Prepared by Agnès Dhur World Food Programme August 2010

EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY ASSESSMENT IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC



Acknowledgements

The WFP Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) team is grateful to the 2000 households and 277 Key Informants in urban and rural areas of Kyrgyzstan who accepted to spend time with the enumerators and give information. Staff of the company El-Pikir in Bishkek and in the various oblasts was instrumental for the preparation and field data collection and for data entry and cleaning. Their efforts to comply with the time pressure put on them were much appreciated. Thanks also go to Mehrigiul Ablezova who offered technical advice for the sampling and produced the output tables.

Khatuna Epremidze from the Georgia WFP Country Office, and Aizhan Mamatbekova provided critical support to the preparations and implementation of the EFSA. Nadya Frank also provided valuable assistance. WFP Country Director Rasmus Egendal is very much thanked for his initiative to launch this EFSA, and his confidence in, and encouragement to the team during the exercise.

Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I – CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY	
ASSESSMENT IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC	1
1.1 – Kyrgyzstan context	1
1.2 – Rationale for the assessment	2
1.3 –Objectives of the EFSA	3
II – METHODOLOGY	3
2.1 – Sampling and sources of information	3
2.2 – Analysis of household food security	5
2.3 – Limitations	6
III – RESULTS	7
3.1 – Household food security situation	7
3.1.1 – Prevalence of food insecurity	7
3.1.2. – Location of food insecure households	/
3.2 - Demographic characteristics	9
3.2.1 - Head of household	9
3.2.2 – Average size of households	10
3.2.3 – Presence of vulnerable nousehold members	10
3.3 - Housing	11
3.3.1 – Displacement	11
3.3.2 – Destruction of nousing	12
3.4 - Main cooking fuel	12
2.5 - Water and Sanitation, nearth situation and services, and nutritional situation	12
3.5.1 – Access to water	IJ
3.5.2 – Realth Situation and Services	14
3.5.5 - Nutritional Studion	10 16
2.6.1 Number of doily mode	16
3.6.2 Kilocoloria protein and fat intaka	10
3.6.3 Food consumption patterns	10
3.6.4 Each stocks	10
2.6.5 Sources of food consumed in providue 7 days	. 19
37 – Boyerty upemployment and social assistance	20 21
3.7 - Poverty, unemployment and social assistance	24
3.7.2 Upomployment	24
3.7.2 - One inployment	25
3.8 - Income and cash sources	20 28
3.81 - Average number of cash-earning members and of cash sources	28
3.8.2 – Main sources of cash	20
$3.8.3 - \Delta verse amount of cash$	20
3.8.4 - Migrants and remittances	
3 8 5 – Use of money transfer systems or bank services	
3.9 – Main expenditures	
3.9.1 – Largest weekly expenditures	
3.9.2 – Average amount of weekly expenditures	36
3.10 – Credit or loans	38
3.11 – Crop cultivation	40
3.11.1 – Agricultural production and food availability at national level	40
3.11.2 – Household access to garden or land to cultivate	41
3.11.3 – Access to fertilizer	43
3.11.4 – Access to irrigation system	44
3.11.5 – Main crops cultivated, harvest period, sales and self-consumption	44
3.11.6 – Main constraints for cultivation	47
3.12 – Ownership of animals	49
3.12.1 - Animal ownership	50
3.12.2 – Prices of live animals	52
3.12.3 – Animal fodder	53
3.12.4 – Main constraints to raise animals	54

3.13 – Markets	56
3.13.1 – Structure and performance of markets	56
3.13.2 – Physical access to local markets	57
3.13.3 – Prices and trends	57
3.14– Assets ownership	61
3.15 – Access to education services	62
3.16 – Main shocks and problems in previous 3 months	62
3.17 – Coping strategies	64
3.17.1 – Reduced Coping Strategy Index	65
3.17.2 – Main types of coping strategies	67
3.17.3 – Strategies entailing risks for the lives and risks for the livelihoods	69
3.18 - Assistance received	
3.19 – Main priorities	73
3.19.1 – Immediate priorities	74
3.19.2 – Priorities for the next months	75
IV – FORECAST EVOLUTION OF THE FOOD SECURITY SITUATION	77
4.1 – Summary of the food security situation	77
4.1.1 – Prevalence and characteristics of food insecure households	
4.1.2 – Food security situation in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts	
4.2 – Macro-economic and poverty prospects for the next 12 months	79
4.2.1 – Macro-economic prospects	79
4.2.2 – Poverty and social prospects	81
4.2.3 – Food availability and prices prospects	81
4.3 – Prospects for Osh and Jalalabad oblasts	82
V – SUGGESTIONS FOR FOOD SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND FOR WFP'S	
OPERATIONS	84
5.1 – General considerations for the short- to medium-term	84
5.2 – Ongoing food security assistance	85
5.3 – Food security assistance requirements during the next 12 months	86
5.3.1 – Food security assistance in oblasts not directly affected by civil violence.	86
5.3.2 – Food security assistance in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts	89
5.4 – Estimated number of people needing food security assistance	90
5.5 – Duration of food security assistance for WFP interventions	92
5.6 – Food security assessments and monitoring	93
5.6.1 – Follow-up Emergency Food Security Assessment in Osh and Jalalabad	93
5.6.2 – Set up of the sentinel-site Food Security Monitoring System	95
ANNEX 1 - HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE	1
ANNEX 2 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONNAIRE	1
ANNEX 3 – DISTINCTIVE FOOD SECURITY CHARACTERISTICS OF OBLASTS AI	ND
BISHKEK CITY	1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context and methodology

- WFP has carried out food security assessments in Kyrgyzstan since 2008, using data collected by the Kyrgyz Integrated Household Survey (KIHS). In view of the violent civil unrest in April and June 2010 in several oblasts of the country, an update of the situation was felt necessary as results of the 2010 KIHS would not be available before 2011.
- The nation-wide Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) was designed to provide statistically representative household food security data at national, rural, urban and oblast levels with the aim of: (i) estimating the current degree of food insecurity and coping capacities; (ii) comparing with KIHS updates which are using different food security indicators; (iii) supporting decision-making on food security assistance interventions throughout the country for the next 12 months; (iv) informing the set-up of a sentinel-based light Food Security Monitoring System to complement the KIHS; and (v) feeding into the Crop and Food Supply Assessment (CFSA) led by FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture at the same time as the EFSA.
- Data were collected between 26 and 30 July 2010 among 2,000 households selected from 250 localities in each oblast and in Bishkek city and 277 Key informants interviewed from the various localities.
- The degree of household food insecurity was assessed by combining food consumption patterns with the amount obtained from the 2 main sources of cash, as indicator of economic access to food. Comparisons were made between rural and urban areas and between oblasts.

How many are food insecure?

- More than a quarter of households were food insecure (27%) mostly moderately (23%). The overall prevalence of food insecurity is close to the prevalence estimated from the reanalysis of the KIHS (33% food insecure) but severe insecurity is lower (20% in KIHS). The difference is explained by the use of distinct indicators to assess food consumption and economic access to food. The EFSA is believed to have underestimated the prevalence of severe food insecurity due to good dietary diversity rendered possibly by the large seasonal availability of food from own production. Conversely KIHS would tend to overestimate the severity of food insecurity.
- This would represent **1,387,430 food insecure persons** at the time of the assessment. Most of the estimated 84,010 IDPs in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts are expected to be among the food insecure, given the high level of food insecurity found in the Rapid EFSA conducted early July.

Where are the food insecure and malnourished individuals?

• Food insecurity was more likely to affect rural than urban households. The highest prevalence of food insecurity was in **Osh** oblast (55%), followed by Yssyk-Kul, Talas, Batken and Jalalabad oblasts. The best food security situation was in Bishkek city and Chuy oblast.

Who are the food insecure people?

• Food insecure households are mostly large families, including under-5 children as well as vulnerable members such as pregnant/lactating women and chronically sick individuals. In Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, they are likely to have suffered heavy damage to their housing. Rural food insecure households own less land and animals. Urban food insecure households often lack regular employment or a steady source of income.

• The main livelihood characteristics of food insecure households are summarized below.

Livelihood assets	Characteristics of food insecure households	
Human and social	 Headed by an adult older than 60 years of age, especially if woman Include under-5 children, pregnant or lactating woman, and/or chronically sick member(s); Large family size (7 or more) – 3 or more children 	
Physical and natural	 Large raminy size (7 or more) – 3 or more children IDP: house destroyed or severely damaged by violence last April or in June; also living in temporary shelter/tent in their house compound; Likely to use wood or animal dung as main cooking fuel; No food stocks, or stocks for less than 2 weeks; No access to garden or land for cultivation and to fertilizer; Lost/decreased harvest and low duration for own consumption (3 months or less) for those who can cultivate; No animals (may have been lost in recent unrest) or less than 9 poultry, less than 9 sheep, less than 4 cattle; Loss/no animals or less than 9 poultry, less than 9 sheep, less than 4 cattle; No (may have been lost in recent unrest) petty trade stock, or shop; Impaired access to and/or to workplaced. 	
Financial assets	 Only 1 member able to earn cash; Loss of life or health problems of a bread-winner; Reliance on charity, sale of crops, sale of vegetables, irregular unskilled wage labour and pensions/allowances as main sources of cash and income, providing low, unreliable and/or unsustainable income. 	

Why are people food insecure?

- Lack of means to produce enough food and insufficient cash to purchase diversified food explain inadequate food consumption. While quantities of staples consumed are generally enough to meet kilocalorie needs, intake of dairy products, animal products (dairies, meat, eggs, fish), pulses, vegetables and fruits is insufficient (especially in winter and in pre-harvest time), leading to vitamin and mineral deficiencies, higher susceptibility to disease, stunting among young children, and decreased learning and productive capacities.
- Food production of food insecure households is limited by low acreage, difficulties to procure agricultural inputs, lack of manpower, as well as inability to pay for veterinary services and animal feed. Unemployment, under-employment and low education levels prevent food insecure households from obtaining stable and well-paid occupations.
- Recent harvest of major staple (wheat, potato) and ongoing harvest of vegetables and fruits enabled many rural households to rely on their own production for food consumption and to decrease the share of food typically purchased on markets. However, rural households still bought about half of their food and urban households the majority of it. Food expenditures represented about half of the 4 main expenditures of households at this time of the year and probably more when food stocks are exhausted. The share of harvest kept for family consumption would not last more than 3-5 months for food insecure households.
- Humanitarian assistance was not a major source of food. It contributed to about 10%-13% of the wheat, oil and sugar consumed. However, it seemed correctly targeted to the food insecure and would be expected to help them access other items, particularly nutritious but expensive food such as animal products.
- The **purchasing power of food insecure households has deteriorated**. Although prices of food have gone down compared to 2008, they still remain higher than the average for the last five years. Wheat prices had started to increase mid-August, reflecting the rise of wheat price on international markets, effects of the Russian ban on exports, lower harvests in other major wheat producing countries, including Kazakhstan, and lower domestic wheat harvest. Pensions, allowances and salaries have augmented in past months but not sufficiently to compensate for the rise of prices of food, fuel and other productive inputs and to lift food insecure households out of poverty. Many of the poorest are also excluded from social assistance.
- Food insecure households rely on irregular and low-paying sources of cash: sales of crops or vegetables, independent work, irregular unskilled wage labour, pensions or charity. Most of the

cash thus obtained is low, meaning that these households remain **below the official poverty** line.

• Lack of assets and savings also **prevent food insecure households to cope with shocks** such as bad weather affecting harvest, animal disease, mudslide, violence and insecurity, and health problems. Even though not frequently, a very large proportion of severely food insecure households (40%) engaged in strategies that entail risks for the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members, including spending days without eating, skipping meals and reducing health expenditures. About 1/3 of food insecure households used strategies that jeopardize their future livelihoods such as excessive sale of animals, consumption of seed stocks or sale of productive assets. Reflecting the overall general hardship and economic depression, 1/5 of food secure households also employed these strategies.

How is the situation likely to evolve?

- Macro-economic prospects are pessimistic for the rest of 2010, with a negative 3.5% GDP growth and a decrease of GDP per capita to US\$826. Projections for 2011 are optimistic however, with GDP growth anticipated at 7.1%. Many farmers are likely to face hardship due to decreased agricultural output as a result of the April and June 2010 civil unrest and augmentation of petrol and diesel prices that translate into higher fertilizer and other agricultural production costs. Unemployment rates will also rise due to physical damage to businesses and business closure in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, and drying up of tourism in Yssyk-Kul oblast, although reconstruction activities in the south may somewhat alleviate the situation.
- Wheat and bread prices are expected to augment sharply as a result of higher wheat price on international market, suspension of wheat exports by Russia and increased export prices in Kazakhstan. This may lead to both shortages and rocketing prices which will seriously hurt Kyrgyz households, since bread is the main staple. Poor and food insecure farmers are net buyers of wheat and will not benefit from a price increase.
- Pensions and wages were raised recently and a rebound of remittances from migrants took place in the 1st quarter of 2010. Together with the forecasted slowdown of inflation, this may ease somewhat the economic situation of households. Nevertheless, **poverty is expected to rise** given the projected economic contraction. **Given the strong association between poverty and food security, the latter is also expected to worsen**.
- The conditions in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts remain highly volatile with a continuation of low intensity ethnic conflict, sporadic security coverage and deep scars left by the violence. The poverty and social impacts of the events will not be fully reversed by the reconstruction of infrastructure or the payment of compensation for lost livelihoods. The Government is taking measures to replace lost official documents in order to facilitate access to assistance, to provide cash compensation for affected families and rebuild houses. Food insecurity among IDPs had reached alarming levels early July 2010 and is likely to deteriorate as pre-crisis livelihoods will not be recovered before the winter. The food security situation of residents in affected areas is also anticipated to deteriorate as access to jobs, fields and markets remain difficult.
- In addition, Kyrgyzstan remains highly susceptible to natural hazards (e.g. earthquake, mudflows, land slides, snow storms etc.) which can cause heavy losses of lives, livestock and crops, and damage to infrastructure. **The population's resilience capacity is limited** by the low asset base and lack of opportunities to diversify livelihoods.

Which type of food security assistance is suggested for the next 12 months?

• A combination of short- and medium-term interventions is necessary to address both urgent food security and nutrition needs, and address the main factors of food insecurity. Donors have pledged US\$1.1 billion at the end of July 2010 to help the Government and the private sector to: (i) cover essential public expenditures and services, (ii) support housing, livelihoods, social protection and other social programmes, (iii) rebuild destroyed private commercial and public buildings, and (iv) support agriculture and security-related programmes. The Government, with donors' support, has a direct responsibility in strengthening the social assistance system, generating employment, and providing a package of nutrition interventions to tackle underlying causes of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition, and decrease risks of further civil unrest.

- WFP has been implementing a Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF) programme since 2009, targeting between 250,000 and 333,000 individuals in 6 oblasts. WFP also assisted some 532,400 IDP, host family and resident individuals in July/early August 2010 in violence-affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. A cash transfer proposal has been prepared to complement food rations distributed to the poorest and severely food insecure households in these areas. Other agencies are also implementing cash transfer projects.
- In view of the absence of improvement expected in the next 12 months, food security assistance is required especially in the winter and pre-harvest months for the 1,387,430 persons estimated to be food insecure at the time of the survey. These include households who are chronically food insecure as well as households who have become food insecure due to the civil unrest and economic depression, or natural disasters.
- Food security assistance is understood as a range of support activities, including agricultural interventions, productive safety nets (e.g. employment in times of low seasonal work opportunities and community asset creation), income-generation activities, and social safety nets such as food and cash transfers, school feeding and assistance to specific vulnerable groups such as those affected by HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis.
- WFP already targets chronically food insecure households in 6 oblasts through its VGF programme and should consider expanding it to additional locations and oblasts. 'Newly' food insecure households represent those who have lost their house, animals and safe access to land, pasture, markets and jobs. Most of them are currently located in violence-affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, but others have been hit indirectly by the civil troubles through business closure and economic downturn, such as in Yssyk-Kul due to losses incurred during the traditional tourist season.
- Considering that ³⁄₄ of rural households and ¹⁄₄ of urban households have access to garden or land and own animals, **agricultural support activities** are important to facilitate access to good quality inputs and services, and marketing. For those without sufficient land acreage or animals, **food or cash transfers** (unconditional or productive safety net activities) can be considered, depending on safety and accessibility of markets and risks of inflation. Complementary **support to the government's school feeding programme** is also an option to improve the nutritional quality of children's snack and encourage regular school attendance, provided other constraints (lack of teachers, poor school facilities) are also addressed. **Chronically sick individuals affected by tuberculosis or HIV/AIDS** living in food insecure and poor households could also benefit from food and/or cash assistance, as per programmes implemented elsewhere.
- An estimated **339,760 currently food secure households are considered at risk of becoming food insecure** in the next months due to the forecast deterioration of the economic situation, increased hardship in winter time when food stocks are exhausted and additional expenses for heating and education are incurred, as well as use of severe coping strategies that may affect health and nutrition in the medium-term. Livelihood support to protect food security in this group would be valuable, particularly in the agricultural sector and for job creation in periods of low employment opportunities.
- Capacity building to government and private institutions to better analyse food security and target food insecure households with social assistance will also be valuable as well as advocacy to expand the coverage and amount of social benefits.
- A follow-up Rapid EFSA is recommended in violence-affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, to gauge the extent of recovery and adjust needs that were estimated early July. The FAO/WFP Crop and Food Supply Assessment that was conducted at the same time as the EFSA will provide additional information on harvest and requirements for commercial imports and food assistance. The results of the nation-wide EFSA should be used to establish a light Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) to complement the KIHS by providing early warning of changes in household food security and nutritional situation. It is suggested to pilot the FSMS in Osh or in Yssyk-Kul oblast, considering the high prevalence of household food insecurity there, and to expand the FSMS to 4 oblasts in 2012.

I – CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY ASSESSMENT IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

1.1 – Kyrgyzstan context

Kyrgyzstan is a low-income country with a population of approximately 5 million inhabitants. Around 70% live in rural and high mountainous areas. Poverty is widespread, affecting 1/3 of the population including 6% extremely poor. While poverty rates declined significantly in the period 2003-2008 owing to strong economic growth, progress was halted in 2008-2009 by the effects of the food and fuel price crisis and of the global economic crisis.

Kyrgyzstan is also prone to various natural disasters, including earthquake, floods, land slides as well as avalanches and snow storms in winter.

Violent political and civil unrest in April and June 2010 has been attributed to a conjunction of factors including poor governance, continuing poverty and widening socio-economic disparities, as well as competition over productive resources, harsh border regimes that stifle commerce and movement of people while feeding corruption, drugs smuggling (especially in the south), and widespread unemployment and under-employment particularly of youth¹. The main elements are summarized in Box 1. The change in government deepened regional divisions and alienated many southern Kyrgyz who felt that "their" president Bakyiev had been unlawfully removed by northern rivals.

Box 1 – Civil troubles of April and June 2010 in Kyrgyzstan

In early April 2010, anti-government political demonstrations took place in various cities of the Kyrgyz Republic against the authoritarian tendencies of the president that had led to a centralization of power within the presidency. Protests were fuelled by economic and social policy decisions taken without adequate public consultation (e.g. rise in electricity tariffs). Moreover, there was a widespread belief that corruption and misuse of public assets had risen markedly. These protests culminated in riots in Bishkek and several other cities on April 7-8 and violent crackdown by the government, the subsequent removal of the president from office, and the formation of an interim government headed by a coalition of opposition political and civil leaders. The events led to loss of life and injuries, the destruction of private and public property, a weakening of confidence within the private sector, and to economic and fiscal pressures.

In June, social tensions that had been on the rise in the south of the country with a population fractured by divided loyalties to the new government, climaxed into violent inter-ethnic clashes over 3 days, particularly in the cities of Osh and Jalalabad, including ethnically-directed extreme, brutal violence and targeted arson (mostly affecting Uzbek communities). The death toll is uncertain but could exceed 2,000 persons, and over 2,500 were injured. Large-scale destruction of public and private property, especially housing occurred.

