/media/strengthening-participation-internally-displaced-persons-workshop-report (Accessed: May 18, 2025).

UNHCR (2024) *Focus Area Strategic Plan for Protection and Solutions for Internally Displaced People 2024-2030*, pp. 1–41.

UNHCR (2024) *UNHCR hails local and regional support for IDP bills | UNHCR Philippines.* Available at: https://www.unhcr.org/ph/news/unhcr-hails-local-and-regional-support-idp-bills (Accessed: 2025).

UNHCR Evaluation Office (2025) *Evaluation of the Protection and Solutions Programme for Internally Displaced Persons in Mindanao from 2014 to 2022.* Geneva, Switzerland: UNHCR.

United Nations Secretary General (2022) *Action Agenda on Internal Displacement* United Nations Office of the Special Adviser to Internal Displacement.

United Nations, &. and Representative of the Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons (1998) *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* New York: United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

United Nations and Chief Executives Board for Coordination (2025) *Report of the High-level Committee on Programmes at its forty-eighth session - United Nations system-wide approach to internal displacement.* Available at: https://unsceb.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/CEB_2024_6_Add1_UN%20system-wide%20approach%20to%20internal%20displacement.pdf (Accessed: 2025).

University of Wisconsin-Madison (2022) *Introduction to the Data Lifecycle.* Available at: https://data.wisc.edu/data-literacy/lifecycle/ (Accessed: 2025).

UNOCHA (2025) *Mindanao Displacement Dashboards.* Available at: https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/philippines/philippines-mindanao-displacement-snapshot-19-may-2025 (Accessed: 2025).

Voda, A.I., Bortos, S. and Soitu, D.T. (2023) 'Knowledge Ecosystem: A Sustainable Theoretical Approach', *European journal of sustainable development,* 12(2), pp. 47–66 Available at: https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2023.v12n2p47. (Accessed: 2025).

Yonetani, M. and Yuen, L. (2014) *The evolving picture of displacement in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan- An Evidence-based Overview.* IDMC, IOM, DSWD, SAS. Available at: https://commons.datacite.org/doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.11573.78563 (Accessed: 2025).

Appendix A: Interview Guideline

Data for the Displaced
Semi-Structured Interview Guideline for Key Informants

Prior to the Interview: Brief introduction to the researcher and research project, request verbal consent for the conduct, use, transcribing, and recording of the interview.

Themes & *Initial Codes*	Main Questions	Probing Questions
Background and Role	Can you describe your role in your organization and how it relates to internal displacement data?	• Personal identification • Professional background • Background of organization, programs associated with internal displacement and data processes
Participation and Collaboration	What does 'participation' mean in the context of your work? Does your organization explicitly support/apply participatory approaches?	• Can you describe any projects where IDPs/affected communities were involved? • What stages of the data life cycle involve displaced populations, if at all? • How were these [participatory approaches] introduced? • Who are the main partners your organization collaborates with in IDP data processes? What roles do they play? • Are there gaps or misalignments between the data priorities of affected communities and institutional partners? How do you mediate between these?
Participation and Data Processes in Practice	What kind of tools, methodologies, or platforms are used to facilitate partnership and collaboration across different levels and actors? What challenges arise in using participatory approaches?	• Are there specific types of data or data processes that directly involve IDPs, or would create risks to IDPs if they were involved? • Have you seen any shifts toward more inclusive and participatory data practices? If yes, when and what do you think enabled this? • What, if any, are the established frameworks or protocols guiding your organization's participatory approaches? • How are IDPs involved in data processes at different levels (national, regional, municipal)? • What barriers exist and what are the risks to including IDPs in data processes? • What type of participatory approaches have worked the best in your context

