MONGOLIA COVID-19 HOUSEHOLD RESPONSE PHONE SURVEY

- Mongolia has taken early and decisive measures to prevent the inflow and outbreak of COVID-19. Despite the limited cases confirmed in Mongolia, the household-level shocks caused by COVID-19 can be long-lasting and disproportionately hit the poor and vulnerable the hardest, creating an urgent need for timely data collection to help monitoring and mitigating the socio-economic impact of the shock.

- To monitor the household-level impacts of COVID-19 in “real-time”, the National Statistics Office of Mongolia (NSO) and the World Bank have implemented a joint COVID-19 Household Response Phone Survey (HRPS).

- The survey focuses on (i) economic transmission channels, (ii) information access and behavioral changes, (iii) access in education, health and financial services, (iv) coping mechanisms, and (v) welfare impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The survey is planned to be carried out at least twice on the same households nationwide.

- This presentation summarizes the results of the first round of the survey conducted from May 22 to May 29, 2020. The next round of the survey is scheduled in late August – early September.

Note:
1. Containment and mobile restriction measures including closures of the boarder with China and schools have been implemented since January 27, 2020.
2. 197 cases were confirmed as of June 17, 2020, with all cases being linked to visitors and evacuated citizens from overseas.
KEY FINDINGS

- Awareness of containment policies as well as prevention and social distancing measures against COVID-19 is strong
- Self-employed and agriculture households have been significantly impacted
  - 16 percent of self-employed workers received zero income and 73 percent experienced business income losses since end-January. This is mainly due to fewer customers, business place closures and logistics disruptions due to COVID-19
  - 70 percent of farmer and herder households reported their agricultural income has declined compared to the same time last year
- Wage employment was less affected by COVID-19, yet more than one in three households reported wage income losses
- Nearly three-quarters of households, in particular 85 percent of the poor, experienced some sort of shocks since end-January
  - 12 percent of households experienced job losses
  - 7 percent of households had to close their non-farm business
  - 64 percent of households reported increase in price of major food items
KEY FINDINGS

- Food security is a serious issue for the poor
  - Nearly **half of the poor** were uncertain about their ability to obtain food in the past 30 days due to lack of money or rising prices. **Three in four** poor households were affected by the recent price increases of the major food items
  - **One in four poor** households (23 percent) expressed concerns about food security in the next week

- Alarming levels of concerns on household finances were reported
  - More than **40 percent** of households, particularly the poor (53 percent), are worried about their finances in the next month

- Three in four households with school-enrolled children were engaged in distance learning activities. The overall satisfaction on these learning activities is high but most children need assistance from other household members at home

- No major disruptions in access to health and financial services under the COVID-19 pandemic were observed
Survey Overview (Round One)

- **Data collection period:** May 22-29, 2020
- **Sample size:** Sub-sample of 2000 households that were representative nationally, urban/rural and by location (UB/aimag center/soum center/countryside) from the 2018 Household Socio-Economic Survey (HSES). The response rate is 66.7 percent (1334 households were responded).
- **Implementation method:** Computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI)
- **Average duration of interview:** 11.5 minutes
- **Average number of call attempts until interview was completed:** 1.7 times
- **Sampling weights:** Weights were calculated by following the approaches outlined in Himelein, K (2014).1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown of interview results</th>
<th>No of households</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially complete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody answered</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number does not exist</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone turned off</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know the household</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference person can’t connect household</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The sample distribution of HRPS 2020 is similar to the HSES 2018 in location, household head’s education level and poverty status (2018).

Note: Phone survey respondents were not always head of the household. Interviews were conducted if the respondent was aged over 15.