In the wake of the violence, an estimated 75,000 people sought refuge in neighbouring Uzbekistan and a further 300,000 were estimated to be internally displaced within the southern oblasts. Refugees returned within about 10 days and all but 75,000 IDPs also returned to their homes by mid-July. Overall, 400,000 persons have been affected by the crisis.

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010

The April and June events have profoundly impinged on the economy and caused much hardship to violence-affected population as well as other population groups who suffered from loss of jobs and income as a result of depressed investment, border trade, tourism and businesses, and reduced access to productive inputs, crop fields and local markets. **Coming in the aftermath of the high food and fuel price and global economic crises, these factors have halted the progress made in previous years in poverty reduction and**

¹ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010

likely worsened the situation of vulnerable households or already chronically food insecure.

1.2 – Rationale for the assessment

WFP initiated household food security analyses in Kyrgyzstan in 2008 in the context of harsh winter and high food and fuel price crises. Using data collected by the government Kyrgyz Integrated Household Survey (KIHS) since 2006, the food security situation of households was evaluated using poverty (economic access) and food consumption indicators derived from levels of income and kilocalorie intake². Regular updates were done in 2009 and early 2010 using data from the KIHS of the previous year up to the last quarter available. In July 2010, a rapid Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) was conducted in Osh and Jalalabad cities and surroundings to estimate the impact of the civil violence that took place mid-June on the food security situation of the affected population³.

The KIHS is a nation-wide statistically representative survey collecting extensive information from almost 6,000 households each 3 months in rural and urban areas throughout the country, including demography, education, income, access to social allowances, expenditures, dietary intake (food diary), asset ownership, cultivation, animal husbandry, credit, housing conditions and more. The weight and height of children under-5 years of age are also measured. For food security, the KIHS presents a number of qualities but also limitations, which are summarized in Box 2.

Box 2 – Strengths and limitations of KIHS for household food security analysis

- KIHS is a very rich source of detailed data on cash income (including a cash-conversion of own agricultural production and other assets) that can be used to approximate levels of economic access to food, and on kilocalorie intake that can be used to approximate the adequacy of food consumption;
- data collected on many other elements allow to identify factors associated with poverty and food insecurity;
- the high frequency of its data collection rounds enables an analysis of seasonal trends;
- the collection of information on child nutritional status permits to investigate relationships between child malnutrition and households food insecurity.

KIHS limitations that prevent an optimal use for decision-making on food security assistance interventions:

- results from each quarterly round are only available 6 to 9 months after data collection, and the annual report is issued one year or later after the data collection year;
- there is little quality control of the work of supervisors and enumerators in the field and the lack of resources at their disposal, such as for transportation, may hamper the respect of proper sampling and data collection techniques, such as for anthropometric measurements;
- some key components of food security analysis are not included, including food stocks, coping strategies and exposure to shocks;
- it is difficult to regroup the multitude of income sources and activities into livelihood groups that can be used for programming and targeting purposes.

The economic and energy crisis of 2008, and the civil violence that took place in April and mid-June 2010, have highlighted the need for a system able to provide timely information on household food security information and on the main dynamic factors at household and geographical levels contributing to changes in the situation. In addition, it was felt important to capture the impact of the recent troubles on household food security, without waiting for the results of the 2010 KIHS, in order to design interventions with no delays. The nation-wide

² For the re-analyses of KIHS data, the National Statistics Committee was contracted to produce output tables additional to the ones they already process, as per a Plan of Analysis provided by WFP.

³ Rapid Emergency Food Security Assessment in Osh and Jalalabad, Kyrgyz Republic. World Food Programme, July 2010.

EFSA was launched to provide up-to-date data on household food security for use by WFP and partners to decide on both humanitarian and recovery interventions, as well as to inform the set-up of a sentinel-based Food Security Monitoring System⁴ to complement the KIHS. The EFSA was also timed to coincide and feed into the FAO/Ministry of Agriculture-led Crop and Food Supply Assessment.

1.3 – Objectives of the EFSA

The main objectives of the EFSA were to:

- estimate the prevalence of household food insecurity at national, urban and rural levels, as well as at oblast level and Bishkek city;
- determine the coping strategies used by households to mitigate food insecurity and their effects on livelihoods and resilience to shocks;
- Identify the main structural and dynamic factors associated with food insecurity that can be used for targeting;
- Anticipate the likely evolution of the food security situation of households in the next 12 months, taking into account the forecasts for the next agricultural season, households' food stocks, income sources, coping strategies, and political and macro-economic prospects;
- Determine the requirements for relief and recovery assistance (in-kind, cash-based or agricultural) to protect and improve household food security in the next 12 months.

The EFSA also intended to:

- provide a baseline for the future Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) and suggest areas of high food insecurity where the FSMS could focus;
- contribute to the Crop and Food Supply Assessment led by FAO by providing householdlevel information on crops, animals and food security;
- enable some comparison with KIHS updates which are using a different set of indicators.

II – METHODOLOGY

Note: In the survey and throughout the report, a 'household' is defined as a group of individuals who live together and share food and income resources. Households are considered separate 'units' if they do not share these resources, even if they live under the same roof.

2.1 – Sampling and sources of information

In order to derive statistically representative data at national, urban and rural levels⁵, as well as at oblast level in the 7 oblasts⁶ and in Bishkek city, a two-stage cluster sampling approach was applied to select localities (first stage) and households (second stage). In each oblast and in Bishkek city, 250 households were randomly selected as follows:

 25 clusters (villages/city neighbourhoods) randomly selected in each oblast and Bishkek city proportionally to the population size (systematic sampling). Rural/urban strata were defined in each oblast so that the number of clusters per strata was proportional to the rural/urban share of the total population in the oblast;

⁴ Under an AIDCO-funded project to *Improve the Food Security Information System in the Kyrgyz Republic*, FAO and WFP will collaborate to strengthen the quality and timeliness of information collected on the agricultural sector and markets, support the National Statistics Committee to enhance the KIHS process and analysis, and set up a Food Security Monitoring System probably focusing on sentinel sites in areas of high prevalence of food insecurity.

⁵ There are 25 urban settlements in Kyrgyzstan, including the country's two largest cities of Bishkek (1.2 million persons) and Osh (600,000 persons) and 23 smaller towns (668,000 persons).

⁶ Yssyk-Kul, Batken, Naryn, Talas, Osh, Jalalabad, Chuy

• 10 households randomly selected per village/city neighbourhood using existing lists or by dividing localities in blocks of approximately the same size⁷ if no lists were available.

The final sample (see Table 1) included 2000 households, including 669 in urban areas (33%) and 1331 in rural areas (67%). The distribution urban/rural of the sample⁸ is close to national averages (31%/69%).



Source: Census March 2009, National Statistics Committee, 2010

A total of 277 Key Informants, generally a local administration employee, school principal, health agent, agricultural officer and/or NGO representative, were interviewed in the various selected localities. About 60% were men and 40% women.

Some locations of the sample included IDPs, mostly in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts as well as a few in Bishkek city, Talas, Batken and Yssyk-Kul oblasts. The household sample in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts included 26 households displaced⁹ due to the violence in June (IDPs).

Oblact/oity	Households		Average number of Key Informants per locality			
Oblasticity	Urban	Rural	Total	Men	Women	Total
Total	669	1331	2000	164	112	277
Yssyk-Kul	80	170	250	0.6	0.6	1.3
Batken	53	197	250	1.0	0.3	1.3
Naryn	47	203	250	0.6	0.4	1.0
Talas	44	206	250	1.1	0.8	1.9
Osh	74	176	250	1.2	0.6	1.8
Jalalabad	63	187	250	1.1	0.3	1.4
Chuy	58	192	250	0.5	0.7	1.2
Bishkek city	250	0	250	0.4	0.8	1.2

Table 1 – Sample of the EFSA

A Household and a Key Informant questionnaire (translated in Russian, Kyrgyz and Uzbek) were administered in each selected locality (see Annexes 1 and 2). Data collection took place between 25 and 29 July 2010. Considering the information already available from the various KIHS updates and Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) surveys undertaken by WFP and its partners after food distributions in several oblasts, the EFSA focused on key information needed to understand the food security situation, some 'dynamic' factors associated with food insecurity, and capacities of the population. Data were collected on demographics, housing,

⁷ Enumerators identified blocks of about the same population size (houses or flats) within the locality. One block was selected and the number of households counted. The total was divided by the number of households to interview (10) in order to define which households to interview. Enumerators moved along the block systematically on the right hand-side to interview each randomly selected household.

⁸ Weights were applied to the results to reflect the actual distribution of the population between rural/urban areas and in the various oblasts and Bishkek city.

⁹ This number was too low to run statistics for IDPs as a distinct category.

livelihoods (income sources, food sources, main expenditures), ownership of assets, food consumption patterns, food stocks, coping strategies, access to assistance, exposure to shocks and priorities.

Key Informants were interviewed on the locality's population, main livelihoods, markets access and prices, access to services (health, education), main shocks, vulnerable groups and priorities Whenever relevant, questions were asked separately for IDPs and residents.

A national company (El Pikir) was contracted to: (i) draw the sample, (ii) translate the questionnaires in Kyrgyz and Uzbek, (iii) identify and train enumerators, and (iv) collect, enter and clean the data. A national consultant supported the company when necessary and processed the output tables. WFP trained the supervisors and enumerators of several oblasts, prepared the Plan of Analysis, analysed and interpreted the data.

Comparisons were made between urban and rural areas, oblasts and food security groups.

2.2 – Analysis of household food security

The degree of food insecurity at household level ('severely food insecure', 'moderately food insecure', 'food secure') was determined by combining the WFP standard Food Consumption Score (FCS) with the main source of income and level of income as food access indicator¹⁰.

For each indicator, groups of households were created as follows:

• Food Consumption Score: 3 groups ('poor', 'borderline', 'acceptable') based on the thresholds used in previous surveys in Kyrgyzstan (28,42):

Food Consumption	Food Consumption Score	Food Consumption Score	Food Consumption
Groups	below 28	between 28-42	Score above 42

3 food access groups ('poor', 'average' or 'good'), based on the average monthly cash
obtained per capita from the 1st and 2nd main cash sources¹¹, compared to the official
extreme poverty line and to the poverty line:

¹⁰ The combination of a food access indicator with the Food Consumption Score was needed because:

a) Food consumption patterns over 7 days prior to the survey do not indicate how sustainable is the diet, especially considering that the survey took place just after the wheat and potato harvests and at a time of high availability of vegetables and fruits;

b) Sources of cash complement the food consumption indicator with information on the ability to purchase food, considering that the majority of food consumed by Kyrgyz households must be purchased.

In the Rapid EFSA in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts conducted in July 2010, sources of food were combined with sources of income to inform on economic access to food. However, in this nation-wide EFSA, the majority of households only used 2 sources of food, both considered relatively "good" (own production and purchases) and it was therefore not possible to discriminate between households having "poor", "average" and "good" sources of food.

<u>Note</u>: Other food access indicators than sources of food and sources of income could also have been considered but were found less robust than the sources of food and cash to identify economic access capacity. These include ownership of productive assets or duration of food stocks for household self-consumption. ¹¹ The majority of households had 2 income sources. On average the 1st source of cash provided 69%

¹¹ The majority of households had 2 income sources. On average the 1st source of cash provided 69% of total cash obtained and 2nd source of income provided about 31% of total cash. This criteria was chosen in order to be as close as possible to the methodology used for previous re-analyses of the KIHS.

Food Access Groups	Poor: Less than 960 KGS/capita/month In general, this corresponded to the following 1 st source of cash: Irregular wage labour unskilled Sale of crops Sale vegetables Petty trade Pension/allowances Sale of humanitarian assistance Sale of assets, of domestic belongings Charity	Average: Between 960 and 1575 KGS/capita/month. In general, this corresponded to the following 1 st source of cash: • Sale animal products or animals • Regular wage labour unskilled • Independent worker • Government employee • Rent of land or property • Remittances • Use of personal savings, sale jewellery • Credit, loans from organizations	Good: More than 1,575 KGS/capita/month. In general, this corresponded to the following 1 st source of cash: • Sale handicrafts • Regular wage labour skilled • Employment in UN/NGO • Small business • Large business

The 3 food security groups were obtained by cross-tabulating the 3 Food Consumption Groups with the 3 food access groups (see below):

Food access	Food consumption (FC) groups			
groups (cash level)	Poor	Borderline	Acceptable	Total
Poor	% severely food insecure	% severely food insecure	% moderately food insecure	% poor access
Average	% severely food insecure	% moderately food insecure	% food secure	% average access
Good	% moderately food insecure	% food secure	% food secure	% good access
Total	% poor FC	% borderline FC	% acceptable FC	100%

2.3 – Limitations

While the Russian translation of the English questionnaires was carefully checked, lack of fluent Kyrgyz- and Uzbek- speakers prevented a similar check of the translations in these languages. The training carried out enabled to clarify meanings however.

Training of enumerators was completed in only a day, leaving no time for a field pilot or roleplay exercises. There was also limited direct supervision of the enumerators, as many villages were remotely located and the supervisor could not accompany each enumerator. On the other hand, the workload of the enumerators was low (only 10 household and 1 Key Informant questionnaires to fill in), thus contributing to better quality of the data collection process.

The sampling approach that was used does not enable to identify areas of high prevalence of food insecurity below the level of oblasts, nor for individual cities in the oblasts. For programming purposes and to design the sentinel-based Food Security Monitoring System, an additional step of analysis will need to take place within the oblasts showing the highest proportions of food insecure households.

In Bishkek city and other towns, sampling was based on territorial community councils (groups of streets). Semi-informal settlements in the periphery of cities (*'novostroiki'*) were not included¹². As poor households tend to concentrate in these settlements, the prevalence of food insecurity at urban level may be underestimated.

Too few IDP households were included in the random sample to derive valid results that can be generalized for this particular group.

¹² Bishkek has about 50 such settlements with a population estimated between 125,000 and 200,000 (up to 1/5 of the capital's total population). Osh has 8 with a total population of possibly in excess of 50,000.

III – RESULTS

3.1 – Household food security situation

<u>3.1.1 – Prevalence of food insecurity</u>

- More than a quarter of households were food insecure (27%) mostly moderately (23%) rather than severely (4%). This is lower than the proportion of food insecure households estimated from the re-analysis of the national Kyrgyz Integrated Household Survey (KIHS). Since 2006, KIHS data indicated that about 1/3 of the population was food insecure (33%), including 20% severely.
- The prevalence of global food insecurity is close between the two surveys. The difference of proportion of severe food insecurity is likely explained by the use of distinct indicators to assess food consumption and economic access to food (see Box 3).

Box 3 – Possible factors of discrepancy between EFSA and KIHS estimates of food insecurity

Food consumption and kilocalorie intake

- The EFSA found a much lower proportion of households consuming a 'poor' diet than the KIHS (4% versus 20%). In the EFSA, food consumption was approximated by the frequency and diversity of consumption of food items. Studies conducted in several countries¹³ have found that the severity of kilocalorie shortfall is underestimated in the 'poor' food consumption group. Furthermore, the assessment took place at time of large food availability owing to recent or ongoing harvest of wheat, potato, vegetables and fruits, enabling households to consume a diverse diet without needing much market purchase. As households are not food self-sufficient and many are poor, the EFSA most likely **underestimates the severity of inadequate food consumption** on a yearly basis.
- On the other hand, kilocalorie intake of a large proportion of KIHS individuals would be below-survival kilocalorie intake contributing to an **overestimation of the severity of poor food consumption** in the KIHS.

Food access and poverty

- The EFSA found a larger proportion of households in extreme poverty, based on cash earnings below the extreme poverty line: 25% of households earned less cash than the extreme poverty line, compared to 6% of households in the KIHS. The EFSA relied on households' self-report of cash sources. No details were sought, the enquiry was limited to 3 sources of income and the cash-equivalent of own production was not included. It is probable therefore, that **extreme poverty was overestimated** in the EFSA.
- In KIHS re-analyses, detailed accounting of cash sources, including a valuation of own production, is used to define access groups, potentially resulting in a more accurate estimation. However, the extreme poverty line used in the last KIHS re-analyses (2009) was much lower than the January 2010 official extreme poverty line (640 KGS versus 960 KGS), thus suggesting a potential underestimation of extreme poverty in the KIHS.
- Acknowledging a likely underestimation of inadequate food consumption and overestimation of extreme poverty, the EFSA results are deemed to represent correctly the prevalence of food insecurity across the country, although most probably underestimating its severity. The KIHS, in turn, probably overestimates the severity of food insecurity.

<u>3.1.2. – Location of food insecure households</u>

• As noted in KIHS, the prevalence of food insecurity was higher in rural than urban areas. About **1/3 of rural households were food insecure**, compared to 17% of urban households.

¹³ Validation of Food Frequency and Dietary Diversity as Proxy Indicators of Household Food Security. IFPRI, World Food Programme. May 2008.

- High prevalence of food insecurity was found in **Osh** oblast (55%) reflecting the hardship caused by the violence in June. This is despite the fact that 42% of households in Osh had received food aid during the 3 months prior to the survey (June-July). In the Rapid EFSA carried out early July 2010, 60% of IDPs were food insecure and 20-25% of host families and residents.
- **Yssyk-Kul** and **Talas** were the next oblasts with high levels of food insecurity, affecting about 40% of households, followed by **Batken** oblast (31% food insecure). These findings are consistent with KIHS, with the exception of **Naryn** oblast (22% food insecure in the EFSA versus 47% in KIHS 2009). This is most likely due to the high proportion of households having access to animals and consuming animal products in Naryn oblast, which enabled many households to consume an acceptable diet¹⁴ despite widespread poverty. Poverty may also have been temporarily alleviated owing to the availability of produce to sell. In addition, 36% of households in Naryn oblast had received food aid during the 3 months prior to the survey¹⁵.
- An average prevalence of food insecurity was found in **Jalalabad** oblast (28%) despite the violence that took place in the city in June and the fact that "only" 22% had received food aid during the previous 3 months.
- Very low levels of food insecurity were found in **Bishkek** city (1%) and **Chuy** oblast (6%). This is also consistent with KIHS though much lower (24% and 23% respectively in 2009). This may be linked to the high proportion of migrants found in both Bishkek and Chuy and related access to remittances, as well as better access to food from own production in Chuy and better access to income-earning opportunities in Bishkek. Also, the survey in Bishkek did not include poor neighbourhoods which are not included in the census and were not part of the sampling frame. Food insecurity is expected to be higher in these areas, as noted in the survey¹⁶ conducted by WFP in November 2008.



¹⁴ The methodology used to define food consumption groups assigns weights to the various food items. A high weight is attributed to animal products.

¹⁵ Mostly WFP distributions under its Vulnerable Group Feeding programme in July 2010.

¹⁶ Rapid Food Security Assessment in the Periphery of Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan. WFP, November 2008.



3.2 - Demographic characteristics

Overview: Food insecure households were larger than food secure households. This was true independently of the sex of the head of household. Even though woman-headed households tended to include a larger number of vulnerable members than man-headed households, they were not more likely to be food insecure than man-headed households were smaller than rural households, partly explaining to the variation of level of food insecurity between urban and rural areas.

Food insecure households also included larger number of vulnerable members than food secure households, also independently from the sex of the head of household. Older heads of households were encountered in Yssyk-Kul, Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts. Larger families were living in Talas, Batken and Jalalabad oblasts. Higher average numbers of vulnerable members were found in Talas, Osh and Jalalabad oblasts.

3.2.1 - Head of household

- About ¼ of households were **woman-headed**.
- Woman-headed households are more likely to be found in **urban** than rural areas (30% versus 20%).
- Woman-headed households were not more likely to be food insecure than man-headed households. This seems mostly explained by the fact that woman-headed households obtained on average larger amounts of cash per capita from most cash-earning activities or sources, than man-headed households (see paragraph 3.8.3), which enables them to compensate for their comparative disadvantage in terms of number of vulnerable household members (see paragraph 3.2.3), access to garden or land (see paragraph 3.11.2) and animal ownership (see paragraph 3.12.1).
- Heads of households were 47 years of age on average.
- Households headed by an adult above 60 years of age were more likely to be moderately food insecure than households headed by a younger adult. Elderly woman-headed households were more likely to be severely food insecure than younger woman-headed households.

