



IOM International Organization for Migration
OIM Organisation Internationale pour les Migrations
OIM Organización Internacional para las Migraciones

2009/2010 MONGOLIA DZUD:

**DISPLACED RURAL HERDER COMMUNITIES
RESPONSE ASSESSMENT AND INTENTIONS SURVEY
(RAIS)**

**FUNDED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION
(IOM)**

AUGUST 2010

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Glossary of Terms	
Executive Summary	
Recommendations for responses	
The Mongolian Migration Context	3
Dzud Affected Community Response Assessment and Intentions Survey (RAIS).....	11
Analysis of Data from the RAIS	12
1. Impact of Dzud and Migrations	12
2. Perceived alternatives	17
3. Humanitarian Response	18
4. Movement of Populations and Intentions	21
5. Access to Information.....	22
6. Summary of Data Analysis	23
Annex 1 Areas and number of family surveyed	25
Annex 2 Access DB Front Page	26
Annex 3 Questionnaire.....	27
Annex 4 Map	32

Glossary of Terms

Aimags (Province)

Dzud

General Authority for State and Registration (GASR)

Government of Mongolia (GoM)

Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MOLSW)

Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA)

Mongolian Immigration Agency (MIA)

Mongolian *tögrög* or *tugrik* (MNT)

Soum (Village centers),

United States (US)

United States Dollar (USD)

Executive Summary

Situational analysis: The assessment found that on average the Mongolian herders lost 53% of their herd due to the Dzud. The assessment also identified certain geographical areas which were most affected, this includes the Aimags of Bavan Olgii, Govi-Altai and Hovd all respectively losing approx. 66-67% of the herds in total. Associated with this, the largest movements of rural householders interviewed were from the Aimag of Bayanhongor. Livestock sales in rural areas as a means of coping with the Dzud were also limited with only a small fraction of herders selling animals (74 out of 534).

Rural herders incurred large amounts of debt due to the Dzud; The assessment established that large numbers of herders have fallen into debt as a result of the impact of the Dzud on their herds. Over one-third of those interviewed had gone into debt as a result of the Dzud, and 58% of these households stated that they are unable to repay these debts. Should the Dzud become a repeated phenomenon, which is thought possible, herder families may not be able to respond to their own needs (through selling livestock) as they were in 2009-2010. Escalating debt from future Dzuds still may catalyze migration to urban or mining areas should other mechanisms of reliance or assistance not exist.

No large numbers of newly displaced populations were found in urban centres; Despite the widespread perception of ‘tens of thousands of displaced rural migrants’ in Ulaanbaatar, based on the data, there is strong indication that the herders have not migrated in mass numbers to urban areas. From field observation, it appears that those who have been affected and have migrated to the capital have scattered throughout Ulaanbaatar, settling on family plots primarily inside areas of the ger district. Of those rural herders surveyed who were contemplating migrating to urban areas, most state that they have family within the urban centre - half of these are planning to migrate to an area where they have close relatives. This confirms assumptions that family within the capital is one strong influencing factor for movement.

Existing communities of displaced populations from previous Dzuds; The assessment also found a large number of displaced populations from previous disasters. Whilst assistance to communities affected by the Dzuds should still be predominantly targeted in the rural areas most affected it should be noted that historically migration to urban areas is/has been considered a survival option for rural communities. Furthermore, there should be better planning to deal with anticipated future influxes of rural migrants as evidence has shown that once in the city these communities lack adequate services, live in poverty, and that there are no long-term integration policies in place.

Integration of migrants in urban centres hampered by lack of registration: The assessment found that in Ulaanbaatar, most migrants do not register – which precludes them from accessing social services and assistance. All citizens of Mongolia hold registration cards linked to their place of residency – most are issued at the place of birth. Theoretically, migrants should register any permanent relocation, which involves obtaining the correct paperwork at the place of origin to de-register and re-registering with the Civil Authority within the place of relocation. This then allows the migrants to access local services. The price of registration is unclear, and some have stated it can be up to 60 to 70 USD. The process is similarly confusing for migrants and local authorities alike and the obstacles to registration in urban areas are not fully understood.

Restocking is the preferred option by rural communities but is discouraged by government: The assessment found that restocking remains a preferred option and obvious mechanism by herders to recover livelihoods, as 61% of answers pointed restock as the preference for assistance

(first or second alternative). The GoM has stated their intention to increase assistance to those rural populations who chose not to migrate, by promoting alternative livelihoods as aligned with Government Resolution #67. This is seen as an alternative to restocking and also as a disaster mitigation strategy. The reasoning was that livestock restocking, although preferred by the majority of rural residents, was considered a short-term response which contributed to further desertification.

Need for long-term planning to address situation of rural herders: As the pattern of rural-to-urban migration is likely to continue, the primary concern is also with providing assistance to the herders already residing in urban areas who have chosen to make the transition from nomadic to city lifestyles and livelihoods. For those that stream towards mining areas, a hazardous life awaits as some herders are reportedly co-opted into ‘ninja’ mining operations that are not only extremely dangerous, but also threatening to their environments. Additionally, there is the ongoing concern about the potential impact that climate change may have on the rural herders.

Recommendations (see also Annex 1):

- 1. Improved skills training in alternative livelihoods for rural populations (aligned with Government Resolution #67) to reduce an over-reliance on farming which has contributed to environmental degradation;**
- 2. Consider a micro-credit scheme for those rural migrants living in poverty in urban areas;**
- 3. Dissemination of Dzud-Preparedness and Resilience Practices for Vulnerable Herders;**
- 4. Development of a comprehensive migration management (policy, information, and assessment) approach for the herders;**
- 5. Step-up civil registration drives in the city including subsidized rates for displaced populations. Combine this with comprehensive mapping of newly arrived migrant communities which will act as a base-line survey if further displacement occurs;**
- 6. Review of existing disaster coordination mechanisms, such as CCMM cluster approach, and ways to strengthen the existing system so as to provide quick, flexible, and targeted disaster response;**
- 7. Support NEMA to monitor displacement, analyze and prioritize actions to respond to natural disasters;**
- 8. Possible return mechanisms to formally rural residents now living in poverty on the periphery of urban centres;**
- 9. Feasibility Assessment of Government-identified Resettlement Areas (Ulaanbaatar Proximity sites) for Dzud-affected Populations and Rural-Urban Migrants;**
- 10. Advocacy for sustainable, equitable and effective Urban Development Policies and their implementation amongst Government, Financial institutions and Construction Sector.**

IOM's Recommendations for responses

The results of the assessment were presented to NEMA in October 2010. The following recommendations have been discussed in detail with the Mongolian authorities.