		and why? Were there any benefits to using these?
Politics, Policy, and Power	How are decisions made about what displacement data is collected, by whom, and for what purpose? Have there been tensions or resistance between institutions or governments around who owns or controls IDP data?	• Have you faced resistance from institutional partners (governments, donors, etc.) in implementing participatory approaches? • How do you see participatory approaches in promoting meaningful IDP involvement and empowerment? • How do you think participation should be approached, considering risks of tokenism or extractive participation in displacement contexts?
Impact, Change, and Future Developments	In your experience, how does the participation/inclusion of displaced populations affect the usability of the data? What impact (if any) has increased participation had on the visibility and governance of internal displacement? Do you think more meaningful participation of IDPs in data processes should be pursued? If yes, what would enable this?	• Do you think participatory approaches in data processes contributes to addressing displacement-related issues? • How has your institution approached participation changed over time, and what triggered these changes? • How do you assess the trend of participatory approaches to data in displacement contexts? • Have participatory approaches led to visible changes in humanitarian response or advocacy for internally displaced people? • In what ways could participatory data processes alter power relations in governing internal displacement?

Post-Interview: Inform the participants of the next steps in the research process. Ask if there are any clarifications, concerns, recommendations or referrals. Ask whether they would like to be updated upon completion of the research. Re-confirm their consent to use their responses and their preference regarding anonymization/pseudonymization.

Appendix B: Consent Form

Information and Consent Form
IDP Participation and Data Governance

You are invited to participate in an online interview as part of the Research Paper being prepared by Gabrielle Tañada, as part of the thesis requirement of the Masters' program at the International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam (ISS-EUR). The research aims to answer the question: How are participatory methods viewed and used by displacement monitoring institutions in addressing data gaps of internally displaced persons (IDPs)? The research will focus on the process of gathering and managing IDP data and how involved IDPs are in that process towards durable solutions.

At ISS-EUR, we conduct scientific research. This is to learn, help people, and contribute to society. Since this is an academic institution conducting scientific research, your data will be processed exclusively for research based on public interest.

You decide whether to participate
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can stop at any time and would not need to provide any explanation. You are not expected to answer any questions that you are not comfortable with. All information will be made anonymous and confidential.

What are the potential risks and discomforts?
There are no anticipated risks or discomforts while participating in this study.

What data will I ask you to provide?
During the interview, the following personal data will be collected from you and processed: name, age, organizational affiliations, professional background, opinions on displacement governance and policy, political affiliations as it relates to the previous, and contact details. I will store your data so that I can be in contact with you and send the results of the study to you, once it is complete.

It will be helpful to take audio-record of the interview and obtain digital screenshots without personal details for analysis. But if you feel uncomfortable about taking recordings or pictures, I will shut off the equipment and take notes by hand instead.

Who can see your data?
- All your data will be stored securely.
- Only persons involved in the research can see the data. This includes me and my thesis supervisor.
- Recordings are transcribed. Your name will be replaced with a number/made-up name.
- Data such as your name, contact details and recordings will be stored separately from your answers/the transcription.
- Your specific answers may be in the published Research Paper, but your name will be replaced or excluded and not identifiable to you personally.
- The results of the study which will be published online in the ISS Repository of MA Research Papers. The results will be accessible by anyone.

How long will your personal data be stored?
Your data will be retained for a minimum of 10 years, in accordance with the ethics process of Erasmus University Rotterdam. The data will be retained so that other researchers have the opportunity to verify that the research was conducted correctly.

Using your data for new research
The data collected may be useful in pseudonymised form, for example for educational purposes and future research, including in very different research areas. Therefore, in the consent form you are asked to provide permission to use your data, excluding name, email address and other contact details for follow-up or other scientific research.
What happens with the results of the study?

Each participant will receive a summary of the results by email and the results will be published online, in the ISS Repository of MA Research Papers on the [ISS website](#).

Do you have questions about the study?
If you have any questions about the study or your privacy rights, such as accessing, changing, deleting, or updating your data, please contact me.

Name: Gabrielle Tañada
Phone number: +31 616 05 7826 | +63 998 973 4812
Email: 707326jt@eur.nl

Do you regret your participation?
You may regret your participation. Even after participating, you can still stop. Please indicate this by contacting me and I will delete your data. Sometimes your data is necessary to retain so that, for example, the integrity of the study can be checked.