<u>By oblast</u>

- The highest proportion of **woman-headed households** was in **Bishkek** (more than 1/3), followed by **Chuy** oblast, while lower proportions were found in Batken (14%) and Jalalabad (18%) oblasts. Generally, the proportions of female-headed households were lower than those reported in the KIHS survey. A difference in definition of 'female-headed' is not excluded¹⁷.
- Heads of household tended to be older in Yssyk-Kul, Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts (around 48 years) and younger in Bishkek and Talas oblast (around 45 years).

<u>3.2.2 – Average size of households</u>

- The average household size was 5.8 members, including 12% under-5, 14% primary school-aged children, 17% children 12-18 years, 25% adults and 8% adults older than 60 years of age.
- As found in previous surveys, **food insecure** households were **larger** than food secure households: 7-8 members and 5 members respectively.
- Woman-headed households were smaller than man-headed households (5 versus 6 members) except in Batken and Osh oblasts where household size was about 7 members whatever the sex of the head of household. However, food insecure woman-headed households were larger than food secure woman-headed household, confirming the role played by family size in food insecurity, over and above the sex of the head of household.

<u>By oblast</u>

• Larger family sizes were found in Talas, Batken and Jalalabad oblasts (around 7 members), while smaller family sizes were found in Bishkek city, Chuy and Yssyk-kul oblasts (less than 5 members). Larger family size is associated with poverty (see paragraph 3.7) and food insecurity. A higher prevalence of poverty was noted in Jalalabad oblast (37%) than in other oblasts. However, poverty was also widespread in Yssyk-Kul oblast (46%) and Naryn (44%) oblasts even though the average family size was less than 6 members, reflecting the importance of other contributing factors of poverty in these oblasts (unemployment, low agricultural productivity etc.).

<u>3.2.3 – Presence of vulnerable household members</u>

- Food insecure households were more likely to have vulnerable members, including under-5 children, pregnant and lactating women, and chronically sick individuals, than food secure households.
- The average number of vulnerable members was higher in **women-headed households** in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Batken** and **Naryn** oblasts. Conversely, it was lower in women-headed households in Talas and Jalalabad oblasts. The reasons for these differences are unclear.

<u>By oblast</u>

• Overall, the average number of **vulnerable members** (children under 5 years of age, elderly, chronically sick and pregnant/lactating women) was higher in **Talas, Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts.

¹⁷ In this EFSA, the sex of the head of household was determined by the answer given by the respondent. As such, a respondent could declare that a man was the head of household even if he was a long-term migrant. It reflected the fact that this migrant was still considered the main decision-maker in the household. It is likely that in the KIHS only heads of household living in their household for most months of the year were considered, hence out-migrants (mostly men) would not have been recorded as head of household

- Higher numbers of **under-5 children** per household were found in **Naryn**, **Talas**, **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts. Lower numbers of under-5 children per household were found in Bishkek and Chuy oblasts. Higher numbers of **elderly members** (60 years and above) were reported in **Talas** and **Osh** oblasts.
- The highest average number of **chronically sick** household members was reported in **Talas** while lower numbers were found in household of Batken and Jalalabad oblasts, and Bishkek city.
- The average numbers of **pregnant and/or lactating women** were higher in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts, followed by Batken, Talas and Yssyk-Kul.



3.3 – Housing

Overview: The assessment estimated that there could be some 44,720 displaced persons (6,320 households) in Osh and 39,290 displaced persons (5,810 households) in Jalalabad oblasts (total 88,410 IDPs, or 12,130 households). The level of housing destruction has been widespread particularly in Osh oblast. Some house damage was also reported in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts, mostly during unrest last April.

Those households whose house had been totally or partially destroyed were clearly more food insecure than other households.

<u>3.3.1 – Displacement</u>

- The majority of households lived in their own or rented house, and were not sharing their dwelling with another family (or did not consider that they were distinct families). Only 8% indicated that 2 families shared the house and 3% that 3 families shared the house. Probably reflecting recent displacement, the proportions of households with 2 families tended to be higher in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts (4% and 6% respectively).
- Food insecure households were more likely to share their house with another family.
- Based on the population size per oblast (see Table 2) and the proportions of households found in the sample, there would be some **44,720 displaced persons** (6,320 households) **in Osh** and **39,290 displaced persons** (5,810 households) **in Jalalabad oblasts,** reaching a **total of 84,010 IDPs, (12,130 households)**.

Table 2 - Number of persons and households not living in their own or rented house

	Hosted	Non-hosted persons	Total not livir rented	ng in own or house
	persons		persons	households
Osh	8,943	35,773	44,716	6,316
Jalalabad	36,835	2,456	39,291	5,812
TOTAL	45,778	38,228	84,007	12,128



3.3.2 – Destruction of housing

- The number of IDPs in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts in the sample is too low to enable to derive reliable estimates on the number of houses destroyed or damaged at oblast level.
- A few households in **Yssyk-Kul, Naryn** and **Talas** oblasts also reported that their house had been stoned and damage during civil unrest in April or June. The low numbers do not enable any extrapolation of meaningful figures at oblast level, however the results do point towards insecurity and violence in several areas of the country.
- Food insecure households, especially the severely food insecure, were more likely to report a full destruction or partial destruction preventing living in their house: 20% were in this situation, compared to 3% of moderately food insecure and 1% of food secure households. Loss of housing thus remains a clear criterion associated with food insecurity.

3.4 – Main cooking fuel

- About 36% of households used electricity for cooking, 28% gas, 28% wood/charcoal, and 8% animal dung.
- **Rural** households were more likely to use **wood** and less likely to use gas than urban households, reflecting different access to forest resources and gas facilities.
- Food insecure households were also more likely to use wood, especially those severely food insecure, and animal dung, and much less likely to use gas.



<u>By oblast</u>

Most of the households in Bishkek city used gas for cooking and to a lesser extent electricity. Gas and electricity were equally used as cooking fuel in Chuy oblast. Electricity was mostly used by households in Naryn and Talas oblasts and by half of the households in Yssyk-Kul. Some 2/3 of households in Batken, almost half in Osh and Jalalabad, and 1/4 in Yssyk-Kul mainly used wood. Animal dung was the main cooking fuel of less than 20% of households in Yssyk-Kul, Osh and Batken oblasts.



3.5 – Water and sanitation, health situation and services, and nutritional situation

3.5.1 – Access to water

Since the collapse of the former Soviet Union, there has been a rapid deterioration in the availability and quality of public infrastructure and basic services. Services once taken for granted (drinking water, solid waste collection, waste water treatment, etc.) are now often only intermittently available, if at all, and the steady decline in the quality of these services has created serious risks to public health¹⁸. According to other nation-wide surveys, about 56% of urban residents have piped water in their homes and 42% rely on street water taps. Water quality is poor. About 75% of the urban population has access to sanitation services.

¹⁸ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

While 78% of the population in Bishkek has access to municipal sewerage facilities, only 10% have access in other oblasts.

- Reliable data is lacking in rural areas, however in 2008 it was estimated that only about 66% of rural households had access to water supply services, and 51% had access to sanitation services. In Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, only about 40% of villages had operable water systems.
- The assessment found that 11% of households in **rural** areas were obtaining their drinking water from an **unsafe source** (non protected well, canal, river, swamp), compared to only 2% of urban households.
- Food insecure households were more likely to use an unsafe source of water, than food secure households.

<u>By oblast</u>

• Some 21% of households in **Jalalabad**, 12% in **Yssyk-Kul** and 9% in **Osh** oblasts were obtaining their drinking water from an **unsafe source**. Around 6% of households in Naryn and Batken oblasts also used unsafe water sources.

<u>3.5.2 – Health situation and services</u>

- Waterborne illnesses such as typhoid and parasitic diseases, linked to the poor quality of water and limited access to sanitation services, are a major problem. In 2006, diarrhoea was estimated to cause 35 deaths per 100,000 under-5 children, a very high rate¹⁹. Parasite burden (mainly soil-transmitted helminth infections) was also extremely high, affecting half or more of the general population and 75% of school-aged children.
- More than 60% of the Key Informants in rural areas and about half in urban areas indicated **acute respiratory infections** as the main diseases affecting the population. In **urban** areas, ¼ of Key Informants mentioned chronic illnesses while in **rural** areas ¼ of Key Informants mentioned diarrhoea, reflecting differences in ways of life as well as the impact of poor water and sanitation services in rural areas.
- Almost every Key Informant in **Naryn** and **Chuy** oblasts and in **Bishkek** city mentioned acute respiratory infections as the main diseases, and more than 40% in Batken oblast. They less frequently reported these diseases in Osh, Jalalabad and Yssyk-Kul oblasts.
- Diarrhoea was more often mentioned by Key Informants in the southern oblasts (**Batken**, **Osh** and **Jalalabad**) as well as in **Talas** and **Yssyk-kul**, than elsewhere. This is consistent with a higher proportion of households using unsafe water sources in these oblasts.
- Chronic diseases were reported by the majority of the Key Informants in Yssyk-Kul.
- Key Informants indicated that households mostly go to the nearest health centre to seek treatment. Some Key Informants in Talas oblast also mentioned private clinic or doctor and use of home-made treatment, while a few Key Informants in Osh mentioned traditional medicine.
- The majority of urban and rural locations were located at less than 30 mn distance from the nearest health centre. About 12% were situated at 30-60 mn, reflecting easy access to health services in general. Access tended to be more difficult in **Chuy** oblast (1/3 of the localities at 30-60 mn).
- Lack money to pay for drugs and medical care was the most frequently mentioned constraint (more than 90% of Key Informants). About 60% of Key Informants reported lack of doctors and other health personnel and lack of drug supplies within health centres

¹⁹ Multi-Cluster Indicator Survey in the Kyrgyz Republic, 2006.

as constraints for households to receive treatment. The lack of health personnel and lack of drug supplies seemed more acute in **Naryn** and **Batken** oblasts.

• About half of the Key Informants in **Osh, Jalalabad** and **Talas** oblasts mentioned insecurity to reach the centre as a constraint.

3.5.3 - Nutritional situation

- The National Statistics Committee implemented a nation-wide nutritional survey in 2009²⁰. While wasting rates were low (1.5% in urban areas and 1.1% in rural areas), **stunting** affected **15% of under-5 children in urban areas** and **26% of children in rural areas**. Stunting levels in rural areas indicate medium public health significance. Stunting reflect chronic malnutrition as a result of insufficiently diversified diet and frequent infections.
- Although reliable figures are not available, large variations of stunting rates across oblasts exist, resulting from differences of income level and access to water, sanitation and health care services. These differences also explain the higher stunting rates in rural than urban areas. Data from 2006 showed higher prevalence of stunting in Batken, Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts. Inadequate food consumption and poverty are also higher in Batken and Yssyk-Kul than in other oblasts.
- Among non-pregnant women, 6% were underweight but overweight and obesity were also widespread: in urban areas almost 36% were overweight or obese and 30% in rural areas.
- Micronutrient deficiencies and anaemia in particular are important problems among young children and women. More than ¼ of under-5 children were anaemic in 2009 and 40% iron-deficient²¹. Higher rates of anaemia were found among rural children (29%) than urban children (20%). About 28% of non-pregnant women were anaemic and 41% iron-deficient. Anaemia levels correspond to moderate public health significance according to WHO reference.
- Vitamin A deficiency was found in 4% of under-5 children, corresponding to mild public health significance. This may be thanks to the large coverage of the twice-yearly vitamin A supplementation programme.
- Micronutrient deficiencies reflect the **lack of variety of the diet** (see paragraph 3.6.3) with a low consumption of animal products (particularly important for iron against anaemia) and large seasonal variations in the intake of vegetables and fruits²². It must be noted that overweight and obesity can also be associated with micronutrient deficiencies, as the diet may be rich in kilocalories but low in vitamins and nutrients. In fact, this is increasingly the case for members of poor households since kilocalorie-rich food are cheaper than micronutrient-rich food.
- The **low proportion of exclusively breastfed children** (23% in 2009) up to 6 months of age, and relatively late introduction of semi-solid food (9 months) also contribute to both stunting and micronutrient deficiencies.
- A recent analysis by the World Bank and UNICEF²³ estimated that annual economic losses from undernutrition, due to lost workforce (mortality) and productivity (deficits in education and labour productivity), are as high as **US\$32 million** in Kyrgyzstan (0.7% of GDP). The losses are primarily due to productivity losses resulting from iodine deficiency (48% of the

 $^{^{20}}_{\sim}$ A preliminary draft was shared by UNICEF at the time of writing this report.

²¹ Worsening of iron deficiency leads to anaemia.

²² UNICEF is supporting the Ministry of Health with a nation-wide campaign to improve diet during pregnancy, as well as breastfeeding and complementary feeding practices. A pilot programme of micronutrient powder distribution (sprinkles) has also started in Talas oblast, with plans for expansion in other oblasts in 2010.

²³ Situational Analysis. Improving Economic Outcomes by Expanding Nutrition Programming in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Draft, May 2010.

losses) and stunting (22% of the losses). The relationships between undernutrition and mortality and Disability Adjusted Life Years are summarized in Box 4.

Box 4 – Key findings of the situation analysis of the implications of undernutrition in Kyrgyzstan

Mortality

- An estimated 22% of all under-5 children deaths a year are attributable to undernutrition.
- Severe and moderate stunting are responsible for about ½ the mortality attributable to undernutrition.
- The 2nd most common cause of nutrition-related deaths is low birthweight (25%).

Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs)

• Low birthweight is the main cause of DALYs, causing 14% of all DALYs for children under 5 years of age

Note: 1 DALY can be thought of as "one lost year of healthy life".

Source: Situational Analysis. Improving Economic Outcomes by Expanding Nutrition Programming in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. UNICEF/World Bank, Draft, May 2010.

3.6 – Food consumption and stocks

3.6.1 – Number of daily meals

- Households eat on average 3.3 meals per day.
- **Food insecure** households tended to eat slightly less meals (between 3-3.2 compared to 3.4 for food secure households).
- The number of daily meals was slightly lower among **woman-headed households** in Naryn and Yssyk-Kul oblasts compared to man-headed households, but remained above 3.
- The average number of daily meals was slightly higher in Naryn and Talas oblasts and lower in **Jalalabad**, **Osh** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts.

3.6.2 - Kilocalorie, protein and fat intake

Overview: Based on KIHS results (first 3 quarters of 2009) on average kilocalorie, protein and fat consumed per capita, households' dietary profile was worse than average in Yssyk-Kul, Batken and Naryn oblasts, and better in Chuy oblast and Bishkek city. Kilocalorie consumption was low in the poorest quintiles, especially in Bishkek, and low across all poverty quintiles in Batken oblast.

• According to KIHS data collected in the first quarter of 2010²⁴, the average food consumption per capita was 2,360 kcal/capita²⁵. About half of the kilocalories were provided by cereal products. Proteins provided 10% of the calories and fats 20%. **Below average kilocalorie intake per capita** were reported in **Batken**, **Yssyk-Kul** and **Osh** oblasts, while higher than average kcal intake was reported in Talas and Chuy oblasts and Bishkek city. The average kilocalorie intake per capita was just above the standard of 2,100 kcal in Batken, Yssyk-Kul and Osh. As the distribution of kilocalorie intake is unequal between households, this indicates that large groups of the population in these oblasts are consuming less than the standard requirement.

²⁴ Food Security and Poverty Information Bulletin of the Kyrgyz Republic, 1st quarter 2010. National Statistics Committee.

²⁵ The following values were applied to calculate the kilocalorie content for 100 g: bread 250 kcal, potatoes 80 kcal, vegetables 40 kcal, fruits 60 kcal, sugar 400 kcal, meat 250 kcal, milk/dairy products 70 kcal, oil/fat 900 kcal and eggs 60 kcal/piece.



• There was not much variation in average protein intake per capita across oblasts, but **fat** intake was lower in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Naryn** oblasts and higher in Chuy oblast and Bishkek city.



• As already noted in previous assessments, the poorest quintiles had a much lower kilocalorie intake per capita than richer quintiles. Kilocalorie intake was particularly low among the poor in **Bishkek city**, possibly reflecting difficult arbitrage between food and comparatively high non-food expenditures in urban areas. Relatively little variations across poverty groups were noted in **Batken** oblast, reflecting the **poor living conditions prevailing in this oblast**.



<u>3.6.3 – Food consumption patterns</u>

Overview: A low proportion of households consumed an inadequate diet (7%). This reflects the high seasonal availability of staples from recent harvests (wheat, potatoes), as well as of vegetables and fruits at this time of the year in many of the areas surveyed. Many poor households managed to consume an acceptable diet now, but they will not be able to do so when their food stocks are exhausted if their cash income remains insufficient to purchase similar amounts and variety of food. Food stocks on average were not sufficient for more than 3-4 months for food insecure households.

Food insecure households consuming an inadequate diet had very low intakes of fresh products (animal products, vegetables, fruits) as well as energy-dense food (oil, sugar) for those consuming the poorest diet, leading to kilocalorie and micronutrient deficiencies and risks for the nutritional and health status of vulnerable household members.

Dietary diversity was generally lower in Osh and Jalalabad (possibly reflecting the current hardship in these oblasts) and to a lesser extent in Yssyk-Kul and Batken oblasts, while it was best in Chuy oblast and Bishkek city.

Food consumption groups

• As explained in paragraph 2.2, food consumption was analysed by looking at the frequency and diversity of food items consumed during the 7 days prior to the interview. Three Food Consumption Groups were created using standard thresholds (see Box 5).

Box 5 – Food consumption groups and patterns

- Poor food consumption patterns: a diet likely to be insufficient in kilocalories and grossly lacking vitamins and minerals to meet the nutritional requirements of an average household member. Typically this diet consists of daily cereals, oil and sugar, with minimal consumption of animal products, beans/peas, vegetables and fruits. It entails serious risks of malnutrition and diseases if consumed on the medium and longer term, especially for young children, pregnant and lactating women, and the elderly.
- Borderline food consumption patterns: a diet that probably contains sufficient kilocalories but remains insufficiently diversified to provide the essential vitamins and minerals. This diet is characterized by regular consumption of cereals, beans/peas, oil and sugar, and intake of animal products, vegetables and fruits 2-3 times a week. The deficiency in micronutrients causes particularly risks of chronic malnutrition and anaemia.
- Good food consumption patterns: a diet with sufficient variety and frequency of weekly consumption to broadly meet the nutritional requirements of an average household member.
- Overall, **7% of the households consumed an inadequate diet**, including 1% poor and 6% borderline food consumption. This relatively low proportion may be explained by the fact that the assessment took place just after harvests of staple food such as wheat and potatoes, and at the season of vegetable and fruit production. As mentioned in paragraph 3.1.1, is it also likely that the EFSA underestimated the proportion of households consuming a diet deficient in kilocalories. Furthermore, the survey also coincided with recent food distributions in response to the crisis in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, and as part of WFP Vulnerable Group Feeding programme in several other locations.
- Most households consuming a 'poor' diet had monthly cash amounts below extreme poverty, which limited their capacity to purchase food and increase the diversity and quality of their diet. On the other hand, almost half of households consuming a 'borderline' diet and almost ¼ of households consuming an 'acceptable' diet also had cash amounts below the extreme poverty line. This is likely to represent households having access to their own production for food consumption and therefore not depending very much on cash to obtain food. As the survey took place at a time of high availability of agricultural produce, a number of these households will be **unable to maintain their diet when food stocks are exhausted in later (winter) months**. Indeed, most stocks of food kept from the various crops for family own consumption last between 3-5 months for food insecure households, and about 6 months for food secure households (see paragraph 3.11.5).

• Reflecting the methodology used to analyse food insecurity, food insecure households had a worse diet than food secure households. During the 7 days prior to the survey, food insecure households had eaten less frequently all food items except bread.