- 1. Improved skills training in alternative livelihoods for rural populations (aligned with Government Resolution #67) to reduce an over-reliance of farming which has contributed to environmental degradation;**

Technical and Vocational Training for Ex-herder Migrants and Capacity Building in Household Green Technologies and Sustainable Livelihoods: The provision of alternative livelihoods, cash-for work, and water and sanitation will be among the primary needs for the rural communities most affected by the Dzud. While Ulaanbaatar has not yet seen a large number of migrants migrate to the capital as a result of the Dzud, most people expect that the 8,000 families that lost all assets during the Dzud may seek refuge in Ulaanbaatar or mining areas for the next winter. These families could be prioritized as the first recipients of any such vocational training.

- 2. Consider a micro-credit scheme for those rural migrants living in poverty in urban areas;**

Micro-credit schemes to assist integration of rural herders into urban areas: Migrant influxes into urban areas are usually characterized by arriving with little income and likely to move to areas with poor social service provision. Very few of the migrants will have the proper registration cards for these areas, and will therefore be prevented from accessing social services. Within these urbanizing areas, programming should seek to assist the ex-herder migrant populations to transition to more sustainable livelihoods and lifestyles, promote social cohesion with migrant receiving areas, and mitigate against the environmental hazards of the current population influxes and behavioral practices in general. Micro-credit schemes and small business creation is one option to contribute to the greater integration of rural migrants.

- 3. Dissemination of Dzud-Preparedness and Resilience Practices for Vulnerable Herders:**

Dissemination of Dzud preparedness strategies to at-risk rural communities: A current gap in preparedness lies with the provision of information to herders who are vulnerable during the winter season. Agencies report that few have reliable sources of information, including a lack of operational radios. In addition to information on weather patterns, herders also do not have access to information on the coping strategies or assistance available to them during the harsh winters. Furthermore, many are not familiar with modern veterinary practices that can help them better sustain their livestock over these critical months. Efforts to provide consistent and reliable information to herders, many of whom are illiterate, can have a significant impact on their resilience and economic survival over the long-term.

- 4. Development of a comprehensive migration management (policy, information, and assessment) approach for the herders:**

Develop a comprehensive migration management approach to address the situation of the herders: This approach would include development of appropriate policy, information management systems to monitor and assess the situation. This information would be used to better inform decision-making, combined with operational measure to allow herders to maintain their life-style in a sustainable manner. It would also be used to support the most vulnerable ones in situ as well

as in the areas of destination for those who have moved to other rural areas or to urban centers, including support to host communities.

5. Step-up civil registration drives in the city including subsidized rates for displaced populations. Combine this with comprehensive mapping of newly arrived migrant communities which will act as a base-line survey if further displacement occurs

Increased Local Capacity and Life-Saving Support to Absorb Dzud-Affected Migrants in urban centers and mining areas: Interventions should focus on assisting local governments to help migrants access social services, to support the integration of migrants in urban areas by providing opportunities for the migrant population to sustain their families over the harsh winter months, and to raise the awareness of newly arrived migrants to the challenges and opportunities that are inherent to urban lifestyles. Local government currently have no mapping on the geographic distribution of displaced populations through Ulaanbaatar, nor have launched out-reach campaigns amongst these newly arrived migrants to encourage their registration to allow for a more comprehensive allocation of social services.

6. Review of existing disaster coordination mechanisms, such as CCMM cluster approach, and ways to strengthen the existing system so as to provide quick, flexible, and targeted disaster response

Disaster Risk Management and Preparedness Review and Capacity Building: The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) is responsible for developing disaster risk reduction strategies and coordinating assistance to natural and man-made disasters within Mongolia. NEMA has branches throughout the country. That said, its capacity is weak to implement outside of Ulaanbaatar. Furthermore, the necessary information management systems do not appear to be in place to analyze collected data and identify priorities from data analysis. A comprehensive review is needed to identify areas for future capacity building of NEMA and its partners so as to strengthen Mongolia's disaster management system to provide quick, flexible, and targeted disaster response.

7. Support NEMA to monitor displacement, analyze and prioritize actions to respond to natural disasters

Develop population tracking systems within NEMA: The Dzud and the expected decrease of pasture carrying capacity will continue to push people to abandon traditional patterns of seasonal migration and seek other patterns that better accommodate their coping strategies. In this process, families will split and attempt to gain income from several different sources – such as both herding and illegal mining for example. To identify the most vulnerable populations to climate change, environmental degradation, and natural disasters such as the Dzud – the examination of social networks and safety nets must be included within a migration patterns study, as well as tools developed for the mapping of population movements. Without such population tracking, it will become increasingly difficult to pinpoint the more permanent locations of people for the provision of longer-term support. Without a complete picture, humanitarian and development agencies will continue to provide assistance to pockets of affected areas, without fully understanding the migration intentions of herders to remain in those areas.

8. Possible return mechanisms to formally rural residents now living in poverty on the periphery of urban centres.

Return or Resettlement of Dzud-Affected Migrants: While not well investigated, there is anecdotal evidence that some Dzud-affected migrants to Ulaanbaatar would like to return to their herding livelihoods in rural areas, but lack the sufficient means to do so. Capacity building on

alternative livelihood as way to support return or relocation of Dzud-Affected Migrants from urban centers and mining areas to rural areas is therefore one potential option.

9. Feasibility Assessment of Government-identified Resettlement Areas (Ulaanbaatar Proximity sites) for Dzud-affected Populations and Rural-Urban Migrants

Long-term planning for further urban resettlement areas: The Government has identified potential areas of resettlement for rural migrants should the trend continue to increase over the next several years. These areas are rumored to be in the periphery of Ulaanbaatar, some are approximately 25 kilometers from the city. An assessment of these areas should be conducted to determine their viability in terms of basic infrastructure, transportation, and livelihoods.

10. Advocacy for sustainable, equitable and effective Urban Development Policies and their implementation amongst Government, Financial institutions and Construction Sector

Development of policies to better manage the implications of future increasing urbanization: The Government of Mongolia is actively seeking to better manage its urbanization process. The efforts are primarily aimed at decongesting and de-polluting the urban centers, though some focus is also given to the need to prevent a build up of slums in the peri-urban areas. Ulaanbaatar is a poorly planned city for the escalating population of which confronts it today. Slums and overpopulation are also concerns of other urban centers within the mining districts, with similar concerns over access to basic services, environmental health, and jobs and livelihoods. There appears to be little coordination amongst Government ministries to discuss, evaluate, and tackle urbanization problems from a migration standpoint.

The Mongolian Migration Context

Mongolia is classified as a lower middle income country that has been steadily improving its free market economy and democratic institutions within the last 20 years. Despite its modernizing society and economy, the country still retains strong characteristics of its ancient nomadic lifestyle with a population of more than 800,000 herders amongst the country's 2 million people. Politically speaking, the country has preserved a highly organized government bureaucracy from its recent socialist past. Government policymaking, planning, and statistic gathering is a stronger asset than its capacity for data-analysis, prioritization of beneficiaries, and implementation. Currently, economic development, environmental sustainability, urbanization, poverty and social service provision are some of the core focuses of the Mongolian Government.