For education attainment level comparison, household head’s education level from HRPS 2020 was compared to the household head’s education level in HSES 2018. Poverty status is based on the 2018 HSES.
Recognition of COVID-19 and preventive measures

- Everyone (99.5 percent of respondents) is aware of COVID-19
- Recognition of Government’s containment measures is high. 97% of respondents know about Stay-at-home order, 96% know about school closure and more than 80% know about travel restrictions
- The vast majority of people take preventive and social distancing measures. 94% of respondents washed hands more frequently, 88% avoided handshakes and 86% avoided group gatherings. No visible difference in these behaviors was seen between urban and rural and between the poor and non-poor
- Over half of those who had planned travel cancelled their travel plans

**Recognition of Government’s containment measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay at home</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted domestic travel</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted international travel</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School closure</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-essential business closure</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behavior and Social Distancing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand-washed more frequently in the last 7 days</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided handshakes or physical greetings in the last 7 days</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided group gatherings (10+) in the last 7 days</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canceled travel plans since Jan 27, 2020 (of those planned travel)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Error bars represent 95% Confidence Interval
Employment: Overall employment status

- In the last week proceeding to the survey, 53 percent of respondents worked and 47 percent did not work.
- 12 percent of respondents reported they worked before end-January but did not work in the last week.
  - The main reason for not working in the last week was closures of business, Government and schools due to COVID-19 restrictions (45 percent).
  - Two-thirds of those not working in the last week were engaged in service sector and one-third were in industry sector. 74 percent are located in Urban areas (54% in Ulaanbaatar).
- The poor are more likely to stop working.
  - 20 percent of poor respondents stopped working, while only 10 percent of the non-poor did.

Note: Poverty status is based on the 2018 HSES
**Employment: Wage**

- Wage employment activities were less affected by COVID-19, yet more than one in three households experienced wage income losses
  - 55 percent of respondents in the survey are currently engaged in wage jobs\(^1\)
  - 90 percent of those wage worker respondents reported they were able to work as usual (either at office or remotely) in the last week.
  - In general, job security for the wage workers is relatively better than that for the self-employed, but still 38 percent of households reported a decline in wage income. Since 78 percent of the wage receiving households live in urban areas, the wage loss is more likely to be an urban phenomenon

Note: Among households that received wage income source in the last 12 months

---

**Wage household income since end January**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Status</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non-Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of wage worker respondents who were able to work as usual in the last week</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[90]</td>
<td>[57]</td>
<td>[59]</td>
<td>[57]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown of urban and rural wage households by income status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Status</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of wage households</td>
<td>[41]</td>
<td>[23]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-employed households in all sectors have been severely affected after the COVID-19 outbreak

- 17 percent of households are engaged in non-farm business activities in 2020
- Among them, 16 percent received zero income and 73 percent experienced incomes losses since end January
- Adverse impacts can be seen across all sectors, particularly in the services sector where 18 percent of self-employed households were earning nothing under the COVID-19 pandemic
- A significant drop in the number of customers and closures of business place due to COVID-19 were the main drivers for business earning losses

1. In the survey, self-employed households are defined as those who have at least one household member engaged in non-farm business activities in 2020
Almost every farmer and herder was able to continue farm/livestock activities under the COVID-19 pandemic.

- 25 percent of households are engaged in farm or livestock activities in 2020. Among them, three-quarters live in rural areas.
- 98 percent of those farmers were able to conduct the normal agriculture activities since end-January.
- However, it seems disruptions in logistics and supply chain affected their sales operations.

- 58 percent of households reported they were unable to sell products from farms in the last month.

Note: N=418

1. In the survey, farmer and herder households are defined as those who have at least one household member engaged in agriculture activities in 2020.
Livestock prices have increased but prices of livestock products, notably cashmere, have declined significantly

- NSO reported the major livestock prices have increased by 6-12 percent since January 2020
- Cashmere price has substantially declined mainly due to demand contractions and trade disruptions
  - According to the HSES 2018, nearly 90 percent of herder households were engaged in cashmere production and on average, herder households received 71 percent of their animal production income from cashmere production. Its increasing market price drove the robust poverty reduction in rural areas between 2016 and 2018\(^1\)

Source: NSO. Livestock and cashmere prices are based on the average market price calculated from all aimags
Employment: Agriculture (3)

- As a result, even though farmers were able to work as usual, their income has declined due to the logistics disruptions and falling livestock product prices
  - 70 percent of farmer and herder households reported their agricultural income has declined compared to the same time last year
  - 87 percent of households reported lower sales price compared to the same time last year
One in three households were worried about food availability and two in three reported they were affected by the recent price increase in major food items

- Food CPI inflation spiked in Feb-Mar 2020, which was reflected in the household food insecurity experiences

- Food security is a serious problem for the poor
  - Three in four poor households were negatively affected by food price increase of major food items
  - 47% were uncertain about their ability to obtain food, 40% were unable to eat healthy food, 42% ate only a few kinds of food, 28% had to skip a meal, and 23% ate less.