By oblast

- The highest proportions of households consuming a 'poor' or 'borderline' diet were in **Yssyk-Kul** oblast (7% and 9% respectively). Close to 10% of households were consuming a 'borderline' diet in the conflict-affected Osh and Jalalabad oblasts
- **Bread** had been eaten practically daily everywhere in the 7 days prior to the survey and **potatoes** 5 to 6 times.
- Other cereals were consumed less frequently (3-4 times) by households in Yssyk-Kul and Jalalabad oblasts than elsewhere (5-6 times).
- Beans, lentils or chickpeas and nuts were rarely eaten by households in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul, Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. Vegetables and fruits were also consumed less frequently (3-4 times) in these oblasts compared to other oblasts (5-6 times).
- Meat had been consumed less than 3 times in the previous 7 days by households in **Yssyk-Kul** compared to 4-5 times in other oblasts.
- Dairy products were eaten 2-3 times by households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, compared to 4-5 times elsewhere.
- Similarly, consumption of **oil and fats** and sugar was less frequent in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts as well as in **Batken** oblast.

3.6.4 – Food stocks

- About ³⁄₄ of **rural** households and slightly more than ¹⁄₂ of **urban** households had food stocks. Duration of most food stocks was 1-3 weeks. It must be noted that this result is somewhat contradictory with answers given about the duration of harvest of several crops kept for family consumption (see paragraph 3.11.5). Underestimation of stocks is not excluded, as households probably did not account for ongoing or imminent harvest of some crops (wheat, potatoes, vegetables, fruits).
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to have food stocks: 35% compared to about 70% of other households. Stocks of most food items would last less than a week for severely food insecure households, and 1-2 weeks for moderately food insecure households, compared to 2-3 weeks for food secure households.

<u>By oblast</u>

- Between 50% and 87% of households had some food stocks. More than ³/₄ of households had food stocks in Naryn, Talas, Batken, Osh and Chuy oblasts and 50%-60% in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Jalalabad** oblasts and **Bishkek city**.
- However, the duration of stocks was less than a month for most households and most food items. Larger food stocks tended to be found in Talas, Chuy and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, expected to last between 4 and 6 weeks. Smaller stocks were reported in Osh, Jalalabad, Batken and Naryn oblasts for most commodities, consistent with the fact that most food is purchased (see paragraph 3.6.5 below) and poverty rates are high in these oblasts. Food stocks also tended to be low in Bishkek city but this reflects more the urban setting whereby easy access to markets and shop throughout the year facilitates frequent purchasing rather than stocks.



3.6.5 - Sources of food consumed in previous 7 days

Overview: As expected, rural households were more likely to have consumed food coming from their own production. Urban households purchased between 70% and 80% of their food. Except meat and sugar, less than half of the food consumed by food insecure households during the 7 days prior to the survey was purchased, with 30%-40% coming from own production. Food secure households were able to purchase 60% to 80% of their food. Food purchases are likely to be facilitated by the lower amounts needed, owing to the availability of food from recent or ongoing harvests, and to lower prices at this season. Between 10%-13% of food insecure households consumed oil and fat received from humanitarian assistance.

Households in Naryn oblast were more likely to have consumed food from their own production, while households in Bishkek city were more likely to have purchased it. Animal ownership facilitated consumption of meat and dairy products particularly in Chuy and Naryn oblasts. Food gifts were received by some 10% of households in oblasts where the items were available from own production (potatoes, animal products), especially in Naryn, Talas, Osh and even in Bishkek city. In Osh oblast, between 9%-14% of households had consumed wheat, oil and sugar from humanitarian aid, while proportions were very low in Jalalabad oblast.

• **Rural** households relied much more on their own production for the food consumed in the 7 days prior to the survey, including more than half of the wheat for bread and potatoes, about half of their vegetables, fruits, and dairy products, 1/3 of their far and ¼ of their meat, and less on market purchase, than urban households. **Urban** households purchased between 70% and 80% of their food.

• With the exception of meat and sugar, less than half of the food consumed by **food insecure** households was purchased and the rest mostly came from their own production. Food secure households purchased more than 60% of their food. Reduced amounts needed to be purchased owing to the availability of own produce, as well as lower prices at this time of the year, are likely to facilitate economic access to food for many of these households, despite their low income.



• Severely food insecure households were less likely to have obtained animal products and fat from their own production, compared to other households. As these items are expensive, this also explains why their consumption was much less frequent in this group. Conversely, **moderately food insecure** (and food secure) households were more likely to consume food from their own production, which largely explains their ability to consume a better diet despite low incomes: 60% of the bread was baked using their own wheat, almost half of the potato and about 40% of the fruits and vegetables came from their own harvest, and more than 30% of the dairy products from their own animals.



• Humanitarian assistance and to a lesser extent gifts provided about 13% of the wheat used for home-baked bread, 13% of oil and 10% of sugar consumed by **severely food insecure** households. Some 9% of moderately food insecure households also consumed oil and sugar from these sources. This reflects the fact that many of the food insecure households either live in conflict-affected Osh and Jalalabad oblasts where these programmes are being implemented, or were targeted by WFP Vulnerable Group Feeding programme which was implemented at the time of the assessment in several oblasts.

<u>By oblast</u>

• Bread was home-made by about 40%-50% of households in most oblasts but especially in Naryn and Talas oblasts (respectively 93% and 71% home-made), except in Bishkek city (less than 1% home-made). A summary of the main sources of food by oblast is provided in Box 6.

Box 6 - Main sources of food consumed in previous 7 days, by oblast

- About 1/3 of households in **Naryn** consumed **wheat** from their own production, compared to less than 15% of households in other oblasts. Some 14% of households in **Osh** oblast had consumed wheat and 9% biscuits from humanitarian assistance. Only 0.4% of households in Jalalabad oblast reported consumption of wheat from humanitarian aid, 3% in Bishkek city and 1% in Batken.
- Between 50%-64% of households had consumed **potatoes** from their own production in **Chuy**, **Yssyk-Kul** and **Talas** oblasts and 30-40% in other oblasts, but only 2% in Bishkek city. Most of the other households purchased potatoes. About 10% also received them as gift in **Naryn** and **Talas** oblasts.
- Beans, lentils or chickpeas were mostly bought in shops or market, except in Talas oblast where 30% of households had obtained them from their own production. Some 5% of households in Osh oblast had consumed beans from humanitarian assistance.
- Between 50%-60% of households in **Chuy** and **Naryn** oblasts had eaten **meat** from their own production. Meat came from own production for 15%-30% of households in Jalalabad, Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts. It was purchased by the other households.
- In Chuy, Naryn and Talas oblasts, 50%-70% of households had consumed dairy products from their own production, compared to 30%-40% of households in other oblasts and less than 2% in Bishkek city. In Osh oblast, 17% of households had consumed dairy products received as gift from relatives or neighbours.
- Eggs came from households' own production in 1/3 to ½ of the cases.
- Between 40%-60% of households in **Chuy, Talas, Jalalabad** and **Batken** oblasts had obtained their **vegetables** from their own production, compared to less than 30% in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul and Osh oblasts and Bishkek city. Vegetable gifts were relatively frequent in **Naryn** (12% of households).
- Less than ¼ of households had consumed **fruits** from their own production in Naryn and Yssyk-Kul oblasts and in Bishkek city, compared to about 40% or more elsewhere. Some 7%-12% of households in **Naryn, Talas** and **Osh** oblasts had received them as gift.
- 2/3 of households in Naryn oblast consumed oil or fat from their own production and 20%-40% of households in other oblasts, compared to less than 1% in Bishkek city. Some 13% of households in Osh oblast consumed oil from humanitarian aid²⁶.
- Sugar, jam and honey were home-made by some 10% of households in **Naryn** and **Batken** oblasts, and mostly purchased in other oblasts. About 9% of households in **Osh** oblast had received sugar from humanitarian aid.

²⁶ The different proportions of households reporting consumption of wheat, oil or sugar from humanitarian assistance are explained by the different rapidity at which these items are consumed.



3.7 – Poverty, unemployment and social assistance

Overview: Based on KIHS 2008, poverty affects almost 40% of the population, including 6% in extreme poverty. Poverty rates are higher in rural areas and in Yssyk-Kul, Naryn, Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. Non-income dimensions of poverty reveal higher levels of extreme deprivation in Osh, Naryn, Chuy, Batken and Yssyk-Kul oblasts. The income level of various groups of the population has improved in the 2nd quarter of 2010, as a result of increases of pension, public sector wages, social benefits and remittance flows. However, the effects of April and June 2010 events on the economy are expected to reverse at least temporarily the progress made in poverty reduction.

3.7.1 - Poverty rates

- The strong rate of economic growth experienced over the 2003-2008 period led to a sharp fall in poverty: **overall poverty** fell from 64% to **32%** in 2009 and **extreme poverty** from 28% to **6%**. A growth in worker remittances and a rise in real terms of pensions also played a significant role. However, progress in fighting poverty is likely to have slowed in 2009 as growth decelerated due to the global economic crisis.
- Based on KIHS results, poverty rates were higher in **Yssyk-Kul** (46%), **Naryn** (44%), **Osh** (38%) and **Jalalabad** (37%) oblasts and lower in Bishkek city (13%) and Chui oblast (21%). Poverty rates are higher in **rural** than urban areas. The Human Poverty Index²⁷ developed by UNDP and capturing **conditions of extreme deprivation** beyond income poverty ranked **Osh** as the worst oblast, followed by **Naryn**, **Chuy**, **Batken** and **Yssyk-Kul**.

	% below poverty line	Human Poverty Index
Total	32%	6.9
Urban	23%	-
Rural	37%	-
Yssyk-Kul	46%	7.8
Batken	31%	7.9
Naryn	44%	8.2
Talas	33%	6.8
Osh	38%	9.0
Jalalabad	37%	5.9
Chuy	21%	8.2
Bishkek city	13%	52

Table 4 – Poverty rates and Human Poverty Index

Sources: Poverty Levels in the Kyrgyz Republic in 2009. National Statistics Committee, 2009 – Kyrgyzstan: Successful Youth, Successful Country. 2009/2010 National Human Development Report. UNDP Kyrgyzstan.

• Poverty in **rural areas** is explained by fewer income-earning opportunities available and high dependence on agriculture, whose activity is circumscribed by factors such as the scarcity of dependable irrigation systems, availability of quality seeds and agricultural inputs, and less-than-optimal land use practices. The lack of cash income leaves rural households dependent on farming, which is especially vulnerable to weather-related shocks²⁸. The official extreme poverty level was set at 975 KGS (US\$21) and poverty at 1575 KGS (US\$33) per capita per month in January 2010.

²⁷ The UN Human Poverty Index focuses on population living in conditions of extreme deprivation, including: % people who die before age 40 years, literacy level of the adult population, and an overall indicator of deprivation (lack of access to safe drinking water and health care services, and % children under 5 year of age who are underweight. Lower index scores represent fewer people living in extreme deprivation.

²⁸ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

- Non-income dimensions of poverty are also more apparent in rural areas. While electricity is available to all urban and rural residents, district heating and hot water are available in Bishkek and partially in Osh as well as a few other towns. Community services such as sewerage, gas and water supply are also available in most oblasts, but rural access rates to these services are significantly lower than in urban areas.
- The profile of poor families is closely correlated to family composition. This is similar for food insecure families, due to the strong links between poverty and food insecurity. Families with **3 or more children** have a much higher probability of living in poverty.
- It is not yet possible to quantify the effects of the April and June 2010 violence on poverty. However, **some increase in extreme poverty** is anticipated, with up to 20% increase of the number of applicants for Monthly Benefits (see paragraph 3.7.3). **Yssyk-Kul**, already the oblast with the highest poverty rate, is likely to be severely affected by the effects of the April and June 2010 events, given the drop of tourism activities upon which a large part of the local population depends. **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts will also be affected, and represent areas where the number of poor was already the highest.

3.7.2 – Unemployment

- While the official rate of **unemployment** was estimated at 8% in 2008, the actual rate may be much higher, at 18%. The high share of the informal economy in Kyrgyzstan complicates the estimation of the true unemployment rate. However, work in the informal sector is poorly paid, irregular, and does not confer the labour rights and safety standards associated with formal employment. Unemployment benefits are low (on average 450 KGS/month i.e. US\$10, in 2009).
- It is expected that internal displacement resulting from the June events in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts will have brought an unemployment upsurge, as people have lost semiformal or informal jobs in small business, petty trade and farming. A survey conducted by the World Bank in 2-6 July found that small enterprises suffered most physical damage. In Osh, 91% of the 100 respondents indicated they were unable to resume commercial operations, and that their average number of employees dropped from 22 to 2. In Jalalabad, it fell from 21 to 13, mainly due to the displacement of workers.
- In **Yssyk-Kul** oblast in particular, tourism has also been hard hit by the April and June events, with reservations down 80% compared to last year's levels. A large percentage of the usual seasonal employment generated in tourist and retail trade-related economic activity would thus also be affected. This will have significant negative impact on the population of the region who depend on tourism for the majority of its annual income.
- Unemployment may be somewhat mitigated in the summer months but the impact would mostly be noticeable from the fall, after seasonal jobs in agriculture fade out²⁹.
- The Government supported by UN agencies and USAID started to implement public work schemes in the south in August as a short-term emergency measure. The duration of these programmes is unclear however.

3.7.3 – Social assistance

 In January 2010, electricity, district heating and hot water tariffs were raised. Simultaneously, the level of **pensions** was increased by 24%, **public sector wages** by 200 KGS (US\$4), and cash transfer programmes of the **Monthly Benefit** and **Monthly Social Benefit** by 18% and 81% respectively. While the rise of utility tariffs was cancelled after the

²⁹ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

April 2010 events, the benefit increases were maintained. During the first quarter of 2010, **remittances** also increased by 18% compared to the first 3 months of 2009.

• The social assistance system composed of Monthly Benefit (MB), Monthly Social Benefit (MSB) programmes, privileges/compensations, social services and social insurance (pensions), has undergone several changes in recent years (see Box 7).

Box 7 – <u>Social assistance system</u>

The current social assistance system includes cash benefits and category-based compensations. There are 2 targeted cash benefit programmes:

1) Monthly Benefit (MB): for children of poorest families

2) Monthly Social Benefit (MSB): mainly for the disabled and elderly not eligible for a pension (without any working record).

Working-able people are not entitled to social assistance benefits.

Monthly Benefit:

To receive MB, the average monthly per capita family income has to drop below the Guaranteed Minimum Income (GMI), a means-tested threshold. The GMI is calculated as a relative share of the extreme poverty line. When per capita family income is below GMI, the government pays the difference to the children's family. The MB scheme covers 17% of children in the country.

The MB also includes a one-off benefit at child birth for poor families and flat-rate allowances for children below 3 years of age.

Monthly Social Benefit:

The MSB is a cash payment to defined categories of individuals unable to work and not entitled to pensions:

- children with disabilities;
- disabled from childhood;
- disabled ineligible for pensions;
- elderly above retirement age ineligible for pensions;
- mother-heroes

• children whose family has lost the breadwinner.

These persons are also entitled to additional allowances for health services, free medicines, housing subsidies for payment of public utility bills, and a number of other state social support measures. Since January 2010, the MSB calculation is detached from the GMI and flat rates are set for the various categories.

Privileges/compensations:

In 2010 the number of privileges was decreased from 38 to 25 and in-kind privileges (for transport, communications, energy, medicines, health services, housing, sanatorium and resort services, utilities and other municipal services) were monetized. The privileges became a monthly lump sum compensation for all types of previously in-kind privileges. Currently, most of the recipients of privileges are those living in mountainous areas (almost 2/3 or all recipients), people with disabilities (about 20%), war veterans (10%), law enforcement officials, the military, Chernobyl victims, and some other categories.

Social services:

They are almost exclusively limited to residential institutions for children, people with disabilities and the elderly. There is also a poorly funded system of home-based social services for orphans, elderly and people with disabilities.

Social insurance and pensions:

The social insurance system consists mainly of pensions for former employees or farmers (for old age and disability) and their dependents (survivors). Other benefits include illness or maternity for contributors and funeral benefits for pensioners. The pension age is 60 years for men and 55 years for women.

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

Monthly Benefit programme

- A large number of extreme poor are excluded from the MB (67%) and benefits are low. The level of Guaranteed Minimum Income (GMI) was increased to 284 KGS (US\$6) in January 2010 and the Government is planning to increase it further to 310 KGS retroactively from 1st July³⁰ 2010, but it remains well below the extreme poverty line (975 KGS). The average MB paid to beneficiary children is 212 KGS plus a 40 KGS flat rate top-up (total US\$5) to compensate for food price increases³¹.
- Targeting for the MB is complicated by the large number of households living below or near the poverty line, and by the high share of household income coming from informal earnings difficult to verify. In addition, the "*propiska*" system which restricts lawful residence to where one is registered, leads to the exclusion of the majority of internal migrants from applying for social benefits, maternity and unemployment benefits, health care, and education for their children.
- Some 84% of the MB beneficiaries are concentrated in the 3 southern oblasts of **Osh**, **Jalalabad** and **Batken**. Possible changes due to the violence in Osh and Jalalabad mid-June have not yet been captured.

Monthly Social Benefit programme, privileges/compensations

• The average amount of **MSB** is around 1,300 KGS (US\$28) and the Government has drafted a decree increasing it up to 1,500 KGS (US\$32). The monthly amount of **monetized privileges** varies from 1,000 to 7,000 KGS (US\$21 to 149) depending on the category of beneficiary. Exclusion of target beneficiaries is high, with 60% of disabled not benefiting from MSB.

Pensions

- Pensions have been found to be an effective instrument for reducing poverty among the elderly: **households with pensioners have 20% less risk of becoming poor** compared to households without pensioners. However, a key problem with social insurance benefits is that they assume employment in the formal sector. Nearly half of the workforce is found in the informal sector, thus excluded from the pension scheme. Pensions are a key form of social assistance in Kyrgyzstan since most pensioners live in large extended families. However, pensions are by definition not specifically targeted to the poor or vulnerable.
- Following the April events, the Interim Government decided to pay one-off lump sum compensation to all victims (estimated at 1,688 including 86 deaths), of 1 million KGS to families of the dead, and from 10,000 to 100,000 wounded depending on the severity of the injuries. There is also pressure on the government to compensate the victims permanently, by assigning them to a privilege/compensation category similar to World War II Veterans, with a monthly compensation of 7,000 KGS (US\$149).
- Authorities reported that payment of the pre-existing social benefits had been fully executed for the months of April and May and are committed to continue protecting social expenditure in the critical months ahead. Social services were no substantially directly affected by the April or June events largely due to their non-existence in many (rural) areas and generally minor role.

³⁰ This augmentation would increase the number of beneficiaries by 10%

³¹ The 40 KGS topping-up is financed by the European Union.

3.8 – Income and cash sources

3.8.1 – Average number of cash-earning members and of cash sources

- Households had on average 2 members able to earn cash.
- More than ³/₄ of households had **2 sources of cash** and 1/3 had **3 cash sources**. On average the 1st source of cash provided 69%, the 2nd source 32% and the 3rd source 17% of the total cash obtained from these sources³².
- Severely food insecure households were more likely to have only 1 member able to earn cash. Almost half of the severely food insecure households did not have a 2nd source of cash, and more than 90% did not have a 3rd source of cash. Almost 1/3 of moderately food insecure households did not have a 2nd or a 3rd source of cash.
- Woman-headed households were also more likely to have only 1 cash-earning member, except for woman-headed households in Chuy, Naryn and Batken oblasts.



By oblast

• The average number of household members able to earn some cash was above 2 in most oblasts except Yssyk-Kul, Talas and Osh oblasts.

3.8.2 – Main sources of cash

Overview: In rural areas, the most frequent main source of cash was sale of crops, followed by civil service, pensions and sale of animals/animal products. In urban areas, the most frequent main source of cash was independent work, followed by civil service, small business, regular unskilled wage labour and pensions.

Pensions were the most frequent 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} sources of cash of rural households, while civil service and pensions were the most frequent 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} sources of cash of urban households.

Food insecure households were more likely to obtain their main amount of cash from sale of crops, independent work, or pensions/allowances, and less likely to obtain it from civil service or small business than food secure households. Those who were severely food insecure were more likely to receive most of their cash from sale of vegetables, irregular unskilled wage labour or charity, than other households, and for them these were the unique sources of cash.

³² The total of the 3 sources does not equal 100% due to the fact that not all households had more than 1 or more than 2 sources of cash.
Households in Naryn, Talas and Batken oblasts were more likely to rely on sale of crops as their main source of cash while households in Chuy oblast more frequently mentioned sale of animals/animal products. Wage labour of any kind and independent work were mentioned less frequently in Naryn oblast. Civil service was more frequently the main source of cash in Naryn and Talas oblasts. Households in Bishkek city and in Osh oblast were more likely to rely on independent work as the largest source of cash. Households in Yssyk-Kul were more likely to rely on pensions/allowances for most of their cash.