Internal migration patterns of the past twenty years critically influence and impact each of these priority areas listed above. The loss of jobs in the 1990s after the fall of the socialist system caused many poor city dwellers to relocate or return to the countryside – drawn by the potential profits of goat herding within the cashmere industry. This group of 'newer' herders is seen to be inexperienced and least able to weather the impact of Dzuds. Currently, there is an increase in urban areas population, where reportedly many former herder families migrate to the urban centre or to mining areas, where livelihood opportunities are more abundant. The current grazing land carrying capacity is decreasing as a result of poor land management, overgrazing, and as a probable consequence of environmental change. Today's estimates indicate approximately 40 million livestock within the country, number which had been capped under socialist system to 25 million.

This trend will likely continue to push herders, especially the poorer and less resilient herders away from rural areas towards alternative livelihoods. That may be sought in either Soum (village) centers, Aymag (provincial) centers, mining areas, or Ulaanbaatar. None of these areas are prepared for the service provision and employment needs of a growing population and herder's perception of alternative livelihood are limited. At present, the intentions and options available to those affected by current socio-economic conditions, environmental degradation, climate change and the Dzud phenomenon, are unclear. Without such information, it becomes more difficult for the Government and its humanitarian and development partners to efficiently allocate resources to areas in greatest need.

The primary concern with rural-urban migration is the need to support herders to make the delicate and essential transition from nomadic to city lifestyles and livelihoods. For those that stream towards mining areas, a hazardous life awaits. Herders are reportedly co-opted into 'ninja' mining operations that are not only extremely dangerous, but also threatening to their environments. Such operations have led to mercury and cyanide contamination of the local drinking water supply. Labor and sex trafficking or exploitation, and other forms of abuse of male and female workers and children are known to take place. Additionally, there is tangible friction between mining companies, government and 'ninja' miners. Some efforts have taken place to hold dialogues amongst government officials and the mining migrants in these areas. Comprehensive and holistic support to these ex-herder migrant communities – inclusive of protection of their rights, access to basic services, and political representation – is currently lacking. Influxes of dzud-affected migrants have the potential to augment these socio-economic issues. Erdenet, Sukhbaatar, and Darkhan are some of the key growing cities in the mining areas.

The herding lifestyle is closely linked with Mongolian National identity, causing many of the herders to prefer to stay near their pasturelands – especially those that are more experienced and more resilient to the harsh winters. Some veterinary and agriculture programmes are in place to

assist them with better herding practices, pasture conservation, and livestock management (breeding and handling). These veterinary and agriculture programmes claim that with a 3-5 year project lifespan, herders are increasingly less likely to lose livestock over the winter. Such programmes appear to be focused in remote areas, and not extended throughout the country.

Ulaanbaatar (UB) is seen as the last destination of migration by destitute herders. Of the nine districts of the capital, only the districts of Songinokhairkhan and Bayanzurkh have available land remaining to construct plots. Each Mongolian is said to be entitled to 700 square meters of land. Despite this right, most migrants to the capital set up their gers (yurt) in unoccupied areas and do not officially register their plots. One of the most probable reasons for the little evidence of exacerbated migration towards UB is that displaced will have not congregated in obvious areas or camp-like settings within these two districts, as was expected. Instead, many appear to be residing with host families (As a result from assessment IOM found out that 57% of interviewees have direct families in an Aimag center). Many families within Ulaanbaatar in the 'ger district' have plots of land that can easily accommodate 3-4 gers. Spread around the city, it is difficult to track the recent in-migration amongst a population of 1.2 million people. After several interviews with Khoroo governors and anecdotal evidence there is a concern that receiving communities, while not seen to be expressly hostile to the incoming population, are wary of the strain on livelihoods and social services that are brought by the population increase, as well as the extreme pollution burden that such migration will inevitably be enhanced in the city.

The primary challenges for Dzud-affected migrants, and rural-urban migrants in general, is the lack of basic social services and livelihood opportunities in the urban centers. Given that migrants arrive to the city with a ger, shelter is not seen as a significant concern. The issue of registration, however, is a significant challenge to the integration of migrants into urban centers. All citizens of Mongolia hold registration cards linked to their place of residency – most are issued at the place of birth. Theoretically, migrants should register any permanent relocation, which involves obtaining the correct paperwork at the place of origin to de-register and re-registering with the Civil Authority within the place of relocation. In Ulaanbaatar, most migrants do not register – which precludes them from accessing social services and assistance. The price of registration is unclear, and some have stated it can be up to 60 to 70 USD. The process is similarly confusing for migrants and local authorities alike and the obstacles to registration in urban areas are not fully understood.

Host families play a role in supporting families upon their arrival. There is a lack of information on the migration dynamics of families from rural areas to the urban centre. It appears that families often split – keeping some members within the rural areas to maintain pasture claims and livestock. There has been little research on the role of remittances by Diaspora communities in aiding the incomes or investment opportunities of urban families. Additionally, little is known as to the extent and productive use of remittances sent from urban families to their relatives in rural areas.

Dzud Affected Community Response Assessment and Intentions Survey (RAIS)

Methodology

IOM together with its partners the Mongolian Women's Lawyer Association (MWLA) implemented an assessment of 534 Households in the Aymags of Arhangai, Bayanhongor, Bayan-Olgii, Bulgan, Govi-Altai and Hovd.

The RAIS covered criteria related to the following topics:

1. Dzud impact and Migrations
2. Humanitarian assistance
3. Economic capacity and perceived coping mechanisms
4. Migration intentions
5. Access to information.

Locations were chosen based on two criteria:

1. Government of Mongolia Recommendation (Ministry of Agriculture) for the soums in Bayan-Olgii, Govi-Altai and Hovd as this are remote regions where needs might be less assessed;
2. Soums where more than 15% of herder families had lost all herd¹.

Locations Assessed:

Please see Annex 2

Criteria of assessed families:

2% of randomly chose families in areas comprised under criteria 1 and 2

Tools used:

IOM used readily available tools that were developed locally in Mongolia and in Manila with the help of the MAU team. IOM developed an MS Access DB and Questionnaire that could easily be carried to the field and implemented quickly and widely.

Front Page of the DB Annex 3

Questionnaire Annex 4

¹ According to data from Ministry of social Welfare.

Analysis of Data from the RAIS

	Total	
Number of interviews	534	
Number of Male Head of Household interviewed	427	
Number of Female Head of Household interviewed	104	
Households interviewed (gender not specified)	3	
Average age of HH(years)	43	
Maximum Age HH	83	
average family size	4.3	
Maximum family size	9.0	
Household composition	F	M
Total	748	981
0 - 5	85	86
6 - 18	391	325
19 - 60	261	538
60 >	11	32

1. Impact of Dzud and Migrations

In this section is analyzed the impact dzud had on herders and capacity to cope with the dzud. There are the following points to note:

- On Average Herders lost 53% of their herd (Table 1)
- Livestock sales limited - Only a small fraction of herders have sold animals (74 out of 534)
- In is possible to see that herders who sold lost where less affected (on average lost 40% against the 53% average lost for all herders)
- A significant amount of families hold debt (37%) with 60% of those perceiving that are unable to repay – these herders also lost on average 64% of Herd (against 53% average loss herd)
- The amount of debt that is perceived not to be possible to pay is almost 70% of total amount of debt (230 out of 338 million MNT)
- From

Table 3 there is no direct correlation between the severity of dzud impact and the migrations of persons.

