INTRODUCTION

While seasonal migration by nomadic populations is a key migration pattern in Northern Mongolia, the rising incidence of severe droughts and dzuds (harsh winters) in Mongolia are making mobility conditions increasingly difficult and forcing herders to either travel larger distances to find pasture or to move to urban centres. In response, IOM Mongolia, working with the National Emergency Management Authority (NEMA) and supported by the IOM Development Fund, has deployed IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) and tested site assessment tools tailored to the Mongolian context. The purpose of the assessments was to better understand migration trends of nomadic populations in Mongolia and monitor population movements caused by slow-onset disasters and climate change. The project aims to contribute to strengthened migration management in Mongolia by improving the knowledge and skills of government officials to use DTM; and by building evidence and data on current migration flows to improve future response planning. The project also aims to improve coordination between key stakeholders and produce an agreed upon Plan of Action to further strengthen coordination efforts and the use of evidence in decision-making.

IOM Mongolia conducted site assessments in 10 herder encampments between 6-16 April 2018. 30 key informants, including regional officials and livestock and veterinary experts, were interviewed for the purpose of the assessment.

KEY FINDINGS

- 10 sites assessed
- 746 individuals (268 HH)
- 67% male
- 33% female
- 70% displaced by drought
- 30% displaced by dzud
- 50% short-term sites
- 50% protracted sites
- 100% of HH with livestock
- 982 animals per HH (average)
DTM identified 746 individuals amidst 268 households. The overwhelming majority of individuals (90%) were adults, while 9% of them were children (elderly people were accounted for 1% of the identified population). The majority (67%) of herders were male, while 33% were female (Figure 1). This discrepancy is explained by the fact families sometimes go separate ways during seasonal migration, with family members traveling to separate areas in search of pasture for their cattle. In other cases, families split as the men travel with the cattle and the women stay at the soum centres because children are attending school or they have found employment in the centre.

A relatively small percentage of individuals presented vulnerabilities (123, or 16%), which included single male-headed households (100), breastfeeding mothers (17), and pregnant women (6). Notably, no unaccompanied or separated child was identified during the assessments.

Communities from the majority of assessed originated from Bayankhongor aimag (reported by 40% of sites), followed by Zavkhan aimag (20% of sites), Bulgan, Arkhangai, Khuvsgul, and Govi-Altai (one site each) (See Map 1 on page 4). To reach the sites where they are now staying, displaced populations travelled between 42km (distance between Aldarkhaan soum and Agit displacement site) and 241km (distance between Ikh-Uul soum and Khar us displacement site).

In terms of return intentions, all of the ten sites indicated that the majority of individuals wished to leave the site, 90% of which wished to return to their soum of origin to join the rest of their family (the remaining 10% indicated the wish to go to the nearest soum). Herders tend to return to their area of origin at the end of the seasonal migratory season. However, communities face obstacles in their soum of origin which prevent them from returning, including land degradation, desertification, drought and dzud, which reduce the pasture areas available for cattle.
Figure 3 presents the numbers of households (HH) in each of the sites assessed, which range from 8 (in Melzen) to 62 (in Bugdgeen, Teel). On average, there were 27 HH in each site.

Nine out of the ten sites were spontaneous. Half of the sites were short-term (lasting one season, either over the winter or in the spring), with the other half being protracted (lasting more than one season).

In terms of site administration, official registration, conducted at soum centres, took place in 90% of sites, and 70% held contact lists. A Site Management Committee (SMC) was present in only two sites.

The most common shelter, or ger, type was temporary in 70 per cent of the sites, while in 30 per cent of sites, the majority of shelters were permanent. All households in all sites, reported having shelter. And in all sites, all households lived indoors.

Temporary shelters are smaller than more permanent gers. They are also more precarious and more poorly isolated, making them less resistant to natural hazards and more exposed to weather conditions.

There are few stores in rural areas along the migratory routes, and migrants consume what they produce. Moreover, seasonal migrants generally stock basic foods. As a result, in all the sites, the majority of households indicated providing food for themselves. Nonetheless, the majority of households accumulate some money for the winter, either through loans or by selling meat, to spend in case of hardship. In addition, every site reported that supplementary feeding was provided for both mothers and children. No site reported signs of acute malnutrition. In 90 per cent of sites, more than 75 per cent of households reported access to markets.

In all ten sites, the primary water source was on site, and individuals had not only enough water, but there were no complaints about the water quality. Five of the ten site reported that the primary source of drinking water was snow, while households at four sites got their water from a river and one site from a well (Figure 4).

None of the sites assessed had functioning toilets. In all sites, over 75 per cent were reported defecating in the open air.

None of the sites reported any health problem, and all sites indicated the availability of common medications on site, which are provided by district centres.

Seven of the ten sites reported that the nearest health clinic was over 30 km away, while 2 report the nearest health clinic was between 10 and 20 km away, and 1 site reported that the nearest clinic was less than 10 km away.
In terms of protection of the encampment populations, it was reported that security was available in 30% of the sites assessed. Security is guaranteed by district administrators, albeit not directly on displacement sites. Security incidents were reported in 20% of sites, and no GBV-related incident was reported. At the same time, a referral mechanism for survivors of GBV was available in 80% of sites (Figure 6).

Finally, there was no lighting in any of the sites. All sites cited solar panels and torches as the only source of lighting on site.

**COMMUNICATION**

The majority of communities requested additional information on safety and security as well as information on registration and possibilities of staying longer in the site (both indicated by four sites), followed by policies on livestock and forage (three sites). In addition, all sites reported that over 75% of individuals had access to a cellphone.

**LIVESTOCK**

On average, each site possessed approximately 26,300 animals. Every household in all of the sites assessed possessed livestock (on average, a household possessed 982 animals, representing 353 animals per person), and livestock was the primary source of income of communities in all of the sites assessed. The animals most commonly found at assessed sites were sheep (about 10,000 per site on average), goats (about 7,100 on average) and cattle (approximately 6,900 on average) (Figure 7).

In all sites, over 75% of livestock has a shelter and had access to water. However, there were large discrepancies in terms of access to pasture: in four of the ten sites, no animal had access to pasture, while in five sites, over 75% has access to pasture (in one site, less then 25% of animals had access) (Figure 8).

With over 75% of the animals in half of the assessed sites having received one dose of vaccine, a large share of the livestock was safe from diseases. As a point of comparison, in seven out of the ten sites, over 75% of the animals had access to veterinary services. The most prevalent diseases among cattle livestock were foot and mouth (FMD) disease, whilst amongst sheep and goats, pox and rabies were the most prevalent ones.
### Map 1: Number of IDPs in assessed sites and soum of origin of IDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aimag</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Individual IDPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayankhongor</td>
<td>Bayangin gol</td>
<td>16 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khar us</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayantsgaan/tosui</td>
<td>101 - 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davsantal</td>
<td>41 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkhangai</td>
<td>Arzuu</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khuvsul</td>
<td>16 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zavkhan</td>
<td>Agit</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khuvsul (Tuulaitin uvur)</td>
<td>101 - 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khuvsul</td>
<td>Bugddeen and teel</td>
<td>41 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvurkhangai</td>
<td>Melzen</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The map in this section is for illustrative purposes only. Locations and names on the map do not imply, or express, official endorsement or assent by IOM.
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**Herders leading cattle through rough dzud conditions in Ikhtamir soum, Arkhangai aimag © 2018**