- The most frequent main sources of cash were **independent work** (18% of households), **civil service** (14%), **sale of crops** (11%), **pensions/allowances** (9%) and **regular unskilled wage labour** (8%). About 7% obtained most of their cash from irregular unskilled wage labour. Only 3% mentioned remittances as their main source of cash.
- In **rural areas**, sale of crops was the main source of cash for 16% of households, followed by civil service (12%), pensions (10%) and sale of animals/animal products (9%). In **urban areas**, the most frequent main source of cash was independent work (21% of urban households), followed by civil service (17%), small business (9%), regular unskilled wage labour (8%) and pensions (7%).
- In **rural areas**, pensions were the most frequent 2nd source of cash (14% of households) followed by sale of crops or vegetables, sale of animals/animal products, irregular unskilled wage labour, civil service and independent work for about 7%-8% of households for each of these activities. In **urban areas**, civil service was the most frequent 2nd source of cash (13% of households), followed by pensions (10%), irregular unskilled wage labour and independent work (7% each). Pensions were the most frequent 3rd source of cash in both rural and urban areas.
- **Food insecure** households were more likely to obtain their main amount of cash from sale of crops, independent work, or pensions/allowances and less likely to obtain it from civil service or small business than food secure households. **Severely food insecure** households were more likely to receive most of their cash from sale of vegetables, irregular unskilled wage labour or charity, than other households. For them, these were also often the sole source of cash. If they had a 2nd income source, it was another low-earning, irregular source of cash.



- Severely food insecure households tended to mention more frequently irregular unskilled wage labour as their 2nd source of cash.
- Woman-headed households tended to rely more often on civil service, small business and pensions, and less on sale of crops than man-headed households, but the differences were not very large.

<u>By oblast</u>

- Households in **Naryn**, **Talas** and **Batken** oblasts were more likely to rely on sale of crops as their principal source of cash (20%-30% of households), while households in **Batken** and **Jalalabad** oblasts were more likely to rely on sale of vegetables as their main source of cash (about 10%).
- A higher proportion of households in **Chuy** oblast (about ¼ households) mentioned sale of animals/animal products as their main source of cash, than in other oblasts.



- Households in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Talas** oblasts relied more often on irregular unskilled wage labour for most of their cash (more than 10%), while households in **Batken**, **Jalalabad** and **Chuy** oblasts and **Bishkek** city tended to mentioned more frequently regular unskilled labour.
- Regular skilled wage labour was more frequently the main source of cash for households in **Bishkek** city and in **Chuy** oblast.
- Wage labour of any kind was mentioned less frequently in **Naryn** oblast as a major source of cash.



• More than 20% of households in **Bishkek** city and in **Osh** oblast relied on independent work as the main source of cash, and 10%-15% of households in other oblasts except in Naryn (less than 5%).

- Civil service was more likely to be the main source of cash in **Naryn** (more than 30% of households) and **Talas** (more than 20%) oblasts, and for about 15% of households in Jalalabad and Chuy oblasts and in Bishkek city.
- Pensions were more frequently mentioned as the main source of cash in **Yssyk-Kul** oblast (more than ¼ of households), probably reflecting a lack of other work opportunities in this particular oblast and the sharp decline of tourism this year.
- Households in **Batken** oblast tended to mention more often remittances as their main source of cash (more than 10% of households), while very few households in Talas and Yssyk-Kul, and Chuy oblasts and Bishkek city relied on this source of cash. This differs from the perception of Key Informants who reported 15%-20% of households relying on remittances in Talas, Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, compared to 7% in other oblasts.



• Sale of vegetables was more frequently the 2nd source of cash in **Chuy** and **Batken** oblasts. Independent work was also more often the 2nd source of cash in **Batken** oblast. Households in **Bishkek city** and in **Naryn** oblast relied more on civil service for their 2nd source of cash.

3.8.3 - Average amount of cash

Overview: Large business and employment by UN/NGOs provided the highest amount of monthly cash per capita, followed by sale of animals/animal products, regular skilled wage labour, small business and rent of land or property. The lowest cash amounts were obtained from sale of crops or vegetables, unskilled wage labour, independent work, civil service, petty trade, remittances and pensions/allowances. The total amount of cash earned per capita from their 3 main sources was below the extreme poverty line in a quarter of households, and the earnings for another quarter placed them between the extreme poverty and poverty lines. This does not include the cash-equivalent of own production kept for self-consumption. The amounts of cash obtained from various sources were higher in urban areas than in rural areas.

Food secure woman-headed households obtained higher amounts of cash per capita than food secure man-headed households, mostly owing to their smaller family size. However, food insecure woman-headed households earned the same cash amount per capita as food insecure man-headed households.

Most households in Osh oblast obtained monthly amounts of cash per capita below poverty levels as well as about 2/3 of households in Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts and more than ½ of households in Batken and Jalalabad oblasts.

• Large business and employment by UN/NGOs provided the **highest amount of cash** (3,300-4,080 KGS/capita/month). Sale of animals/animal products, regular skilled wage

labour, small business and rent of land or property provided between 1,800 and 2,400 KGS/capita/month. Sale of crops or vegetables, unskilled wage labour, independent work, civil service, petty trade, remittances, pensions/allowances and credit/loans provided between 500-1,500 KGS/capita/month).

- A similar ranking was found for the **2nd source of cash**. The highest amounts obtained from the 2nd cash source were from regular skilled wage labour (1,600 KGS/capita/month), rent of land or property (1,370 KGS/capita/month), credit or loans (1,580 KGS/capita/month) and small business (1,020 KGS/capita/month). Again, average amounts were higher for urban households than for rural households for the same activities.
- As **3rd source of cash**, regular skilled wage labour provided the highest amount on average (1,060 KGS/capita/month).
- According to Key Informants, the daily remuneration for agricultural casual labour was 210 KGS/day in rural areas and 344 KGS/day in urban areas. The remuneration was slightly higher for non-agricultural casual labour (e.g. construction) in rural areas (290 KGS/day) but similar to agricultural labour in urban areas.
- Based on the average amount of cash obtained from 1, 2 or 3 sources of income, ¼ of the households had cash amounts per capita **below extreme poverty line** and ¼ **between extreme poverty and poverty**. As mentioned in paragraph 3.1.1, the EFSA is likely to overestimate poverty due to the absence of valuation of own production kept for family self-consumption, limitation to 3 cash sources, and lack of detailed account of cash receipts.
- The proportion of households obtaining amounts of cash below extreme poverty level was double in **rural areas** compared to urban areas (31% versus 15%).
- By definition (see paragraph 2.2), **food insecure** households earned significantly lower cash amounts. Differences between severely and moderately food insecure households in terms of cash obtained from the main source were small, reflecting the fact that at this period of the year the severity of food insecurity was more linked to differential access to food from own production rather than to income.
- Woman-headed households obtained on average higher amounts of cash per capita from practically all sources and activities except regular unskilled wage labour. This largely explains why no differences in levels of food insecurity are found between woman- and man-headed households despite the fact that woman-headed households are generally at a disadvantage in terms of vulnerable household members, access to land and access to animals. However, the difference of earnings per capita between woman- and man-headed households is only valid for food secure woman-headed households compared to food secure man-headed households and is mostly due to the smaller family size of food secure woman-headed households). Food insecure woman-headed households did not earn more on average than food insecure man-headed households.

<u>By oblast</u>

- The average amount of cash obtained from various activities by households in **Bishkek city** and in **Chuy** oblast was almost always higher than in other oblasts, possibly reflecting better access to markets and to market information. Conversely, the cash amounts obtained from activities by households in **Osh** oblast were smaller than elsewhere, reflecting the negative impact of the violence in June on the local economy.
- The lowest daily remunerations for agricultural labour were reported by Key Informants in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts (140-160 KGS/day), possibly reflecting the depressed activity due to the June events. Average remunerations for non-agricultural labour were also lower in Osh and Jalalabad as well as in Naryn oblasts, compared to other locations. The highest wages were mentioned in Bishkek city followed by Yssyk-Kul oblast.



- More than half of households in **Osh** oblast obtained a monthly amount of cash per capita below extreme poverty level. This was also the case for more than 1/3 of households in **Talas** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts, 30% in **Batken** and ¼ of households in **Jalalabad** oblasts.
- Overall, the majority of households in Osh oblast (86%) obtained monthly amounts of cash per capita below poverty levels, about 2/3 of households in Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts, more than ½ of households in Batken and Jalalabad oblasts, 1/3 in Naryn oblast, less than ¼ in Chuy oblasts and about 10% of households in Bishkek city.

3.8.4 – Migrants and remittances

- According to the Ministry of Labour, there were 350,000 Kyrgyz labour migrants in Russia and about 60,000 in Kazakhstan. Other sources report higher figures with more than 500,000 migrants in Russia. Roughly 80% of all labour migrants were from southern Kyrgyzstan. Remittances which had dropped in 2008-2009 as a result of the global economic crisis picked up in the first 5 months of 2010, largely due to improving Russian and Kazakh economies. The Kyrgyz diasporas in Russia and Kazakhstan were also sending humanitarian assistance to Osh and Jalalabad oblasts in July 2010.
- About ¼ of households had at least one family member living outside the country. Migrants were slightly more frequent in urban areas than in rural areas.
- About 70% of migrants sent goods or money back, on average 5 times a year. However, remittances were rarely the main source of cash for the households, indicating that the amount sent may not be very high.
- Food insecure households, especially severely food insecure woman-headed households, tended to have less migrants than food secure households and to receive goods or money less frequently. Severely food insecure households with migrants were also less likely to receive goods or money back (57% did), and received them only 3 times a year on average.
- As expected, **woman-headed households** (except the severely food insecure) were slightly more likely to report external migrants: almost 30% compared to 23% of manheaded households. This was especially the case in **Bishkek city** (38% of woman-headed compared to 26% of man-headed households). Woman-headed households were also more likely to receive goods or cash from migrants, although this was not true everywhere such as in Talas and Batken oblasts.

<u>By oblast</u>

- About 30% of households in **Bishkek city** and in **Chuy, Osh** and **Batken** oblasts reported family members living outside Kyrygzstan. Between 11% (Yssyk-Kul) and 20% of households had external migrants in the other oblasts.
- More than ³⁄₄ of households received money or goods from migrants except in **Chuy** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts and **Bishkek city** where less than 60% benefited. The most frequent receipt of remittances was reported by households of migrants in Naryn, Jalalabad, Osh and Batken oblasts.
- The Rapid EFSA early July found that many households in the affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad had external migrants, including about 33% of the IDPs, 43% of host families and 39% of residents. According to the Russian migration authorities, a peak of applications from Kyrgyz migrants was witnessed in July, with applicants explaining that they are not only seeking migration permits for the purposes of getting employment, but also for personal security reasons. Bishkek authorities also voiced concerns about a **visible increase in internal migration to the capital city**, leading to increased risks of unlawful acquisition of land and further pressure on the city's labour market and social infrastructure.

<u>3.8.5 – Use of money transfer systems or bank services</u>

• Microfinance organizations (MFOs) have played an increasingly important role in providing credit to the private sector. Box 8 summarizes their main characteristics and the effects of the April and June events.

Box 8 – Microfinance organizations in the Kyrgyz Republic and effects of the April and June violence

Microfinance organizations (MFOs) account for 23% of all credit provided by the financial system. Average lending interest rates are 34%. There are 3 large entities (FINCA, Bai Tushum and Kompanion). Many of the 369 other MFOs are effectively non-operational.

MFOs have been successful in expanding credit to rural areas. They are primarily concentrated in financing agriculture (41%) and trade (35%).

Liquidity in local currency has tightened following the April events. This is because of the suspension of the AUB Bank's operations, which used to provide the US\$ funding used by MFOs.

The impact of the June 2010 events in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts has been much more severe, with all lending suspended in the affected regions and all MFOs reporting a material spike in non-payments. Only about 20%-25% of borrowers were estimated not to be affected in the events.

The June events have also impacted some MFOs in Yssyk-Kul oblast, as a result of the depressed tourism activity.

Another negative effect is a lack of funding since most traditional funders (international microfinance funds) have downgraded their country ratings and postponed planned loans to MFOs until at least November 2010, after the October parliamentary elections.

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

- **Rural** households were less likely to sometimes use a money transfer system than urban households (20% and 27% respectively) or to use bank or postal services to receive or send money (29% and 37% respectively).
- The vast majority of **severely food insecure** households were not using money transfer systems and only 12% sometimes used bank or postal services for cash transactions. These results should be taken into account when designing cash transfer interventions targeted to the most food insecure households.

<u>By oblast</u>

- The proportion of households using money transfer systems was higher in **Naryn** (38%) and **Batken** (33%) oblasts. Less than 10% of households were users of these systems in Chuy and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, but households were also less likely to receive any transfers from migrants in these oblasts.
- About 1/3 of households were sometimes using bank or postal services to receive or send money, including more than 60% in **Naryn** oblast.

3.9 – Main expenditures

Overview: Food was the 1st expenditure of more than 80% of urban households and almost 70% of rural households. The exceptions were in Naryn and Chuy oblasts were the ample availability of food obtained from harvest and animals enabled households to forego most food expenditures at this time of the year. Instead, expenses for agricultural inputs/livestock were the main ones for households in these oblasts. Food expenditures represented about half of the total 4 main expenditures incurred by households on a weekly basis. Most households mentioned utilities and hygiene items as their 2nd and 3rd expenditures.

Rural households spent larger amounts for water and agricultural inputs than urban households, while urban households spent larger amounts for food, hygiene items, clothing, house rental, transportation, health/medicines, ceremonies, debt repayment, land rental and house construction/repair material than rural households. Food insecure households spent lower amounts on every expenditure than food secure households. Average weekly expenditures for all items except education and house construction/repair

Average weekly expenditures for all items except education and nouse construction/repair material were higher in Bishkek city and Chuy oblast. They were lower in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, reflecting the effects of the June crisis.

<u>3.9.1 – Largest weekly expenditures</u>

- **Food** was the largest expenditure of ³/₄ of households, including more than 80% of urban households and close to 70% of rural households. Less than 3% of households ranked first their various other expenditures for basic needs (water, hygiene, health, utilities) or for livelihoods (transportation, education, agricultural inputs, material, debt repayment).
- Food represented almost half of total expenditures: 51% for urban households and 44% for rural households. A similar result was found in the KIHS.
- **Food insecure** households, especially the severely food insecure, were more likely to mention food as their largest expenditure: 90% of severely and 78% of moderately food insecure, compared to 71% of food secure households.
- The share of food expenditures was rather similar across all food security groups, just slightly higher among the severely food insecure (50% versus 47%).
- **Utilities** were the 2nd most frequent expenditures, especially in urban areas, closely followed by transportation, clothing, food and health. There were no significant differences across food security groups.
- Both **utilities** and **hygiene items** were the 3rd and 4th most frequent expenditures, especially utilities in urban areas and hygiene in rural areas, followed by clothing, transportation and health. Food insecure households were more likely to mention hygiene items as their 3rd expenditure than food secure households.

By oblast

• Households in **Naryn** oblast were much less likely to rank food as their largest expenditure, reflecting the large availability of recent and ongoing harvests (wheat, potatoes, vegetables, fruits enabling also to prepare jam as substitute for sugar) and easy access to animal products for dairy products, meat and fat. Instead, more than 40% of Naryn households

mentioned agricultural inputs/animal feed/irrigation as their largest expenditures, and 16% mentioned construction material for housing.

- The share of food expenditure was much lower in **Naryn** oblast (20%) than elsewhere, again reflecting the heavy reliance on own production at this time of the year.
- Households in **Chuy** oblast also tended to mention less frequently food as their largest expenditures (slightly more than half of Chuy households). Similarly to Naryn, it seems to reflect an easier access to own production (particularly potatoes, animal products and vegetables). Almost 20% ranked agricultural inputs/animal feed/irrigation as their largest expenditures.
- Households in **Chuy** and **Batken** oblasts were less likely to mention food as their 2nd expenditure with their answers more likely to mention hygiene items, and schooling in Chuy, whereas in Batken it was transportation and clothing.
- Hygiene items and clothing were more frequently mentioned as 2nd expenditures in **Osh**, **Jalalabad** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts.
- Households in **Naryn** oblast were more likely to mention agricultural inputs and house construction/repair materials as their 2nd expenditures.
- Households in **Naryn** oblast were more likely to mention both food and transportation as their 3rd and 4th expenditures and less likely to mention hygiene items and clothing.
- Utilities were more frequently ranked as 3rd expenditure for households in Batken oblast and in Bishkek city.



 Households in Bishkek city, Yssyk-Kul and Naryn oblasts were more likely to mention utilities as their 4th expenditure.

3.9.2 - Average amount of weekly expenditures

- Total weekly expenditures for the 4 most costly expenses reached 560 KGS/capita (US\$12, or US\$1.7/capita/day). They were higher in **urban** than rural areas, reflecting the wider variety of expenditures of urban households. Urban households spent on average 740 KGS/capita/week (about US\$2.2/capita/day) compared to 450 KGS for rural households (about US\$1.4/capita/day).
- Taken individually, the largest expenditures in absolute amount corresponded to telephone, house construction/repair material, education, clothing and agricultural inputs. For those incurring these expenditures (i.e. a single household was not incurring all

these expenditures), weekly averages were 250 KGS for food, 280 KGS for water, 220 KGS for hygiene items, 200 KGS for utilities, 550 KGS for clothing, 250 KGS for house rental, 1350 KGS for telephone, 320 KGS for transportation, 410 KGS for health/medicine, 610 KGS for education, 310 KGS for ceremonies, 500 KGS for agricultural inputs, 260 KGS for land rental and 1,130 KGS for house construction/repair material.

- **Rural** households spent larger amounts for water and agricultural inputs than urban households. **Urban** households spent larger amounts for food, hygiene items, clothing, house rental, transportation, health/medicines, ceremonies, debt repayment, land rental and house construction/repair material, than rural households.
- Food insecure households were spending lower amounts for all expenditures than food secure households.

By oblast

- Total weekly expenditures for the 4 most costly expenses were higher in **Bishkek city**, **Chuy** and **Naryn** oblasts. The lowest amount was in **Osh** oblast.
- Some households reported not spending anything on food because they fully relied on existing stocks. These households were mostly located in **Chuy** and **Naryn** oblasts and confirm a high reliance on own production for food consumption.
- The average amounts of weekly expenditures for all individual items except education and house construction/repair material were higher in **Bishkek city** and **Chuy** oblast. Conversely, average expenditures were low in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts reflecting the effects of the June crisis. Food expenditures were lower in **Osh**, **Yssyk-Kul** and **Batken** oblasts than elsewhere.
- The above findings are rather consistent with KIHS for the first 3 quarters of 2009, except for Osh where the situation has changed due to the June events. KIHS results indicated that monthly food expenditures per capita were much lower in the poorest quintiles of the population. They were also lower than average across all poverty quintiles in **Batken** and **Naryn** oblasts, confirming the widespread poverty in these oblasts. This poverty was not captured in the EFSA mostly due to the season, which enabled poor Naryn households to save on food expenditures and to earn a bit more cash from the sale of their produce.
- Considering that the levels of income by poverty quintiles in the KIHS were comparable across the various oblasts, the differences in food expenditures probably reflect variations of access to own food production as well as of prices possibly. Poorer households in Batken and Naryn oblasts may spend less of their income on food owing to greater reliance on their own products. Nevertheless, the low levels of kilocalorie consumption by households in bottom poverty quintiles in both oblasts indicate that the contribution of own food production is inadequate to ensure a proper diet.



3.10 - Credit or loans

Overview: Almost ¼ of households were in debt. Indebtedness was especially widespread among households in Naryn and Talas oblasts. The most frequent expenditures covered by credit or loan were transportation (about half of the borrowing households) and food, house construction/repair material and/or agricultural inputs for more than 1/3 of borrowing households.