- The most affected Aymag's by the Dzud were Bavan Olgii, Govi-Altai and Hovd all respectively losing approx. 66-67% of the herds in total.
- Largest movements of HH was from the Aimag of Bayanhongor of those interviewed

Table 1- Herds data

	Statistic	Goats	Sheep	Horses	Cattle	Camels	Total
Herd size last year	Total Herders with animals	497	468	413	396	58	508
	Total heads	56023	56351	7919	8660	499	129452
	Median Herd	80	53	8	8	0	167
	Average Herd	106	106	15	16	1	242
	Std Deviation	97	169	21	21	6	255
	Skew	2	6	3	2	13	3
Herd size this year	Total Herders with animals	467	433	355	344	50	489
	Total heads	27486	29208	4689	4617	357	66357
	Median Herd	30	20	3	3	0	65
	Average Herd	52	55	9	9	1	124
	Std Deviation	66	120	16	14	4	176
	Skew	3	8	4	3	10	4
Animal losses	Total Herders with animals	482	452	331	348	35	500
	Total heads lost	28282	24930	3456	4195	132	60995
	Median lost	39	27	2	3	0	82
	Average lost	53	47	7	8	0	114
	Std Deviation	58	65	12	12	2	121
	Skew	3	3	4	3	13	3
	Average percentages lost	53%	52%	47%	53%	33%	53%
Animals Sold	Total Herders who sold animals	47	54	21	32	1	74
	Total heads sold	1195	1361	73	181	20	2818
	Std Deviation	13	16	1	2	1	25
	Skew	9	10	13	11	23	7
	Median Herd last summer from herder who sold	86.0	62.0	9.0	11.0	0.0	194.0
	Average Herd last summer from herders who sold	116.1	127.5	15.2	19.4	1.9	278.2
	Median Herd this year from herder who sold	41.0	29.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	97.0
	Average Herd this year from herders who sold	70.8	74.3	14.1	10.0	1.4	170.7
	Median loss from herder who sold	30.0	27.0	2.5	5.0	0.0	93.0
	Average loss from herders who sold	47.6	45.3	4.3	7.5	0.5	104.6
	Average percentage lost by herder who sold	40%	38%	31%	44%	18%	40%

Table 2 - Herders Debt

Do you have outstanding debt to the bank or other people?	Do you have means to repay	Number of Herders	Average of debt (MNT)	Average of % herd lost	Total Debt
No	No/A	315		48%	
Yes	No	123	2,019,214	64%	230,190,350
	Yes	71	1,358,107	50%	92,351,300
	I Don't know	13	1,560,000	48%	7,800,000
	(blank)	12	1,214,286	56%	8,500,000
	Total herders with debt	219	1,746,606	58.15%	338,841,650
Total		534		53%	

Table 3 - Dzud Impact on herds and Migrations

Aimag last winter	Soum last winter	Average of % herd lost	Number of Families that moved from Soum	Number of Families that moved from Bagh
Arhangai	Battsengel	49%	0	0
Arhangai	Bulgan	42%	0	1
Arhangai	Chuluut	0%	1	1
Arhangai	Erdenemandal	56%	0	0
Arhangai	Hairhan	49%	1	1
Arhangai	Hangai	35%	4	9
Arhangai	Hashaat and Hotont	68%	1	1
Arhangai	Ihtamir	43%	1	6
Arhangai	Jargalant	65%	0	0
Arhangai	Ogинуур	56%	0	0
Arhangai	Olziit	54%	0	1
Arhangai	Ondor-Ulaan	33%	1	1
Arhangai	Tariat		1	1
Arhangai	Tobshruuleg	77%	0	0
Arhangai	Tsahir	20%	0	0
Arhangai	Tsenher	77%	0	0
Arhangai	Tsetserleg	14%	1	1
Bayan-Olgii	Altansogt	69%	0	3
Bayan-Olgii	Bayannuur	60%	0	0
Bayan-Olgii	Bugat	68%	0	5
Bayan-Olgii	Bulgan	68%	1	1
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Oboo	56%	1	4
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Ondor	60%	2	5
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Sagaan	52%	2	4
Bayanhongor	Bayanbulag	43%	0	0
Bayanhongor	Bayangobi	19%	1	1
Bayanhongor	Bayanhongor_C	41%	0	3
Bayanhongor	Bayanlig	94%	0	2
Bayanhongor	Buutsagaan	32%	0	0
Bayanhongor	Erdenetsogt	52%	1	1
Bayanhongor	Gurvanbulag	46%	7	10
Bayanhongor	HureemaraI	24%	0	1
Bayanhongor	Jargalant	38%	0	5
Bayanhongor	Shinejist	48%	3	6
Bayanhongor	Zag	21%	0	0
Bulgan	Gurvanbulag	22%	2	2
Bulgan	Hangal	46%	0	0
Bulgan	Hishig-Ondor	38%	0	0
Bulgan	Orhon	62%	2	5
Bulgan	Saigan and Mogod	30%	0	1
Govi-Altai	Bayan-Uul	83%	0	1
Govi-Altai	Hohmort	87%	0	0
Govi-Altai	Tsogt	28%	1	1
Hovd	Erdeneburen	81%	0	1
Hovd	Most	53%	0	0
Hovd	Tsetseg	74%	0	0
Hovd	Zereg	58%	0	0
Omnogov	Gurvantes	52%	1	1
#No/A	#No/A	35%	2	2

2. Perceived alternatives

1. Restocking remains a largely preferred option and obvious mechanism by herders to recover livelihoods. There is no strong evidence, as such, to demonstrate a mass migration to urban centers – 61% of answers pointed restock as the perceived alternative (first or second alternative)
2. Restocking as first alternative was chosen by 388 herders who responded (72%)
3. Agriculture is secondary and supplementary to re-stocking (with 19% answers)

Table 4 - Perceived alternatives

Alternative	Total Answers (1 st + 2 nd)	Percentage answered	As first alternative	Choose the same alternative twice	Choose only one alternative
Agriculture	198	19%	63	10	
Dairy	60	6%	15	4	
Mining	44	4%	12	2	
Pigs and poultry	15	1%	5	0	1
Potato growing	39	4%	8	1	
Restocking	624	61%	388	181	
(blank)	43	4%	43	-	-
total	1023		534	241	