- Households in the countryside are less likely to be exposed to food insecurity but there are no statistically significant differences across locations

Note: Poverty status is based on the 2018 HSES. Error bars represent 95% Confidence Interval

(1) The recent decline in Food CPI inflation was also reflected in the improved results of households’ future food security concerns. For more details, find “Concerns” section.
73 percent of households, in particular 85 percent of the poor, experienced some sort of shocks since end January:

- 12 percent of households experienced job losses of their household members
- 7 percent of households had to close their non-farm business

Disruptions in farming and livestock activities were limited (2 percent), but 43 percent of the rural households reported they suffered from price decline in farming/business outputs, in line with what we observed in the agriculture employment section.

### Share of Households Experiencing Any Shocks Since End-January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Shock</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non-Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job loss</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business closure</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of farming, livestock activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in price of farming/business inputs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall in the price of farming/business output</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Has Your Household Been Affected by [SHOCK] Since End-January?

- **Job loss**: 12, 14, 15, 18
- **Business closure**: 7, 9, 7, 8
- **Disruption of farming, livestock activities**: 2, 1, 3, 2
- **Increase in price of farming/business inputs**: 8, 7, 14, 10
- **Fall in the price of farming/business output**: 18, 18, 18, 18

**Legend:**
- National
- Urban
- Rural
- Poor
- Non-Poor
Shock and Coping strategies (2)

- Urban and rural households take different forms of coping strategies
  - Urban households tend to reduce consumption both in food and non-food
  - Rural households are more likely to take a loan and rely on assistance from family and friends
- There were no clear differences in coping strategies between the poor and non-poor
- About one in three households did nothing against shocks

How did your household cope with these shocks? (multiple answers)

- Received assistance from Friends & family
- Borrowed from friends & family
- Took a loan from a financial institution
- Credited purchases
- Delayed payment obligations
- Reduced food consumption
- Reduced non-food Consumption
- Relied on savings
- Other
- Did nothing

% of households who experienced any shock

Urban

Rural
Concerns

- The majority of respondents are not worried about food availability in the next week
  - 61 percent of households who reported concerns about food availability in the past 30 days are no longer worried in the next week as the food prices have been recently stabilized
- Yet, nearly one in four poor households (23 percent) expressed concerns about food security in the next week
- Concerns of household finances are serious
  - On average, 20 percent of households are very worried and another 22 percent are somewhat worried about their household finances in the next month
  - In particular, over half of poor households (53 percent) expressed concerns about their finance

![Graph showing how worried respondents are about having enough to eat in the next week and their household’s finances in the next month.](image-url)
Education (1)

- Of households with any school-enrolled children, 75 percent were engaged in distance learning activities in the last week (preceding the survey)
  - There was no significant difference in participation rate across location and poverty status
  - The most popular learning activity is educational TV program (89%), followed by online sessions (37%) and assignments provided by the teacher (36%)
  - There was an urban-rural disparity in access to online sessions: 42% of urban households joined online sessions provided by teachers, while only 25% for rural households did.
- 73 percent of households with school-enrolled children communicated with their teachers in the last week, mainly by telephone (65%) and Facebook (47%)
Households are largely satisfied with the quality and implementation of learning activities, but the vast majority of children need assistance from other household members

- Among households engaged in learning activities, nearly 80 percent are satisfied with the quality and implementation of learning activities provided in the last week.
- 41 percent of households reported their children needed help frequently from other household members in learning activities. Another 36 percent said they needed occasional help.

A clear digital divide for children’s learning was seen in the ownership of digital devices. While TV is widely available across the country, poor and rural households are less likely to own computers, tablets and smartphones.
Access to health and financial services

- No visible disruptions in access to health and financial services were observed
  - More than 90 percent of households that needed medical treatment have been able to access it since end January
  - Households needing access to financial services after end January did not face disruptions