Rural households were more likely to have borrowed money for hygiene products and agricultural inputs, than urban households, while urban households were more likely to have incurred debts for food, transportation, education, clothing, house rental and house construction/repair materials.

Food insecure households had more often borrowed for food, utilities, hygiene items, education and house construction/repair materials than food secure households. Severely food insecure households were more likely to have borrowed for health expenditures, ceremonies, clothing and material to remove rubbles, and less for agricultural inputs than other households.

In Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, the most frequent expenditures covered by credit or loans were food, as well as utilities, hygiene items and agricultural inputs in Osh. In Batken oblast it was transportation and land rental, health in Bishkek and utilities, hygiene items and agricultural inputs in Naryn and Batken oblasts. Education costs and ceremonies were also reasons for debt in Bishkek, Chuy and Talas oblasts.

- Almost ¼ of households had credit or loan to reimburse.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to be indebted, possibly because they had less collateral (land, animals, property) to secure loans and/or weaker network of relatives and friends who could loan them money.
- There were no significant differences between man- and woman-headed households in terms of indebtedness. However, woman-headed households were more likely to be indebted in **Osh** oblast (33% had credit or loan to reimburse compared to 20% of man-headed households), while in Batken oblast only 3% of woman-headed households were indebted compared to 11% of man-headed households. Departure or loss of the man bread-winner may explain the higher rate of indebtedness among woman-headed households in Osh oblast.
- The most frequent expenditures covered by credit or loan were **transportation** (about half of the borrowing households), **food** (37% of borrowers), **house construction/repair material** (35%), **agricultural inputs** (34%), **utilities** (28%), **health/medicine** (25%), **hygiene items** (22%) and **clothing** (21%).
- **Rural** households were more likely to have borrowed money for hygiene products and agricultural inputs, than urban households. **Urban** households were more likely to have incurred debts for food, transportation, education, clothing, house rental and house construction/repair materials.
- Food insecure households were more likely to have borrowed for food, utilities, hygiene items, education and house construction/repair materials than food secure households. Severely food insecure households were more likely to have incurred debts for health expenditures, ceremonies, clothing and material to remove rubbles, and less for agricultural inputs than other households.



<u>By oblast</u>

- Between 30% and 40% of households in **Naryn** and **Talas** oblasts were indebted, and between 20% and 25% in the other oblasts and Bishkek city, except Batken where only 10% had credit or loans to reimburse.
- Food was the main expenditure covered by credit or loans in more than half of the households in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts and by more than ¼ of households in other oblasts except Batken (only 17% of households). Credit/loans were used to pay for **transportation cost** by more than 80% of households in **Batken** oblast and by more than half of households in Osh and Chuy oblasts and Bishkek city. More than half of households in **Osh** used credit or loans to pay for **utilities**. About 30% of households in **Bishkek** used them to cover **health expenses** and more than 40% in **Osh** oblast.



• About 60% of households used credit or loans to purchase **agricultural inputs** or pay for **irrigation** in **Batken**, **Talas** and **Chuy** oblasts, and between 30% and 40% of households in Osh and Naryn oblasts. More than 70% of households in **Batken** used credit or loans to pay for **land rental**. **Hygiene items** were mentioned by half of the indebted households in **Osh** and 30% in Jalalabad oblasts. Credit/loan was used to cover **education-related costs** by about 30% of households in **Chuy** oblast and **Bishkek city**. More than 30% of households in **Talas** and 20% in Naryn and Bishkek city got indebted to cover **ceremony** expenditures.

3.11 – Crop cultivation

A Crop and Food Supply Assessment was conducted together with FAO at the same time as this survey and will provide additional information on agriculture and forecast harvest and livestock production this year³³.

3.11.1 – Agricultural production and food availability at national level

- Agriculture is the mainstay of the economy, accounting for a more than a quarter of total GDP and employing a third of the workforce. The country has predominantly mountainous terrain with only about 6% of the land suitable for cultivation (1.4 million hectare). As a result, the livestock sector is a major agricultural activity, with wool, meat and dairy products being the main commodities. More than 90% of cattle, sheep and horses and 85% of poultry are owned by small-scale farms with either small household plots or private farms.
- The major crops are potato, wheat, sugar beet, cotton, tobacco, vegetables and fruit. About half of the wheat consumed by the population is imported, mainly from Kazakhstan. Around 40% of vegetable oil and 80% of sugar are also imported.
- The agricultural sector is highly dependent on regional trade:
 - Kazakh border: major route for livestock, dairy, fruit and vegetable exports to Kazakhstan and Russia, and a route for wheat flour, oil and sugar, fuel and spare-part imports to Kyrgyzstan;
 - Uzbek border: major route for seasonal import and export in vegetables, import of nitrogen fertilizer to Kyrgyzstan, and export of livestock;
 - Tajik border: mainly a route for livestock trade;
 - Chinese border: major route for a diverse range of imports and exports.
- Prices of wheat are expected to increase in the next months as a result of downward harvest in several of the major world suppliers and ban on wheat grain exports announced by Russia on 4 August 2010. The wheat harvest in Kazakhstan is forecast to be down by 20% compared to the record harvest of 2009 (the decrease is lower if compared to the past 5-year average), but no ban on exports are intended so far (see paragraph 4.2.3).
- According to the Joint Economic Assessment (JEA) carried out in July 2010 by the Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund and the World Bank³⁴, domestic agricultural activity is expected to decline by 12% and agricultural gross value by 19% in 2010 as security problems and lack of inputs have led to a disruption in agricultural work and trading in the southern oblasts, which account for 25% of national output. The main results of the JEA are summarized in Box 9.

Box 9 – Forecast effects of civil unrest on agricultural production

The main factors contributing to the forecast agricultural output decrease include:

- late spring planting following the April events and delayed fuel provision;
- suspension of fertilizer imports from Uzbekistan following the June events;
- reduced irrigation, pest and disease control, weeding and timely harvesting due to insecurity in the southern oblasts;
- severe contraction in crop trade by farmers and traders in southern oblasts due to insecurity;
- higher fuel, machinery service and input prices;
- lower output/crop prices; and
- to a lesser extent, disruption to livestock grazing.

These crisis-related difficulties were exacerbated by a wet spring and early summer, as well as mudslides in isolated areas. Competition over access to land, irrigation and pastures has also been long-standing contributory factors to ethnic tensions in southern oblasts. Restricted market access through Uzbek enclaves, poor farm-to-market roads, weak storage infrastructures and inequitable

³⁴ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

³³ Report expected in September 2010.

natural resources management also worsen tensions.

The cessation of fertilizer imports by the most important company in June due to legal issues will significantly affect the production of maize, potatoes, vegetables and cotton, with yield decreases of up to 5%. The impact of insecurity in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts is substantial: crops planted before the crisis were not irrigated or weeded, pesticides not applied to potatoes and vegetables, and crops left in the ground not harvested. As a result, **agricultural output in the affected farms is expected to decline by 20%-30%**. No formal survey has been implemented, however about 15% of farmers are assumed to be severely restricted in undertaking field work because of security concerns.

Insecurity is also undermining domestic and export trade. Between 10% and 30% of the output will not be sold or consumed as a result of reduced trading activity. Output prices are expected to decline also by 10% to 30%. On the other hand, the price of nitrogen fertilizer increased by 16% during the crisis due to the cessation of imports. Production costs also rose because of higher fuel and machinery service costs.

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

<u>3.11.2 – Household access to garden or land to cultivate</u>

Overview: Access to garden or land to cultivate was widespread, including for about ¼ of urban households. However, the acreage cultivated per capita was low for most households, and below the theoretical minimum enabling self-sufficiency. Severely food insecure households were less likely to have access to garden or land, and cultivated a lower acreage than other households.

Woman-headed households generally had less access to garden or land, especially those severely food insecure, but those who had garden or land tended to cultivate a similar acreage as man-headed households.

Access to garden or land was more frequent in Chuy oblast and less in Naryn oblast. However, average acreage of garden/land cultivated per capita was the largest in Talas followed by Naryn oblast, and lowest in Bishkek city.

- About 71% of households in rural areas and 24% in urban areas had access to a garden or land to cultivate.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to have access to garden or land than food secure households, but this was not the case of moderately food insecure households. This reflects the rural location of most moderately food insecure households.
- In theory, self-sufficiency in wheat, animal products, beans and vegetables could be obtained by cultivating about 0.17 ha/capita (see Box 10). Clearly, this acreage requirement varies according to agro-ecological conditions (e.g. soil fertility, rainfall, altitude, slope etc.) and productivity (influenced by use of fertilizer, irrigation etc.).

Box 10 - Estimation of theoretical minimum land acreage for food self-sufficiency

Wheat self-sufficiency

- Estimated consumption in wheat equivalent: 570 g/cap./day
- Wheat production needed to meet annual consumption requirements: 208 kg/cap
- Average yield of wheat: 2.6 Mt/ha, ranging from 1.5 Mt in some non-irrigated areas of northern oblasts to 6 Mt in some irrigated areas of southern oblasts.
- Land acreage required for theoretical self-sufficiency in wheat: 0.08 ha/cap, ranging from 0.03 ha/cap. in some irrigated areas of southern oblasts to 0.139 ha/ cap. in some areas of northern oblasts
- For an average household of 6 members: 0.48 ha, ranging from 0.21 ha (irrigated) to 0.83 ha (non irrigated, low yields).

Animal, beans and vegetables self-sufficiency

• Most rural households also raise a cattle or a couple of small ruminants. For this, an additional 0.07 ha/capita (about 0.3-0.4 ha for a 6-member household) would be needed, i.e. about 0.4 ha for a 6-member household.

• To grow some beans and vegetables, another 0.02 ha/capita are required, i.e. about 0.1-0.2 ha for a 6-member household.

Total theoretical acreage for wheat, animal products, beans and vegetables self-sufficiency

- Wheat: 0.08 + animals 0.06 + beans/vegetables 0.02 = 0.17 ha/capita, i.e. about 1 ha for a 6-member household.
- The majority of households including almost 80% in urban areas and 60% in rural areas with access to garden or land cultivated a lower acreage than the theoretical minimum for self-sufficiency.
- More than ³/₄ of the **severely food insecure** households cultivated less than 0.17 ha/capita, i.e. below the theoretical acreage enabling self-sufficiency.
- Woman-headed households were less likely to have access to a garden or land to cultivate, especially in Naryn and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, but not in Bishkek city.



• However, the **average acreage per capita** cultivated by woman-headed households with access to garden or land was not necessarily lower than the acreage per capita of manheaded households. This reflects in part the smaller family size of woman-headed households.



By oblast

• Between ½ and ¾ of households reported access to a garden or land to cultivate, except in Bishkek city where only 15% of households did. Access to garden or land was more frequent in Chuy (72%) and least in Naryn (48%) oblast.

- For households having access to garden or land, the average acreage cultivated per capita was the largest in **Talas** (1.17 ha/cap.) followed by **Naryn** (0.76 ha/cap.) oblasts and lowest in **Bishkek city** (0.15 ha/cap).
- Taking the theoretical reference acreage per capita as a basis, the majority of cultivating households in **Bishkek city** and **Chuy** oblast would not be self-sufficient, while most of the cultivating households in **Naryn** could be self-sufficient in theory, as well as about 70% of households in **Batken**. Between 40%-60% of cultivating households in the other oblasts would potentially be self-sufficient. However, as results on harvests below indicate, the amounts of crops obtained rarely covered more than 5-6 months of family self-consumption



3.11.3 - Access to fertilizer

- Almost 80% of rural households and 70% of urban households able to cultivate were using fertilizer.
- Severely food insecure households tended to use less frequently fertilizer than other households, but 70% still did.

By oblast

- Fertilizer was accessed by about 80% or more households who were able to cultivate in most oblasts except Yssyk-Kul oblast (31% had access) and to a lesser extent Naryn oblast (66%) and Bishkek city (57%).
- As mentioned, fertilizer imports ceased in southern oblasts in June and prices increased by about 16% as a result. Shortage of fertilizer will affect yields of maize, potatoes, vegetables and cotton.
- The price of fertilizer is linked to the price of fuel. Data from the Kyrgyz Agricultural Market Information System (KAMI) indicate a general increase of the price of diesel since 2005, with a peak in 2008 reflecting the rise of price in international markets.



• According to Key Informants, the prices of urea and ammonium nitrate were similar and higher in **Chuy** oblast than elsewhere.

<u>3.11.4 – Access to irrigation system</u>

- **Rural** households able to cultivate were less likely to have a fully functional irrigation system than farming urban households: 50% versus 60%.
- There was no clear association between food insecurity and access to irrigation.

By oblast

- The majority of households with garden or land had access to irrigation, except in **Osh** where more than 1/4 of farming households did not have access. However, between 1/5 and ½ of households with irrigation indicated that the system was only partially functional. **Partially functional irrigation system** was mentioned by more than half of the households in **Naryn** and **Jalalabad** oblasts.
- While irrigation systems were not heavily damaged during the June crisis, they suffer from inadequate repair and maintenance. As access to water is one of the factors contributing to ethnic tensions, ensuring improved access to water will be an important aspect of the recovery programme.

3.11.5 - Main crops cultivated, harvest period, sales and self-consumption

Overview: Food insecure households, especially those severely, were less likely to cultivate potatoes, vegetables and fruit trees, and more likely to cultivate maize. The share of the harvest kept for family consumption was smaller than for food secure households and rarely lasted beyond 4 months of self-sufficiency.



Wheat and maize were essentially planted in Yssyk-Kul (wheat mostly), Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts. Potatoes and vegetables were widespread except in Batken oblast. Fruit trees were less frequently found in Yssyk-Kul, Naryn and Talas oblasts.



For those cultivating wheat, it was the harvest lasting longer for family self-consumption, followed by potatoes. However, the harvest of cereals, potatoes, fruits or vegetables rarely lasted more than 5 months for own consumption.



At least 40% of the harvest of the various crops cultivated was sold in Talas, Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts. Between 40% and 50% of the wheat harvest was also sold in Chuy and Naryn oblasts.



<u>Wheat</u>

- 43% of households in rural areas but only 12% of urban households had cultivated wheat.
- On average **40% of the wheat harvest was sold**, ranging from a low 20% in Yssyk-Kul to a high 67% in Talas. The remaining wheat was reported to last between **6-7 months for family self-consumption**.
- There was no clear relationship with food insecurity, however the wheat harvest kept for own consumption lasted for a **shorter duration** in food insecure households: 4-6 months compared to more than 7 months for food secure households.
- Wheat was cultivated by about half of the households with access to land in **Naryn, Yssyk-Kul**, **Osh**, **Jalalabad** and **Batken** oblasts, and rarely planted in Chuy and Talas oblasts. Most of the households in northern oblasts mentioned September as the harvest month, while July/August were more frequently mentioned in Jalalabad, Osh and Batken oblasts.

<u>Maize</u>

- 47% of rural households and 29% of urban households cultivated maize.
- Between ¼ and ½ of the maize harvest was sold. The remaining maize harvest lasted **4-5 months** for family self-consumption.
- **Food insecure** households were more likely to cultivate maize than food secure households. As for wheat, the duration of their unsold harvest was shorter than for food secure households: 3-4 months compared to almost 5 months.
- Maize was cultivated by 40% to 67% of households in Chuy, Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts, but much less in the other oblasts. It was mostly harvested in September/October, somewhat sooner in Chuy and Jalalabad oblasts.

Potatoes

- 72% of households in rural areas and 55% in urban areas cultivated potatoes.
- The potato harvest kept for family consumption lasted on average **5-6 months**, ranging from 4 months in Jalalabad oblast to 8 months in Yssyk-Kul oblast.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to cultivate potatoes than other households. The unsold harvest of food insecure households lasted about 5 months, compared to almost 6 months for food secure households.
- The proportion of farming households planting potatoes was lower in Batken (35%) and Bishkek city (46%). About ¼ of households in several oblasts start harvesting in July, but the majority does so in September.

• The proportion of potato harvest sold varied across oblasts. Between 40%-50% of the harvest was reportedly sold in Talas, Osh and Batken oblasts, between 20%-30% of the harvest in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul and Jalalabad oblasts, and less than 20% in Chuy oblast and Bishkek city.

Cotton

- Only 6% of households, in rural areas, cultivated cotton.
- Cotton was cultivated by 21% of households in **Jalalabad** and practically not reported by households elsewhere. The share kept for self-consumption (cotton oil?) by households in Jalalabad lasted about 4 months.

Vegetables

- 63% of rural households and 74% of urban households with garden or land cultivated vegetables.
- The amount of vegetables kept for family consumption lasted about 3-4 months, ranging from 2 to 5 months in different oblasts.
- Food insecure households were less likely to cultivate vegetables than food secure households. Their unsold harvest lasted 2-3 months, compared to almost 4 months for food secure households.
- More than 2/3 of households with garden or land planted vegetables in most oblasts and Bishkek city, but less so (1/3-½ of households) in **Yssyk-Kul, Naryn** and **Osh** oblasts.
- Most of the vegetable harvest took place in August/September except in southern oblasts (Jalalabad, Osh, Batken) where it mostly took place in June or July. Almost 40% of households in Chuy oblast indicated that they could harvest during the whole year, possibly reflecting access to greenhouses.
- A relatively high proportion of the vegetables (30%-50%) was sold in Talas, Jalalabad, Osh and Batken oblasts. A much lower proportion was sold elsewhere.

<u>Fruits</u>

- 62% of rural households and 66% of urban households had access to fruit trees.
- The amount of fruits kept for family consumption lasted between **3-4 months**, ranging from 2 to 5 months in different oblasts.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to have access to fruit trees. The share of harvest kept for family consumption lasted less than food secure households: 2-3 months compared to 4 months.
- Similarly as for vegetables, 2/3 or more households had access to fruit trees in most oblasts and Bishkek city except in **Talas** (19%), **Naryn** (25%) and **Yssyk-Kul** (39%) oblasts.
- Fruits were harvested mostly in August/September, except in the southern oblasts where the harvest could start earlier in June/July. Again, 34% of households in Chuy oblast reported harvest throughout the year.
- Between 30% and 40% of the fruit harvest were sold in Talas, Jalalabad, Osh and Batken oblasts. A much lower proportion was sold elsewhere.

3.11.6 - Main constraints for cultivation

Overview: The most frequently mentioned constraints for cultivation were high cost of fertilizer and seed, lack of high quality seed, lack or high cost of agricultural machinery, and unstable selling prices. Other constraints mentioned by at least half of the households in most oblasts were the lack of irrigation, lack of manpower and unreliable trade agreements. Food insecure households, especially those severely, were more likely to mention constraints to cultivation than food secure households.

Insecurity to access fields or to irrigate was more frequently mentioned in Talas oblast, followed by Osh and Naryn oblasts, indicating that civil unrest also affected cultivation in some northern oblasts.

• Food insecure households, especially those severely food insecure, were more likely to mention constraints for cultivation than food secure households. This was especially true regarding the high cost of seeds, lack of irrigation, insecurity to access fields, lack of agricultural machinery, lack of manpower to cultivate, unstable selling prices, and unreliable trade agreements.



By oblast

- High cost of fertilizer and seed were mentioned by more than 80% of farmers in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh, Talas and Yssyk-Kul oblasts and by about 60% of households elsewhere.
- Lack of high quality seed was reported by 70% to 80% of households in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh, Talas and Yssyk-Kul oblasts and Bishkek city, and by about 60% of households in Naryn and Chuy oblasts.
- Lack of irrigation was a constraint for cultivation for at least 1/2 of the farmers in Naryn, Osh and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, and also mentioned by about 40% of the households elsewhere.



• The cost of machinery services and the lack of access to agricultural machinery were the main constraints for 70%-85% of households in Jalalabad, Osh, Talas and Naryn

oblasts. These difficulties were also reported by 40%-50% of farmers in Yssyk-Kul and Chuy oblasts.

• The **lack of manpower** was also a problem for half or more of the households everywhere and especially in **Naryn** oblast where more than 80% of the households faced this problem. It was less frequently mentioned by farming households in Chuy oblast (less than 40%).