Table 5 - Alternative combinations

First Alternative	Second Alternative	Total	First Alternative	Second Alternative	Total
Agriculture	Agriculture	10	Pigs and poultry	Agriculture	2
Agriculture	Dairy	1	Pigs and poultry	Restocking	2
Agriculture	Mining	7	Pigs and poultry	(blank)	1
Agriculture	Potato growing	3	Potato growing	Agriculture	3
Agriculture	Restocking	42	Potato growing	Dairy	2
Dairy	Agriculture	1	Potato growing	Potato growing	1
Dairy	Dairy	4	Potato growing	Restocking	2
Dairy	Mining	2	Restocking	Agriculture	115
Dairy	Pigs and poultry	2	Restocking	Dairy	38
Dairy	Potato growing	2	Restocking	Mining	21
Dairy	Restocking	4	Restocking	Pigs and poultry	8
Mining	Agriculture	5	Restocking	Potato growing	25
Mining	Mining	2	Restocking	Restocking	181
Mining	Restocking	5	(blank)	(blank)	43

3. Humanitarian Response

1. 220 (41%) of interviewed herders have not received any information about humanitarian assistance. Even though, 75 Herder households from these received some kind of assistance.
2. Of those interviewed 70% have received some form of assistance (100% of these received fodder for livestock).
3. The local government is perceived by the affected population to be the primary provider of humanitarian assistance, distributing 42.2% of cash distributed to 39.9 % of herders. 52% of herders received food and 59% herder received fodder from local government.²
4. 41% of herder households received food, 24% received fodder from “Other”. “Other³” is also responsible to distribute 44.5% of cash to 53.5% of interviewed herders.
5. Only 17 (2%) of interviewed herders’ households are expecting for more assistance. The large majority, 412 (77%), don’t know if to expect more assistance.
6. One percent of interviewed households have the expectation to receive more food or fodder or cash or restocking as humanitarian assistance.
7. Herders who expect more assistance expect it in majority from Government, if food or fodder. Restocking is expected in greater extent from “Other⁴”
8. Interviewed households receive roughly 7 million MNT as total cash assistance.

Table 6 - Humanitarian assistance received

Have you received any information about humanitarian assistance?	53_Have you received any assistance related with the Dzud?	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
No	No	141	64.1%
	Yes	75	34.1%
	(blank)	4	1.8%
No - Total		220	
Yes	No	11	3.5%
	Yes	299	95.2%
	(blank)	4	1.3%
Yes - Total		314	

Table 7 - Entitlements perception

Are you entitled to humanitarian assistance?	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
No	102	19.1%
Yes	210	39.3%
I Don't know	205	38.4%

² It was not possible to accurately measure the quantities and type of food and fodder distributed, so is not possible to specify how much each entity has provided.

³ During the data entry, individual names of relatives or friends where entered as “Other”.

(blank)	17	3.2%
Total	534	

Table 8 - Assistance Expectations - General

Are you expecting for more assistance?	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
NO	96	18%
YES	17	3%
I Don't know	412	77%
(blank)	9	2%
Total	534	100%

Table 9.1 - Assistance expectations - by item

	Food		Fodder		Cash		goats	
NO	101	19%	101	19%	100	19%	102	19%
YES	7	1%	5	1%	7	1%	4	1%
I Don't know	370	69%	365	68%	354	66%	356	67%
(blank)	56	10%	63	12%	73	14%	72	13%
Total	534		534		534		534	

Table 10.2 - Assistance expectations - by item (cont)

	horses		sheep		cattle		camels	
NO	109	20%	106	20%	107	20%	106	20%
YES	7	1%	6	1%	6	1%	4	1%
I Don't know	350	66%	348	65%	347	65%	350	66%
(blank)	68	13%	74	14%	74	14%	74	14%
Total	534		534		534		534	

Table 11 - Herders expecting more assistance - from whom

	Food		Fodder		Cash		
Government	17	63%	10	43%	11	52%	
Other	7	26%	10	43%	7	33%	
UN	1	4%	1	4%	1	5%	
UNDP	2	7%	2	9%	2	10%	
	27		23		21		
goats		horses		sheep		cattle	
0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7	70%	8	73%	5	63%	5	63%
1	10%	1	9%	1	13%	1	13%
2	20%	2	18%	2	25%	2	25%
10		11		8		8	

Table 12 - Food Distribution

Agency / Institution	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
Local Government	49	52%
Other	39	41%
Red Cross	2	2%
World Vision	3	3%
#Not specified	2	2%
Total	95	52%

Table 13 - Fodder Distribution

Agency / Institution	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
ADRA	3	0.8%
Local Government	223	59.6%
NEMA	1	0.3%
Other	90	24.1%
Red Cross	2	0.5%
UNFAO	2	0.5%
World Vision	20	5.3%
#Not specified	33	8.8%
Total	374	

Table 14 - Cash Distribution

Agency / Institution	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH	Total MNT	% of Cash
Local Government	15	35.9%	3306000	42.2%
Other	23	53.5%	3487050	44.5%
World Vision	1	2.3%	30000	0.4%
Not specified	4	9.3%	1020000	13.0%
Total	43	100%	7843050	100.0%

4. Movement of Populations and Intentions

- 446 (83.5%) herders households interviewed has not moved outside their Bagh, or don't plan to move 66(12.4%) of herders moved outside Bagh boundaries, however stayed in the same Soum. 6 Households (1.1%) did move within the Aymag and 16 households (3%) moved outside Aymag boundaries (Table 15);
- Movement patterns are more or less consistent with the expected movement patterns of herder lifestyles, and do not appear to have been significantly altered as a result of the Dzud. (Table 16)
- A greater number of families stated that they moved last year, as opposed to those who state they intend to move this year. Cross-analyzed with field observation, this is consistent with the observation that the majorities of the households do not have an already conceived intention of movement in the next winter and spring, but will wait to evaluate their circumstances at that time before making this decision.
- 62% of interviewed households stated that have a relative in an urban center.
- 60% of the herder households stated that they do not plan to move despite being affected by the 2009-2010 Dzud. 30% chose to not answer this question, and may again suggest that their decision in this regard rests on the circumstances presented during the upcoming winter-spring.
- Of those that do intend to migrate, most state that they have family within the urban centre - half of these are planning to migrate to an area where they have close relatives – 15 out of 34 herders that are planning to move (Table 17), have a relative in the area where they stated they plan to move. This confirms assumptions that family within the capital is one strong influencing factor for movement. Secondly, this further explains the lack of spontaneous settlements outside the capital as a result of the Dzud. From field observation, it appears that those who have been affected and have migrated to the capital have scattered throughout Ulaanbaatar, settling on family plots primarily inside areas of the ger district. Taking this data into consideration, there is nothing to suggest that this pattern of migration will change

Table 15 - Movement of Herder Households per administrative boundary

Same Aymag	Same Soum(YN)	Same Bagh(YN)\	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
Yes	Yes	Yes	446	83.5%
Yes	Yes	No	66	12.4%
Yes	No	No	6	1.1%
No	No	No	16	3.0%
Grand Total		No	534	

Table 16 - Movements of Herder households per period

Administrative division	Past Winter spring Movement	Past Spring - Summer Movement	Expected Autumn Future Movement	Expected Winter Future Movement	Expected Spring Future Movement
Aymag	10	4	7	4	3
Soum	20	18	18	13	10
Bagh	37	42	36	24	29