Ethics approval
This research has been reviewed and approved by the thesis supervisor at ISS-EUR to ensure that research participants are protected. You can send an email to 707326jt@eur.nl to request a copy of the results of this study or any questions about the study or your privacy rights, such as accessing, changing, deleting, or updating your data.

Do you have a complaint or concerns about your privacy? Please email the Data Protection Officer (fg@eur.nl) or visit www.autoriteitpersoonsgegevens.nl. (T: 088 - 1805250).

Declaration of Consent

I have read the information letter. I understand what the study is about and what data will be collected from me. I was able to ask questions as well. My questions were adequately answered. I know that I am allowed to stop at any time. By signing this form, I

1.　　　consent to participate in this research;
2.　　　consent to the use of my personal data;
3.　　　confirm that I am at least 18 years old;
4.　　　understand that participating in this research is completely voluntary and that I can stop at any time; and
5.　　　understand that my data will be anonymised for publication, educational purposes and further research.

Check the boxes below if you consent to this.

Data
I consent to the researcher's collection, use and retention of the following data: name, age, organizational affiliations, professional background, opinions on displacement governance and policy, contact details ☐

Audio recording
I consent to the interview being audio recorded. ☐

Visual and screenshot recording
I consent to the interview being filmed and to consent to screenshots being taken without personal details. ☐

Sharing of data
I consent to the sharing of my data with Erasmus University Rotterdam in the Netherlands. ☐

My answers in the article
I give permission for my answers to be used in papers, such as an article in a journal or book. My name will not be included. ☐

My answers in the article with my name
I give permission for my name to be used with my answers in an article. ☐

Use for educational purposes and further research
I hereby consent to having my personal data, namely my name and contact details stored and used for educational purposes and for future research, also in other areas of research than this research. ☐

New research
I give permission to be contacted again for new research. ☐

Name of participant:

Participant's signature:　　　　　　　　　　　　**Date:**

You will receive a copy of the complete information and consent form.
The results will be published in the ISS Repository of MA Research Papers on the ISS website.

Appendix C: Overview of Themes, Categories, and Codes

Themes	Categories	Codes
Participation and Collaboration among Institutions	Extent of Participation	- Information transfer - Consultation - Collaboration - Decision-making/Representation - Owned/Led
	Empowerment and Capacity Building	- Technical capabilities - Data validation workshops
	Inter-agency/Multi-level Coordination	- International - National - Regional - Local - Government - International - Civil Society - Community
Participation and Data Processes in Practice	Challenges & Barriers	- Conceptual (definition, understanding) - Operational (resource, logistics) - Political* - Risks and harms
	Data Quality	- Accuracy - Accessibility - Usability - Timeliness - Privacy and security - Inconsistencies/Falsifications
	Data Processes	- Data generation - Data collection & processing - Data storage & management - Data analysis, visualization, & interpretation - Reporting and communication - Feedback and grievance mechanisms - Digitalization
Politics and Power Dynamics	Political Challenges*	- Changing administrations/Turnover - Shifting political agendas - Scope of mandate - Politicization of aid - Path-dependency, continuity

	Relationship between Actors	• Trust building • Expectation of support • Responsibility and accountability
	Perception	• Stigma, Discrimination • Awareness of Displacement Issues • Advocacy
Context of Displacement	Causes of Displacement	• Disaster-induced • Conflict-induced • Development-induced • Overlapping causes
	Nature of Displacement	• Protracted • Recurring • Camp/Shelter • Rental
	Other Embedded/Overlapping Concerns and Vulnerabilities	• Age • Gender • Disability • Religion • Culture • Trauma and sensitivity
Response to Internal Displacement	Immediate Interventions	• Government/Humanitarian Services • Aid provision • Project planning • Project implementation • Project evaluation
	Long-Term Planning	• Normative frameworks and legislation • International frameworks and commitments • Durable solutions • Addressing root causes of displacement • Proactive/Anticipatory action • Rights-based approaches • Informal means and solutions