- Lack of security to access fields or to irrigate was mentioned by about 60% of households in Talas oblast, and by about 40% of households in Osh and Naryn oblasts. It was also a constraint for some 30% of households in Batken and Jalalabad oblasts.
- Unreliable trade agreements with crop buyers was an issue for about 70% of farmers in Osh and Naryn oblasts and for almost half of farmers in Yssyk-Kul, Chuy and Batken oblasts.
- Unstable crop selling prices were a problem for more than 70% of farmers in Osh, Yssyk-Kul, Naryn oblasts nd especially in Talas oblast where it was mentioned by 87% of farmers. It was also a constraint for 50% to 60% of households in the other oblasts.



3.12 – Ownership of animals

Overview: About ³⁄₄ of rural households and 1/5 of urban households owned animals. Severely food insecure households were less likely to own animals, to have adequate winter fodder, to cultivate lucerne and to intend buying supplementary animal feed, than other households. The number of animals kept by severely food insecure households was also lower than the number owned by food secure households. Even though the number of animals kept by urban households was lower than the number owned by rural households, urban households with animals still owned an average of 11 poultry, 5-6 sheep, 2 cattle and sometimes a horse or donkey.

More than half of households owned animals across the various oblasts, except in Bishkek city. Animal ownership was more widespread in Naryn oblast but the average number of small ruminants was higher in Talas oblast while the number of poultry was higher in Chuy oblast. Between 40% and 50% of animal owners had access to adequate winter fodder except in Naryn oblast where less than 30% did.

The most frequent constraints for animal husbandry were the high cost of animal feed, lack of adequate pasture land, animal diseases and high cost of veterinary services. About 40% of livestock owners also mentioned animal theft, insecurity to reach pasture, insecurity to reach markets, low animal/animal product selling prices, and lack of manpower to care for the animals. Severely food insecure households were more frequently constrained by lack of adequate pasture land or insecurity to reach pastures, lack of animal shelter and insufficient manpower to keep animals. Insecurity and thefts, and many of the other constraints, tended to be more frequently mentioned in Talas oblast.

The price of live cattle has increased slightly in the past few years but low animal prices were nonetheless mentioned as a problem by about half of the households in many oblasts.

3.12.1 - Animal ownership

- Livestock production was less affected by the April and June events than crops, although grazing and winter nutrition will be to some extent due to decreased yields of lucerne and maize. Livestock may enter the winter in worse condition and less fodder may be available during the winter. In addition, many of the families in affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad have lost their livestock.
- About ³/₄ of rural households and 1/5 of urban households owned animals.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to own animals, while moderately food insecure households were more likely to own animals, than food secure households. Similarly as for access to land, this may reflect the rural location of most moderately food insecure households.
- Woman-headed households were less likely to own animals than man-headed households except in Osh oblast.



• The average number of **poultry** owned was 11-12 without significant difference between urban and rural areas. Rural households kept on average 10 **sheep** and/or 2-3 **cattle**, while urban households owned 5-6 sheep and 2 cattle on average. **Horses** were mostly owned by rural households (1), although **donkeys** were similarly owned by rural and urban households (0-1).

• Food insecure households owned a lower number (5-9) of poultry than food secure households (12). Severely food insecure households also owned a much lower number than other households (3 sheep compared to 9), and less cattle (about 1 cattle versus 2-3) and less likely. A similar number of donkeys were kept across the various food security groups.



By oblast

- More than half of the households owned animals in most oblasts, more so in **Naryn** oblast (72%) and much less in Bishkek city (7%).
- More than 12 **poultry** were owned on average by households having animals in **Chuy**, **Talas** and **Jalalabad** oblasts and **Bishkek city**, compared to 8-9 poultry in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul and Osh oblasts.
- More than 11 **sheep** on average were owned by households in **Naryn, Talas** (17) and **Jalalabad** oblasts. Lower numbers were owned elsewhere, especially in Chuy oblast (about 5) and Bishkek city (less than 4). An average of 3 **cattle** were raised by animal owners in **Naryn, Osh, Jalalabad** and **Batken** oblasts, and about 2 elsewhere.
- An average of 3 horses was owned by households in Naryn oblast, and about 1 horse in Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts. Donkeys tended to be more frequently owned by households in Talas, Osh and Batken oblasts and Bishkek city.



3.12.2 - Prices of live animals

• Data from the Kyrgyz Agricultural Market Information System (KAMIS) indicate that the price of a live female **sheep** (1-2 years old) remained fairly stable between 2005 and 2009.



- According to Key Informants, the price of a female sheep (after 1st lambing) on local markets was higher in Chuy oblast than elsewhere.
- The price of live **dairy cattle** (1-2.5 years old) tended to increase between 2005 and 2009 but not everywhere. Similar trend and variations were noted for live **meat cattle**.



• Key Informants reported higher prices of a breeding cow/cow after 1st or 2nd calf in local markets of **Chuy** and **Naryn** oblasts, followed by **Jalalabad** oblast than elsewhere.

3.12.3 – Animal fodder

- On average 44% of households had adequate winter fodder and 70%-80% stated that they would buy supplementary feed.
- 19% of rural households and 8% of urban households cultivated lucerne. The amount kept for animal feeding lasted 5-6 months on average.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to have adequate winter fodder and to intend buying supplementary feed. Food insecure households cultivated lucerne less often than food secure households. They tended to sell a larger share of the harvest (25%-30%) and the remaining amount for own use lasted for a shorter duration (2-5 months compared to more than 5 months in food secure households).

By oblast

- Between 40% and 50% of the households owning animals had access to adequate **winter** fodder, except in **Naryn** oblast where only 27% reported access.
- Lucerne was planted by 30% to 47% of households in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts and by only about 20% of households in Chuy and Jalalabad oblasts. It was much less frequently cultivated elsewhere. The harvest took place mostly in August/September.
- About 40% of the lucerne harvest was sold by households in the main producing oblasts and less elsewhere.
- KAMIS results show seasonal variations in the price of lucerne with an increase in 2007 and 2008 followed by a sharp decrease after mid-2009. Lucerne prices have returned to their 2005-2006 levels since then.



• More than 2/3 of households intended to buy **supplementary animal feed** in most oblasts. They were more than 80% to say so in **Batken** oblast and **Bishkek city**.



3.12.4 - Main constraints to raise animals

- Between 60%-80% of animal raising households mentioned the **cost of animal feed, lack of adequate pasture land, animal diseases** and the **cost of veterinary services** as constraints. Between 30%-40% of livestock owners were also constrained by the lack of adequate, good quality winter fodder, insecurity to reach pasture, insecurity to access markets for animal/animal product sales, low selling prices, animal theft, lack of animal shelter and insufficient manpower to care for the animals.
- Rural households were more likely to mention difficulties related to animal fodder and pastures, and to animal health and veterinary services, than urban households.
- Severely food insecure households were more frequently constrained by lack of adequate pasture land or insecurity to reach pastures, lack of animal shelter and insufficient manpower to keep animals, but less likely to report difficulties with the high cost of veterinary services, probably because they tended not to use them at all.



By oblast

• Lack of adequate winter fodder was a problem for about half of the households in Batken and Jalalabad oblasts and for more than 30% of households in Osh, Talas and Chuy oblasts.



- The **lack of manpower** to keep and care for animals was a constraint for more than half of households in **Osh** and **Naryn** oblasts and for more than 30% of households in Jalalabad and Talas oblasts. The **lack of animal shelter** was an issue for more than half of the households in **Naryn** and more than 40% in **Jalalabad** oblasts.
- Animal diseases were a problem for the majority of households in **Talas** and for 60%-70% of households in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh and Yssyk-Kul oblasts. The **cost of veterinary services** was also very frequently mentioned by more than 80% of households in **Talas** and 70% of households in **Chuy** oblasts, and more than half of the households in other oblasts



- Low prices for animal sales were reported by more than half of households in Osh, Talas, Yssyk-Kul and Naryn oblasts and by 30%-40% of households elsewhere.
- Animal theft was a constraint for about 80% of households in Talas and for more than half of households in Jalalabad and Naryn oblasts. It was also a problem for 30%-40% of households in Osh and Yssyk-Kul oblasts. Insecurity to access pasture was also more frequently reported in Talas oblast (about 70% of households) and by about 40% of households in other oblasts except Chuy. Insecurity to access markets for animal or animal product sales was a problem for 40% to 50% of households in Talas, Jalalabad, Osh, Naryn and Chuy blasts.



3.13 – Markets

3.13.1 - Structure and performance of markets

- Limited information was collected on markets since they were also part of the FAO/WFP Crop and Food Supply Assessment³⁵ conducted at the same time as this assessment. The main results of a WFP Regional Market Study³⁶ carried out in 2008 on market structure and performance in Kyrgyzstan are summarized in Box 11.
- Kyrgyzstan is self-sufficient in potatoes, most vegetables and fruits, milk products, meat (93%) and eggs but **must import half or more of its wheat** (around 500,000 Mt annually), **vegetable oil** (44% imported) and **sugar** (85% imported). The volume of food aid is small in comparison. It is mainly provided through WFP Vulnerable Group Feeding Programme in 6 oblasts with high prevalence of food insecurity (about 9,700 Mt in 2009 and 11,184 Mt planned in 2010). WFP has stepped up its food aid programme in Osh and Jalalabad affected areas in July/August 2010 in response to the civil violence. Some 2,409 Mt were distributed in these 2 oblasts in July 2010.

Box 11 – Agriculture and food markets in Kyrgyzstan

Farming is essentially small-scale and with relatively low level of commercialization. In the absence of investment in the agriculture sector, the quality and quantity of Kyrgyz outputs are inferior, making Kyrgyz farmers uncompetitive on international markets, and forcing them to sell at the local market price. Nevertheless, potatoes and vegetables contribute 12% to the value of official exports.

In 2008, prices for some goods, such as cereals and grains, were found to be 50-80% higher in Kyrgyz markets than on world markets. These high prices benefit larger scale farmers, mostly located near the Kazakh border. But the production technology does not apply for the typical small-scale farmer, who has less than 1 ha of land. In addition, these higher prices do not necessarily raise income of Kyrgyz farmers. Incomplete and segmented markets provide arbitrage opportunities for traders, and despite growing competition in trading, there remains a large wedge between farm-gate prices and market prices across the country. Low revenues per worker are partly explained by the high ratio of farm workers to land, and partly by low farm-gate prices for farm outputs.

Trade is liberalized. There are no import taxes on food stuffs, although sugar is subject to seasonal tariffs that may reach 30%. However, in July 2008, the Government introduced an export tax of 100% on the sales of wheat, wheat products, oilseeds and vegetables, effectively blocking export of home-produced goods and their re-export of imported goods.

³⁵ Report expected by September 2010.

³⁶ Regional Market Survey for the Central Asian Region. Food Markets and Food Insecurity in Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. World Food Programme, August 2008.

In response to lower than average domestic wheat harvest and threats on ban of wheat exports from Kazakhstan, the Government introduced a 30% tax on export of wheat of baking quality mid-August 2010, supposed to be valid until early February 2011

Marketing of agricultural produce is hampered by **poor physical and institutional infrastructure, and inadequate access to finance. Markets are generally segmented** (except for wheat flour) due to:

- Rugged geography, which separates the country into two economic regions and two markets that lack integration. The 2 economic centres of the country, the Chuy valley in the north and Ferghana valley in the south, are separated by mountains.
- Dependence on neighbouring countries for reaching internal and external markets. The Kyrgyz Republic's road and railway systems in the north are part of the transportation networks of Kazakhstan, and in the south they are part of the networks of Uzbekistan.
- Restrictions on cross-border trade and road checks internally (bribes).
- Poor road conditions.
- High fuel costs.
- Lack of information on market demands for commodities.

Market segmentation and inefficiencies result in:

- High marketing margins and important differences between farm-gate prices and market prices (low revenues for the producer, and high prices for the consumer);
- High variation in prices across oblasts for similar commodities, depending on their proximity to external markets;
- Exclusion of many producers from access to the market and from gains from higher prices;
- Poor crop diversification, as producers are reluctant to engage into commercial crops without guarantee of the market.

A combination of small size of individual production units and absence of processing plants mean that local produce is: (i) consumed locally, (ii) traded through a series of merchant steps from village to main centres, and (iii) transported by fleets of small, 2-ton trucks by groups of producers to small markets.

Lack of processing also means that much of the surplus seasonal production is probably waster, not including home bottling/curing/salting/drying/smoking practices traditional in rural households to conserve surplus production for winter consumption.

Sources: Regional Market Survey for the Central Asian Region. Food Markets and Food Insecurity in Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. World Food Programme, August 2008 - Poverty, Livelihood Vulnerability and Food Insecurity in the Kyrgyz Republic – M. Abi Samra, World Food Programme, March 2007 (unpublished)

3.13.2 - Physical access to local markets

- According to Key Informants, markets were easily accessible (less than 30 mn) for the majority of **urban locations** and for more than 60% of **rural locations**.
- About half of the markets in both urban and rural areas could be reached within 15-30 mn using the most usual means of transportation. In 15% of urban locations it took 30-60 mn and in 7% more than 1 hour. More than ¼ of rural locations were situated at 30-60 mn from the market and 9% more than 1 hour.

By oblast

- Markets were further away on average in Naryn and Talas oblasts.
- A higher proportion of localities in **Naryn**, **Talas** and **Batken** oblasts were located at more than 1 hour distance. A higher proportion of localities in **Naryn**, **Talas**, **Chuy** and **Jalalabad** oblasts were located at more than 30 mn of distance.

3.13.3 – Prices and trends

Overview: Wholesale consumer price of all major staples, most of which are largely imported, increased between 2005 and 2009-2010, with a peak in 2008. They reflect the transmission of international prices variations. The price of potatoes which are locally produced and marketed did not augment but presented significant seasonal variations. In the spring 2010, the price of

wheat was lower than at its peak in 2008 but above the past 5-year average and had resumed an upward trend in mid-August 2010. It is expected to rise further in the coming months owing to lower than average domestic wheat harvest and decreased harvest from major world suppliers including Kazakhstan which covers 90% of Kyrgyzstan wheat imports.

• Data from central markets collected through the Kyrgyz Agricultural Market Information System (KAMIS) show an increase of the price of **wheat flour** at the end of 2007 and decline in 2009 but prices remained above the 2005-2007 average in the spring of 2010. A similar trend was observed for **sunflower oil**.





- According to Key Informants, the price of most food items on local markets tended to be higher in urban than rural areas, and in Bishkek city compared to oblasts.
- The price of wheat on local markets was lower in Yssyk-Kul, Talas, Osh and Batken oblasts than elsewhere (6-8 KGS versus 10-13 KGS/kg), probably reflecting the recent harvest in these high wheat producing oblasts.



- As mentioned, the price of wheat on local markets is expected to rise as a result of lower domestic harvest due to the April and June disruptions and late spring rains, request by Russia to Kazakhstan to follow suit by temporarily suspending its wheat exports, downward harvest forecast in Kazakhstan (main source of Kyrgyz wheat imports), and increased wheat prices on international markets. The price rise on domestic markets will also reflect the jump of wheat international prices by 50% since June 2010, reflecting concerns about wheat harvests in Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine to a lesser extent, and Canada, which are major suppliers of wheat to world markets.
- Mid-August 2010, the government introduced a 30% tax on the export of wheat of baking quality.
- A higher price of wheat grain will translate into higher **prices of wheat flour, bread and other cereal-based products** on Kyrgyz local markets. This will hurt households who purchase most of their bread and wheat flour. The EFSA found that food insecure households purchased 40% of the bread and 60%-80% of cereal products consumed in the previous 7 days. Food secure households purchased 60% of their bread and more than 80% of other cereals. These proportions will increase in winter and spring months when stocks of wheat from the recent harvest become depleted.
- The price of **potatoes** shows wide seasonal variations linked to harvest times essentially. Potato prices have generally increased compared to 2005.



• Meat and sugar prices steadily increased over the past 5 years, with peaks for meat in 2008 and recently (March-May 2010).





• According to Key Informants, **the price of several commodities had increased** compared to before the violence in mid-June:

- **Bread**: by 27%, from 11 som/piece to 14 som now.
- wheat flour: by about 11%, reaching 760 som/50 kg now;
- **rice**: by about 16%, reaching 66 som/kg now;
- **vegetable oil**: by about 17%, reaching 70 som/litre now;
- **sugar**: by about 14%, reaching 56 som/kg now.

Conversely, **price of potatoes had slightly decreased** from 14 som/kg before to 10 som/kg now. The latter is mainly due to the incapacity of farmers to sell their potatoes to Kazakhstan or Uzbekistan traders as a result of the border closure.



3.14- Assets ownership

Overview: More than 90% of households owned a stove, a television and a cell phone. Ownership of other domestic and productive assets varied quite a lot across oblasts. Asset ownership tended to be lower in Yssyk-Kul, Naryn and Osh oblasts, consistent with the high poverty levels in these oblasts.

- The majority of households owned a stove, television and cell phone.
- In both urban and rural areas, between 50%-60% of households owned a radio, a sewing machine, and/or a car, and almost 40% a bicycle. Almost 1/5 of households had some petty trade stocks and 14% owned a shop.
- Severely food insecure households were less likely to own any of the various assets, although about 70% did have a stove, television and cell phone. Less than 20% had a car, less than 30% a radio, and less than 40% a sewing machine. Almost none had petty trade stocks or a shop. Moderately food insecure households were also less likely to own petty trade stocks as well as a car, but had about the same level of other assets as food secure households. As such, ownership of *domestic assets* is not the best targeting criteria to select food insecure households.



<u>By oblast</u>

- At least 70% of households owned a **radio** in Bishkek city, Talas, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts, but less than 50% in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Osh** oblasts.
- Between 60%-70% of households in Batken, Jalalabad and Talas oblasts owned a **sewing machine** and more than half of households in Yssyk-Kul and Bishkek city, compared to less than 40% in **Osh** and **Naryn** oblasts.
- Less than 30% of households in **Yssyk-Kul** oblast owned a **car or truck**, compared to more than 40% of households in other oblasts
- **Bicycles** were owned by more than half of households in Batken oblast but by less than 1/4 of households in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Naryn** oblasts.



- More than 1/3 of households in Chuy, Talas and Batken oblasts owned **petty trade stocks**, and slightly more than 20% in Bishkek city and Naryn oblasts. Only about 10% of households owned such stocks in **Yssyk-Kul** and **Osh** oblasts.
- Between 15% and 20% of households owned a **small shop** in Bishkek city and in Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts, compared to 5%-10% in other oblasts.

3.15 – Access to education services

- More than 90% of Key Informants in urban and rural areas reported easy access to primary school, located at less than 30 mn distance. In **Chuy** oblast however, 1/3 of Key Informants indicated that the nearest primary school was located at 30-60 mn distance.
- Almost 90% of Key Informants mentioned that lack of money to pay for school expenditures was the main constraint for households to send their children to primary school, more than 70% mentioned the lack of teachers and about 1/2 indicated poor school facilities as constraints.
- Half of the Key Informants in **Osh**, **Jalalabad** and **Talas** oblasts also mentioned insecurity as a constraint.

A very high number of Key Informants in **Naryn** (80%), **Batken** (70%) and **Yssk-Kul** (60%) oblasts indicated that children were also not attending because they had to work or to help with household chores.

3.16 – Main shocks and problems in previous 3 months

Overview: Problems faced by households are combination of macro-economic, localized and individual shocks. High food and fuel prices, violence and insecurity, and weather-related problems associated with low harvest were the most frequent shocks sustained by households during the 3 months prior to the survey.

A higher proportion of rural households were affected by a range of problems than urban households. Rural households were more likely to have faced economic difficulties to purchase food, fuel and agricultural inputs, and health problems, than urban households.

Food insecure households faced all problems more frequently than food secure households. The majority of severely food insecure households in particular had been affected by the high cost of food, fuel and agricultural inputs, and health problems. About half had suffered from loss of employment and decreased salary.

Health problems were affecting at least 1/3 of households in the southern oblasts and in Talas and Yssyk-Kul oblasts. Decreased salaries and loss of jobs affected about half of the

households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. Mudslides had also affected some 30% of households in these 2 oblasts, adding to the difficulties caused by the violence in June 2010.