Table 17 - Relatives in Urban Areas (soum)

	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
--	---------------	-------------------

No	204	38%
Yes	330	62%
Total	534	100%

Table 18 - Relatives in Urban areas (Aymag)

	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
No	248	46%
Yes	286	54%
Total	534	100%

Table 19 - Intentions to Migrate

Planning to migrate in the near future	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
I don't know	7	1.3%
No	320	59.9%
Yes	34	6.4%
(blank)	173	32.4%
Total	534	1.3%

Table 20 - Destination areas

If planning to move, going to areas where have close relatives	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
No	16	47.1%
Yes	15	44.1%
(blank)	3	8.8%
Total	34	

5. Access to Information

1. The large majority if interviewees (88%) have access either to Radio (22%) or Television (66%).

Table 21 – Access to Information

What is your main way to get information	Number of HHH	Percentage of HHH
Newspaper	4	1%
Radio	117	22%
TV	354	66%
Word of mouth	44	8%
N/A	15	3%
Total	534	

6. Summary of Data Analysis

The primary objective of this survey was to enhance understanding of the migration intentions of the affected herder population. Extension discussion with Government, UN, local and NGO stakeholders contributed to the development of the survey, in which the following information gaps were identified:

- § Did the affected population plan to migrate to Ulaanbaatar and would this create a humanitarian situation in mass spontaneous settlements outside the capital?
- § Should the humanitarian community continue to provide assistance in the rural areas, or should it balance its support by preparing to also receive and accommodate Dzud-affected migrants in the capital?
- § If migration is to occur, what the factors behind planned movement by the affected population?
- § What are the perceptions of the population as to the best form of assistance to allow them to retain their nomadic livelihoods, of which they have strong ties and are part of the national identity?

The survey of 534 Herder households affected by the 2009-2010 Dzud concludes that a majority of the herders affected within the areas covered do not intend to migrate to Ulaanbaatar nor other area. At least at the time of survey it did not seem likely that Ulaanbaatar will see a mass influx of Dzud-affected persons noticeably displaced to the fringes of the capital city. This had been an initial concern voiced in the 2010 Mongolia Appeal launched in May.

Humanitarian aid is seemingly appropriately targeted and equitable, covering 70% of those affected. Not surprisingly aid has been focused on re-stocking rather than development of alternative livelihoods which does appear to be the preferred mechanism of assistance by the affected population.

The fact of other perceived alternatives is only considered by few interviewees, may reinforce the theory that herders are tied to their identity, pastures and livelihood as a herder

Among the perceived alternatives only small portion of those interviewed stated that they would also seek mining (assumingly informal or ‘ninja’ mining as it is commonly referred) as an alternative livelihood. Nevertheless, being “ninja” mining the only illegal alternative presented, should not be ruled out that herder households, if intending to sending to send some of the family members to engage in informal mining, may not have felt comfortable stating this to the interviews.

A large majority of interviewees as access to Radio and TV, and this is a fact that can help to better reach out to affected populations in information campaigns in order to mitigate and prevent the adverse impact of Dzud, in order to inform people about entitlements to Assistance and issuing warning of Dzuds.

A primary goal of this survey was to better inform the humanitarian community as to where to plan future assistance interventions, and what type of inventions is more effective. Based on the data, assistance should still be targeted in the rural areas as there is strong indication that the herders will not migrate in mass numbers to urban. However, humanitarian actors should note the obvious number of herders who have fallen into debt as a result of the impact of the Dzud on their herds. Over one-third of those interviewed had gone into debt as a result of the Dzud, and 58% of these households stated that they are unable to pay these debts. Should the Dzud become a repeated phenomenon, which is thought possible, herder families may not be able to respond to

their own needs as they were in 2009-2010. Escalating debt as several Dzuds still may catalyze migration to urban or mining areas should other mechanisms of reliance or assistance not exist.

When people do migrate to the capital of Ulaanbaatar, both field observation and the data of this survey verify that it is most likely to live with relatives. Familial connections do influence this decision. Many plots of land throughout the ger (yurt) districts of Ulaanbaatar are large enough to allow for several gers to be constructed within one plot.

In conclusion, it is important to consider that Mongolian herders are by nature a nomadic population of which migration decisions are guided by their seasonal conditions. There is no reason to believe that the impact of the Dzud has brought any further foresight into plans for movement, and that while conditions may worsen again during the winter-spring, it still may not generate mass movements to Ulaanbaatar. Tied to land and pasture, re-stocking will likely remain the primary coping mechanism of those affected by such climatic changes.

Given this reality, the data does advocate for disaster risk management and reduction within rural areas that is focused on the preservation of livestock – given that a majority intend to remain within their areas of origin. There is both donor and government fatigue related to continual re-stocking, and more attention should be placed on better practices for fodder storage, vaccination, and other livestock management measures that can better sustain herds during perhaps increasingly harsh winters. Lastly, social welfare mechanisms should be scrutinized to foster the alleviation of debt of those affected, with special focus on the poorest and most vulnerable members of the herder community.

Annex 1 Areas and number of family surveyed

Aymag	Soum	Asses.	HH	HH T. Loss	% in Soum	Target
Arhangai	Battsengel	7	358	83	23%	8
Arhangai	Bulgan	14	1048	385	37%	21
Arhangai	Erdenemandal	11	456	172	38%	10
Arhangai	Hairhan	8	455	118	26%	10
Arhangai	Hangai	16	299	70	23%	6
Arhangai	Hashaat and Hotont	23	545	242	44%	11
Arhangai	Ihtamir	6	494	112	23%	10
Arhangai	Jargalant	20	480	105	22%	10
Arhangai	Ogiinuur	11	1071	263	25%	22
Arhangai	Olziit	19				
Arhangai	Tobshruuleg	12	297	264	89%	6
Arhangai	Tsahir	8	347	102	29%	7
Arhangai	Tsenher	16	883	357	40%	18
Bayanhongor	Bayanbulag	4	297	56	19%	6
Bayanhongor	Bayanhongor_C	7	373	65	17%	8
Bayanhongor	Bayanlig	6	297	48	16%	6
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Oboo	29	1351	214	16%	28
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Ondor	9	443	80	18%	9
Bayanhongor	Bayan-Sagaan	17	857	180	21%	18
Bayanhongor	Buutsagaan	2	470	79	17%	10
Bayanhongor	Gurvanbulag	51	1699	257	15%	34
Bayanhongor	Hureemarl	12	586	119	20%	12
Bayanhongor	Jargalant	9	342	50	15%	7
Bayanhongor	Shinejist	7	354	61	17%	8
Bayanhongor	Zag	7	388	67	17%	8
Bayan-Olgii	Altansogt	8	319	63	20%	7
Bayan-Olgii	Bayannuur	9	317	47	15%	7
Bayan-Olgii	Bugat	13	528	98	19%	11
Bayan-Olgii	Bulgan	13	398	79	20%	8
Bulgan	Hangal	1				
Bulgan	Hishig-Ondor	60	1161	135	12%	24
Bulgan	Orhon	13	579	65	11%	12
Bulgan	Saigan and Mogod	16	819	94	11%	17
Govi-Altai	Bayan-Uul	19	761	58	8%	16
Govi-Altai	Hohmort	7	364	31	9%	8
Govi-Altai	Jargalan	1	698	57	8%	14
Govi-Altai	Tsogt	1	455	33	7%	10
Hovd	Erdeneburen	12	1110	56	5%	23
Hovd	Most	13	479	21	4%	10
Hovd	Tsetseg	8	482	23	5%	10
Hovd	Zereg	9	356	16	4%	8
Total		534				

Annex 3 Questionnaire

Mongolian

Монгол орчуулга ИД_ХХ

ID_НН

- 1.1_Та яг одоо аль аймагт амьдарч байна вэ?
- 1.2_Та яг одоо аль суманд амьдарч байна вэ?
- 1.3_Та яг одоо аль багт амьдарч байна вэ?
- 1.4_ГПСийн хэддүгээр өргөрөг вэ?
- 1.5_ГПСийн хэддүгээр уртраг вэ?
- 2.1_ХХ Таний нэр хэн бэ?
- 2.2_Хүйс
- 2.3_Нас
- 2.4_Танай ам бүл хэд вэ?
- 2.5_Та хаана албан ёсоор бүртгэлтэй вэ?
- 3.1_Та яг одоо оршин сууж буй газраа хэр удаан амьдарч байна вэ? /жил,сар/
- 3.2_Та яагаад энд ирж амьдрах болсон бэ?
- 3.3.1_Та өнгөрсөн өвөл хаана байсан бэ?
- 3.3.2_Та өнгөрсөн хавар хаана байсан бэ?
- 3.3.3_Та хаана зунших гэж байна вэ?
- 3.3.4_Та хаана намаржих гэж байна вэ?
- 3.3.5_Та хаана өвөлжих гэж байна вэ?
- 3.3.6_Та хаана хаваржих гэж байна вэ?
- 4.1.1_Өнгөрсөн зун та хэдэн ямаатай байсан бэ?
- 4.1.2_Өнгөрсөн зун та хэдэн хоньтой байсан бэ?
- 4.1.3_Өнгөрсөн зун та хэдэн адуутай байсан бэ?
- 4.1.4_Өнгөрсөн зун та хэдэн үхэртэй байсан бэ?
- 4.1.5_Өнгөрсөн зун та хэдэн тэмээтэй байсан бэ?
- 4.2.1_Одоо та хэдэн ямаатай вэ?
- 4.2.2_Одоо та хэдэн хоньтой вэ?
- 4.2.3_Одоо та хэдэн адуутай вэ?
- 4.2.4_Одоо та хэдэн үхэртэй вэ?
- 4.2.5_Одоо та хэдэн тэмээтэй вэ?
- 4.3.1_Зуднаар танай хэдэн ямаа хорогдсон бэ?
- 4.3.2_Зуднаар танай хэдэн хонь хорогдсон бэ?
- 4.3.3_Зуднаар танай хэдэн адуу хорогдсон бэ?
- 4.3.4_Зуднаар танай хэдэн үхэр хорогдсон бэ?
- 4.3.5_Зуднаар танай хэдэн тэмээ хорогдсон бэ?
- 4.4.1_Та энэ хавар хэдэн ямаа зарсан бэ?
- 4.4.2_Та энэ хавар хэдэн хонь зарсан бэ?
- 4.4.3_Та энэ хавар хэдэн адуу зарсан бэ?
- 4.4.4_Та энэ хавар хэдэн үхэр зарсан бэ?
- 4.4.5_Та энэ хавар хэдэн тэмээ зарсан бэ?
- 5.1_Та ямар нэгэн хүмүүнлэгийн тусламж хүлээж авсан уу?
- 5.2_Та ямар нэгэн хүмүүнлэгийн тусламж авах болзол хангасан уу?
- 5.3_Та зудтай холбоотой хүмүүнлэгийн тусламж авсан уу?
- 5.3.4.1.1_Хэн танд хадлан тэжээл өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.1.2_Хэзээ танд хадлан тэжээл өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.1.3_Танд ямах хэмжээний хадлан тэжээл өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.2.1_Хэн танд хоол хүнс өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.2.2_Хэзээ танд хоол хүнс өгсөн бэ?

- 5.3.4.2.3_Танд ямар хэмжээний хоол хүнс өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.3.1_Хэн танд мөнгөн тусламж үзүүлсэн бэ?
- 5.3.4.3.2_Хэзээ танд мөнгөн тусламж үзүүлсэн ба?
- 5.3.4.3.3_Танд ямар хэмжээний мөнгөн тусламж үзүүлсэн бэ?
- 5.3.4.4.1_Хэн танд ямаа өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.4.2_Хэзээ танд ямаа өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.4.3_Танд хэдэн ямаа өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.5.1_Хэн танд адуу өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.5.2_Хэзээ танд адуу өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.5.3_Танд хэдэн адуу өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.6.1_Хэн танд хонь өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.6.2_Хэзээ танд хонь өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.6.3_Танд хэдэн хонь өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.7.1_Хэн танд үхэр өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.7.2_Хэзээ танд үхэр өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.7.3_Танд хэдэн үхэр өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.8.1_Хэн танд тэмээ өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.8.2_Хэзээ танд тэмээ өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.4.8.3_Танд хэдэн тэмээ өгсөн бэ?
- 5.3.5_Танд дахиад тусламж өгөх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.1_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжийн хүнс ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.2_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжийн хадлан тэжээл ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.3_Хэрэв тийм бол мөнгөн тусламж ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.4_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжаар ямаа ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.5_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжаар адуу ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.6_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжаар хонь ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.7_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжаар үхэр ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.1.8_Хэрэв тийм бол тусламжаар тэмээ ирэх үү?
- 5.3.5.2.1_Хэрэв тийм бол хэнээс тусламжийн хүнс ирэх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.2_Хэрэв тийм бол хэнээс тусламжийн хадлан тэжээл ирэх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.3_Хэрэв тийм бол хэнээс мөнгөн тусламж ирэх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.4_Хэрэв тийм бол хэн танд ямаа өгөх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.5_Хэрэв тийм бол хэн танд адуу өгөх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.6_Хэрэв тийм бол хэн танд хонь өгөх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.7_Хэрэв тийм бол хэн танд үхэр өгөх вэ?
- 5.3.5.2.8_Хэрэв тийм бол хэн танд тэмээ өгөх вэ?
- 5.4_Та хувь хүн эсвэл банкинд өртэй юу?
- 5.4.1_Та хэр их өртэй вэ?
- 5.4.2_Та өрөө эргэн толох боломж байна уу?
- 5.5_Доорхоос та алийг нь амжиргаагаа залгуулах хамгийн боломжийн арга зам гэж үзэж байна вэ?
- 5.6_Доорхоос та алийг нь амжиргаагаа залгуулах хамгийн боломжийн арга зам гэж үзэж байна вэ?
- 6.1.1_Та ойрын үед /өвөл юмуу намар/ эндээс нүүхээр төлөвлөж байна уу?
- 6.2_Үгүй бол яагаад?
- 6.3_Тийм бол хэзээ?
- 6.4_Тийм бол хаашаа?
- 6.5_Хот суурин танай газар хамаатан садан бий юу?
- 6.6.1_Танай эцэг эх аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ? (олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)
- 6.6.2_Танай ах эгч аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ? (олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)
- 6.6.3_Танай авга/нагац аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ? (олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)
- 6.6.4_Танай хүүхдүүд аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ? (олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)

- 6.6.5_Танай хамаатнууд аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ? (олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)
- 6.6.6_Танай садан, төрөл аль төв суурин газар амьдардаг вэ?(олон хүн байдаг бол таныг татах хамгийн боломжтой хүнээ бичнэ үү)
- 6.6.7_Та нүүлээ гэхэд дээрх гэр бүлийн гишүүн хамаатан садныхаа хэн уруу нь хамгийн эхэнд очих вэ?
- 7.1_Та хэрхэн мэдээ мэдээлэл хүлээн авдаг вэ? (хамгийн их хүлээн авдаг аргаа тэмдэглэнэ үү)

English

- 1.1_Where are you - Aymag?
- 1.2_Where are you - Soum?
- 1.3_Where are you - Bagh?
- 1.4_GPS Lat
- 1.5_GPS Long
- 2.1_HH Name
- 2.2_Sex
- 2.3_Age
- 2.4_How many people does the household support?
- 2.5_Where are you registered?
- 3.1_How long have you been here (years/Months)
- 3.2_What brought you here?
- 3.3.1_Where were you last winter?
- 3.3.2_Where were you last spring?
- 3.3.3_Where you expect to be this summer?
- 3.3.4_Where you expect to be next autumn?
- 3.3.5_Where you expect to be next winter?
- 3.3.6_Where you expect to be next spring?
- 4.1.1_How many goats did you have last summer?
- 4.1.2_How many sheep did you have last summer?
- 4.1.3_How many horses did you have last summer?
- 4.1.4_How many cattle did you have last summer?
- 4.1.5_How many camels did you have last summer?
- 4.2.1_How many goats do you have now?
- 4.2.2_How many sheep do you have now?
- 4.2.3_How many horses do you have now?
- 4.2.4_How many cattle do you have now?
- 4.2.5_How many camels do you have now?
- 4.3.1_How many goats did you lose last dzud?
- 4.3.2_How many sheep did you lose last dzud?
- 4.3.3_How many horses did you lose last dzud?
- 4.3.4_How many cattle did you lose last dzud?
- 4.3.5_How many camels did you have last summer?
- 4.4.1_How many goats did sell since last year?
- 4.4.2_How many sheep did sell since last year?
- 4.4.3_How many horses did sell since last year?
- 4.4.4_How many cattle did sell since last year?
- 4.4.5_How many camels did sell since last year?
- 5.1_Have you received any information about humanitarian assistance available to you?
- 5.2_Are you entitled to humanitarian assistance?
- 5.3_Have you received any assistance related with the Dzud?
- 5.3.4.1.1_Who provided fodder to you?
- 5.3.4.1.2_When was fodder provided to you?

- 5.3.4.1.3_How much fodder was provided to you?
- 5.3.4.2.1_Who provided food to you?
- 5.3.4.2.2_When was food provided to you?
- 5.3.4.2.3_How much food was provided to you?
- 5.3.4.3.1_Who provided cash to you?
- 5.3.4.3.2_When was cash provided to you?
- 5.3.4.3.3_How much cash was provided to you?
- 5.3.4.4.1_Who provided goats to you?
- 5.3.4.4.2_When were goats provided to you?
- 5.3.4.4.3_How many goats were provided to you?
- 5.3.4.5.1_Who provided horses to you?
- 5.3.4.5.2_When were horses provided to you?
- 5.3.4.5.3_How many horses were provided to you?
- 5.3.4.6.1_Who provided sheep to you?
- 5.3.4.6.2_When were sheep provided to you?
- 5.3.4.6.3_How many sheep were provided to you?
- 5.3.4.7.1_Who provided cattle to you?
- 5.3.4.7.2_When were cattle provided to you?
- 5.3.4.7.3_How many cattle was provided to you?
- 5.3.4.8.1_Who provided camels to you?
- 5.3.4.8.2_When were camels provided to you?
- 5.3.4.8.3_How many camels were provided to you?
- 5.3.5_Are you expecting for more assistance?
- 5.3.5.1.1_If yes, are you expecting more food?
- 5.3.5.1.2_If yes, are you expecting more fodder?
- 5.3.5.1.3_If yes, are you expecting more cash?
- 5.3.5.1.4_If yes, are you expecting more goats?
- 5.3.5.1.5_If yes, are you expecting more horses?
- 5.3.5.1.6_If yes, are you expecting more sheep?
- 5.3.5.1.7_If yes, are you expecting more cattle?
- 5.3.5.1.8_If yes, are you expecting more camel?
- 5.3.5.2.1_If yes, from whom are you expecting more food?
- 5.3.5.2.2_If yes, from whom are you expecting more fodder?
- 5.3.5.2.3_If yes, from whom are you expecting more cash?
- 5.3.5.2.4_If yes, from whom are you expecting more goats?
- 5.3.5.2.5_If yes, from whom are you expecting more horses?
- 5.3.5.2.6_If yes, from whom are you expecting more sheep?
- 5.3.5.2.7_If yes, from whom are you expecting more cattle?
- 5.3.5.2.8_If yes, from whom are you expecting more camel?
- 5.4_Do you have outstanding debt to the bank or other people?
- 5.4.1_How much?
- 5.4.2_Do you have the means to repay
- 5.5_What of the following do you perceive as an alternative livelihood/way to support yourself?
- 6.1.1_In the near future (before or during winter), are you planning to move from here?
- 6.2_If no, why not?
- 6.3_If yes, When?
- 6.4_If yes, Where?
- 6.5_Do you have close relatives in any urban center?
- 6.6.1_In which urban centers you have parents?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)
- 6.6.2_In which urban centers you have sister/brother?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)
- 6.6.3_In which urban centers you have aunt/uncle?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)
- 6.6.4_In which urban centers you have children?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)
- 6.6.5_In which urban centers you have cousin?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)

- 6.6.6_In which urban centers you have other relatives?(if more than one, write the one more likely to receive you)
- 6.6.7_Of all of the above which relative are you most likely to live with should you leave this place?
- 7.1_How do you receive news / information (tick the most used)

Annex 4 Map