- About 70% of **rural** households mentioned high costs of food, fuel and agricultural inputs as difficulties faced during the 3 months prior to the survey, and more than 60% had faced difficulties related to the weather and low harvest, health problems, and violence/insecurity. More than 1/3 of rural households also mentioned loss of unemployment and decreased salary.
- Similarly, more than 70% of **urban** households mentioned high cost of food as a difficulty and 60% violence/insecurity. They were slightly less than rural households to complain about high fuel prices or health problems. Some 40% mentioned decreased salary and 25%-30% weather and harvest-related problems, loss of employment and high cost of agricultural inputs.
- Similar results were found from Key Informant interviews.
- Food insecure households were more likely to have been affected by a range of shocks than food secure households, especially those severely food insecure. Almost 90% of **severely food insecure** households mentioned high cost of food, fuel and agricultural inputs and more than 80% health as difficulties in the past 3 months. About half of severely food insecure households were also affected by loss of employment and decreased salary.



- Generally, **woman-headed households** were less likely to report problems related to agriculture, including weather, harvest and cost of agricultural inputs and tended to report more frequently shocks and problems related to health.
- However, differences between woman- and man-headed households in relation to shocks and problems faced in the previous 3 months were inconsistent between oblasts. This may reflect their diverse degree of engagement in agricultural activities and employment in the various oblasts.

By oblast

- More than 60% of households said that they had faced difficulties with **high food prices**, especially in Jalalabad, Talas, Yssyk-Kul, Osh and Naryn oblasts.
- Violence and insecurity were the next most frequently mentioned problems. More than 60% of households in Osh, Jalalabad, Talas, Naryn and Chuy oblasts mentioned them, as well as half of the households in Bishkek city and 30%-40% in Batken and Yssyk-Kul oblasts.
- Health problems had affected more than 60% of households in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh, Talas and Yssyk-Kul oblasts and 30%-40% of households in Naryn and Chuy oblasts and Bishkek city.

• Loss of job and decrease of salary were more often mentioned by households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts (about half of the households), reflecting the impact of the recent violence. About 40% of households in Batken and Talas also reported decreased salary as a problem during the previous 3 months. While apparently a lower proportion of households in Bishkek city had been affected by unemployment or salary decrease, the majority of Key Informants in the capital city mentioned these as major problems.



- More than half of households mentioned the **high cost of fuel** as a major problem during the previous 3 months, except in Bishkek city where it was mentioned by only 30% of households. This reflects the need for fuel for agricultural-related activities in most oblasts.
- **Poor climate** and **low/loss of harvest** were the next most frequently mentioned difficulties, affecting more than half of households in all oblasts except Talas and Chuy (between 30%-40%).
- **Mudslides** were reported by close to 30% of households in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts and 15% in Batken and Naryn oblasts. They were also mentioned by 15% of Key Informants in Yssyk-Kul oblast.



3.17 – Coping strategies

Overview: Food-related coping strategies were more frequently employed by urban households, reflecting their economic difficulties to purchase food. Food insecure households,
especially those severely food insecure, also had to use these strategies much more than food secure households.

Most of the other coping strategies were employed rarely or once in a while, but on the medium term could have negative effects, including reducing health expenditures, spending days without eating, selling animals more than usual, consuming seed stocks, decreasing expenditures for agricultural inputs and selling productive assets. These strategies were systematically used more often and by a higher proportion of food insecure households. About 13% of households had used coping strategies entailing risks for the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members, however almost 40% of severely food insecure households had employed strategies affecting future livelihoods, as well as 1/5 of food secure households.

Rural households were more likely to have used coping strategies that jeopardize future livelihoods, than urban households.

Woman-headed households also used coping strategies that could jeopardize the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members more often, except in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, possibly owing to the redistributive effects of humanitarian assistance.

Food-related and other coping strategies were more frequently used by households in Osh oblast, followed by households in Jalalabad and Talas oblasts and Bishkek city. More than ¼ of households in Osh had spent days without eating from time to time during the previous 30 days. Close to 40% of households in Osh and 30% in Jalalabad oblasts had decreased health expenditures. These strategies can entail serious risks for the health and nutritional status of vulnerable household members. About 10% of households in Osh, Jalalabad and Talas oblasts and Bishkek had sold productive assets, thus jeopardizing their future livelihoods. The results reflect the detrimental effects of the civil violence and insecurity in Osh, Jalalabad and Talas oblasts, which hampers safe and stable access to food. In Bishkek, high prices may cause increasing economic hardship for households.

3.17.1 – Reduced Coping Strategy Index

• A group of 5 coping strategies was combined to calculate a **Reduced Coping Strategy Index** (R-CSI), as described in Box 12. The higher the R-CSI, the more frequently households had to use food-related strategies to respond to their difficulties.

Box 12 – Reduced Coping Strategy Index (R-CSI)

The Reduced Coping Strategy (R-CSI) index is computed by counting the number of times the above strategies had been employed during the 7 days preceding the survey. The index captures typical coping strategies related to food that households employ when they face difficulties to meet their food consumption requirements:

- rely on less preferred and less expensive food;
- borrow food, or rely on help from a friend or relative;
- limit portion size at meal times;
- restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat;
- reduce number of meals eaten in a day.

The higher the R-CSI, the more frequently households had to use the strategies in an attempt to resolve their difficulties, thus reflecting greater hardship for these households.

- The mean R-CSI was 4.7. It was higher in **urban** areas (5.2 versus 4.3 in rural areas), reflecting more food-related difficulties for urban households, most likely due to the fact that they had to purchase most of their food, prices remained above the 5-year average and their purchasing power had overall deteriorated.
- Severely food insecure households had a very high R-CSI (11.9) and moderately food insecure had also R-CSI above average (6.3) while food secure households had R-CSI below average (3.8).
- During the 7 days prior to the survey, severely food insecure households relied on less preferred and less expensive food 3 times, and borrowed food or relied on help from

relatives or friends twice. At least once in that period they limited the portion size at meal times, and restricted the consumption of adults in order for small children to eat.



<u>By oblast</u>

- The average R-CSI was higher in Bishkek city and in Talas, Osh, Jalalabad and Yssyk-Kul oblasts and lower in Chuy, Batken and especially Naryn oblasts. In Bishkek city, this may reflects increasing economic hardship, while in Talas, Osh and Jalalabad oblasts it may reflect the effects of civil violence and insecurity and ensuing difficulties for households to pursue their usual livelihoods. Food-related difficulties in Chuy, Batken and Naryn oblasts may have been lessened by recent harvests (especially wheat in Chuy and Naryn) and seasonal availability of vegetables and fruits.
- Most households had relied on less preferred and less expensive food 1-2 times during the 7 days prior to the survey except in Chuy (less than once) and Naryn (almost none) oblasts.
- Households in **Yssyk-Kul, Talas** and **Osh** oblasts had also borrowed food or relied on help from relatives or friends 1-2 times in the previous 7 days, compared to less than once in other oblasts.



<u>3.17.2 – Main types of coping strategies</u>

- During the month preceding the survey (i.e. June), 30%-40% of **food insecure** households had from time to time decreased health expenditures and 16% of severely food insecure did it most of the time.
- Between 20%-30% of food insecure households had also from time to time:
 - o spent whole days without eating;
 - o consumed their seed stocks;
 - o decreased expenditures for agricultural inputs;
 - o sold animals more than usual (mostly the moderately food insecure);
 - gathered wild food, or harvest immature crops (especially the severely food insecure);
- A lower proportion (5%-15%) had:
 - o sent family members elsewhere to eat;
 - sold domestic or productive assets;
 - sent members away to look for work or food more than usual (some 16% of severely food insecure households did it all the time).







<u>By oblast</u>

- Households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts and Bishkek city were more likely to limit portion size at meal times, restrict consumption of adults in order for small children to eat, or reduce the number of daily meals, than households in other oblasts. This is consistent with the recent hardship experienced by many households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts owing to the June violence and persistent insecurity, and may reflect increasing economic difficulties in Bishkek city, such as related to food prices (still higher than 5-year average).
- Nation-wide, sending family members elsewhere to eat was rarely done during the 30 days prior to the survey. However, about 10%-12% of households in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts had done it and 5%-6% in Talas and Chuy oblasts and Bishkek city, compared to less than 1-2% in other locations.
- Almost 7% of households in **Osh** oblast had spent days without eating once in a while during the previous 30 days and 20% had done it rarely. Around 10% of households had also done it rarely in Bishkek city, Naryn and Jalalabad oblasts.



- Between 10%-20% of households in most oblasts except Chuy and Naryn had consumed their seed stocks, albeit rarely, in the 30 previous days. However, 11% of households in **Osh** oblast had done it more frequently and 7% all the time.
- Gathering wild food or harvesting immature crops was done by 10%-20% of households in **Jalalabad**, **Osh**, **Batken** and **Talas** oblasts from time to time. Some 10% of households in Osh did it often or all the time.
- Almost 40% of households in **Osh** oblast had decreased their health expenditures from time to time during the previous 30 days, and 6% had done it often or all the time. More than 20% had also decreased health expenditures in **Jalalabad**, **Batken** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts.



• About 40% of households in **Osh** oblast had decreased their **expenditures for agricultural inputs or animal feed** rarely or once in a while, during the 30 previous days, and almost ¼ of households in Jalalabad and Talas oblasts. Between 10%-17% of households had done it elsewhere, except in Yssyk-Kul (5%).



- Close to 10% of households in **Bishkek city, Talas** and **Jalalabad** oblasts had **sold domestic assets** (radio, TV, furniture etc.) during the 30 previous days.
- A similar proportion of households in **Bishkek city**, **Talas**, **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts had **sold productive assets**.
- Selling animals more than usual was a strategy used by households in most oblasts. Between 20%-30% of households in Osh, Jalalabad and Batken oblasts did so and between 10%-15% in Naryn, Yssyk-Kul, Talas oblasts and Bishkek city.
- Some 30% of households in **Osh** and 23% in **Jalalabad** oblasts had frequently **sent migrants to look for work or food, more than usually**, and 9% had done it once in a while.

3.17.3 - Strategies entailing risks for the lives and risks for the livelihoods

- Coping strategies were divided into 2 groups according to the potential risk they may entail:
 - risks for health and nutrition, and eventually for the lives of individuals if they are used on the medium or long-term, and
 - o risks for livelihoods, by depleting productive assets and animals.

Strategies entailing risks for health and/or nutritional status		Strategies jeopardizing future livelihoods		
Туре	Frequency	Туре	Frequency	
Limit portion size at meal times	 More than 2 days in past 7 days 	Consume seed stocks	RarelyOnce in a whileOftenAll the time	
Restrict consumption by adults so that children can eat	 More than 2 days in past 7 days 	Decrease expenditures for agricultural inputs or animal feed	Once in a whileOftenAll the time	
Spend whole days without eating	Once in a whileOftenAll the time	Sell productive assets	Once in a whileOftenAll the time	
Decrease health expenditures	 Often All the time	Sell animals more than usual	Once in a whileOftenAll the time	

- It must be noted that households using strategies that may have health, nutrition and life negative consequences also put their livelihoods at risk, as members may become unable to work, and additional health expenditures may have to be incurred. The distinction is thus made between households using strategies that may affect both their lives and livelihoods, and households using strategies that put their livelihoods at risk but not their lives.
- About 13% of households had used strategies that entail risks for the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members. **Rural** households were more likely to have also used strategies that jeopardize future livelihoods: more than 30% compared to 14% of urban households.
- Although the use during the previous 30 days was infrequent, a very high proportion of **severely food insecure** (almost 40%) had used coping strategies entailing health and nutritional status risks for vulnerable members and almost 20% of moderately food insecure households. Similarly, about 1/3 of food insecure were using strategies jeopardizing their future livelihoods and 1/5 of food secure households.



• With the exception of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, **woman-headed households** were more likely to use coping strategies that entailed possible risks to the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members, than man-headed households. The reverse situation in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts may reflect the redistributive effects of humanitarian assistance as well as some equality of hardship across households. In Jalalabad oblast 35% of woman-headed households received food, compared to 19% of man-headed households (see paragraph 3.18).



• A similar proportion of man- and woman-headed households used coping strategies that could jeopardize their future livelihoods, except again in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts were woman-headed households tended to less frequently engage in such strategies.

<u>By oblast</u>

- About 20% of households in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts were using **coping strategies which could negatively affect the health and nutritional status of their members**, and 12% in Bishkek city.
- More than 40% of households in **Osh** and about 30% in **Jalalabad** and **Talas** oblasts were using **coping strategies which could jeopardize their future livelihoods**. About 20% of households in Batken and Yssyk-Kul oblasts also engaged in such strategies.



3.18 - Assistance received

Overview: Food insecure households were more likely to have received assistance, particularly food, during the 3 months prior to the survey, reflecting adequate targeting. Receipt of food and hygiene kits was reported mostly by households in Osh oblast and to a lesser extent in Jalalabad, reflecting the humanitarian assistance delivered in these locations in response to the June violence. Cash benefits were more frequently mentioned by

households in Talas oblast. Assistance with fertilizer and agricultural tools were also received by 20%-30% of households in Osh, Talas, Batken and Naryn oblasts. Woman-headed households were privileged for food assistance except in Osh oblast, but were generally less likely to benefit from other types of assistance compared to man-headed households.

- About 1/5 of households had received food assistance during the 3 months prior to the survey. Between 1/5 and ¼ of rural households had received fertilizer and/or agricultural tools.
- Food insecure households were more likely to have received assistance, reflecting adequate targeting. More than 40% of severely food insecure and almost 30% of moderately food insecure households had received food, and between 25%-30% had received fertilizer and/or agricultural tools.



- Woman-headed households were more likely to have received food assistance in most oblasts except in **Osh** where 35% of woman-headed households received food aid compared to 44% of man-headed households. In contrast, 35% of woman-headed-households in Jalalabad oblast benefited from food aid compared to 19% of man-headed households.
- Woman-headed households generally received less frequently other types of assistance than man-headed households.

By oblast

- According to Key Informants, food distributions had taken place in more than 40% of locations in **Yssyk-Kul, Talas** and **Osh** oblasts and more than 60% of locations in **Jalalabad** oblast. These correspond to places where a distribution round from WFP Vulnerable Group Feeding programme had taken place (see paragraph 5.2) and relief assistance in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts in response to the June crisis.
- Less than 10% of Key Informants reported food-for-work activities and less than 20% cashfor-work except in Talas (32%).
- More than ½ of Key Informants mentioned micro-credit programmes in **Chuy** and Naryn oblasts, and more than 20% mentioned cash grants in Chuy, Yssyk-Kul and Talas oblasts.
- More than 40% of households in **Osh** and more than 20% in **Jalalabad** oblasts had received **food assistance**, mostly in relation to the June violence. About ¼ of households in Osh oblast also received **hygiene kits** and slightly more than 5% cash.
- More than 30% in **Naryn** oblast about 10%-15% in **Bishkek city** and in **Talas** and **Batken** oblasts also received **food**. In Bishkek, the food probably came from a time-bound food assistance delivered by the Government in the spring using wheat flour donated by Russia.

• **Cash** was received by close to 10% of households in **Talas** oblast. More than ½ of Key Informants mentioned micro-credit programmes in **Chuy** and **Naryn** oblasts, and more than 20% mentioned cash grants in **Chuy**, **Yssyk-Kul** and **Talas** oblasts.



- More than 30% of households in **Osh, Talas** and **Batken** oblasts had received **fertilizer** during the 3 months preceding the survey, and about 20% in Naryn and Jalalabad oblasts.
- More than 30% of households in Osh and Talas oblasts had received agricultural tools, and about 20% in Naryn and Batken oblasts.



3.19 – Main priorities

Priorities have been split into the immediate priorities and those for the next months, to give an impression of the immediate and medium-term requirements.

Overview: Food was the 1st immediate priority of more than 1/3 of households, followed by security, health and employment. For the next months, food and security were the top priorities.

Urban households tended to prioritize employment more often than rural households. Food insecure households were more likely to prioritize security than food secure households, both as immediate and medium-term priority.

There were few differences in the priorities established by woman- and man-headed households although it varied across oblasts. In Osh oblast, woman-headed households were

more likely to mention health as the top immediate priority and employment as first priority for the next months.

Food was the first immediate priority of more than 60% of households in Talas and more than 50% in Yssyk-Kul oblasts. Security was ranked first by 30%-50% of households in the 3 southern oblasts, reflecting the recent unrest. Employment was more likely to be prioritized in Bishkek city and in Naryn and Chuy oblasts. Cash was a top priority in Talas oblast for 20% of households. Health was a 2nd immediate priority for more than ¼ of households in Batken, Jalalabad and Yssyk-Kul oblasts.

For the next months, security continued to be the first priority for almost half of the households in Batken oblast, and more than ¼ of households in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. Food remained the main priority for more than 40% of households in Talas oblast and more than ¼ of households in Yssyk-Kul oblast and Bishkek city. Employment continued to be prioritized more frequently by households in Bishkek city, and in Chuy and Naryn oblasts.

<u>3.19.1 – Immediate priorities</u>

- The most frequently mentioned 1st immediate priority was **food** (more than 1/3 of households). Between 15%-20% of households mentioned health and security as their 1st immediate priority and 11% employment. Employment, health and food were the most frequent 2nd immediate priorities. The same were mentioned as 3rd immediate priorities as well as cash and security.
- **Rural** households were less likely to prioritize employment as immediate priorities, and more likely to prioritize health
- The majority of Key Informants in both rural and urban areas did not mention food as a priority but employment. In rural areas, most of the Key Informants also prioritized roads construction or repairs, agricultural equipment, veterinary services, water and sanitation services, upgrade of health centre and of primary school, and transportation facilities.
- There were no significant differences in the 1st immediate priorities across the various food security groups, with the exception of security which was more often prioritized by **food insecure** households. However, food insecure households were then more likely to mention food as their next, 2nd immediate priority.
- Overall the ranking of priorities was similar between woman- and man-headed households, although there were some variations across oblasts.
- Woman-headed households were more likely to rank health as their first immediate priority in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, but less likely to prioritize security compared to manheaded households.

<u>By oblast</u>

- Food was the top immediate priority of more than 60% of households in **Talas** and more than 50% in **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts. Close to 40% of households in Bishkek city and between 20%-30% of households in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh and Chuy oblasts also ranked food first.
- Security was the immediate priority for half of households in **Batken** and more than 30% in **Jalalabad** and **Osh** oblasts.
- Employment was a top immediate priority for about 15%-20% of households in Bishkek city and in Chuy and Naryn oblasts.
- Between 10%-20% of households in all locations ranked **health** as their first immediate priority.
- Cash did not come prominently except in Talas where it was prioritized by close to 20% of households. Livestock was also a top priority for more than 10% of households in Naryn oblast.



- Food was the 2nd immediate priority of 15%-20% of households in Batken, Jalalabad, Osh, Talas and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, and in Bishkek city.
- Health was ranked as 2nd immediate priority by more than ¼ of households in Batken, Jalalabad and Yssyk-Kul oblasts, and by about 15% of households elsewhere.





• Third immediate priorities mentioned by 10%-20% of households in all locations were **food**, **health**, **employment** and **cash**. About 10% of households in Naryn oblast also prioritized water and livestock.

<u>3.19.2 – Priorities for the next months</u>

- **Food** and **security** were the most frequent 1st priorities for the next months (mentioned by almost 1/5 of households), followed by cash and employment. Similarly as for immediate priorities, rural households were less likely to put employment first.
- Employment, cash, health and food were the most frequent 2nd priorities for the next months. Education and security were added to these as 3rd priorities for the next months.
- Food insecure households were more likely to put security as their 1st priority for the next months than food secure households.

• For the next months, **woman-headed households** were more likely to prioritize employment in Osh oblast compared to man-headed households but less likely to prioritize security.

By oblast

- Security continued to be the first priority for the next months for close to half of the households in **Batken**, and 25%-30% of households in **Osh** and **Jalalabad** oblasts.
- Food was the main priority for the next months for almost half of the households in Talas and 25%-30% of households in Yssyk-Kul oblast and Bishkek city.
- Employment was ranked first by more than 25% of households in Bishkek city and more than 15% in Chuy and Naryn oblasts.
- Cash was ranked first for the next months by 10%-25% of households in most oblasts.
- Health was prioritized by 10%-15% of households.



- **Food** was the 2nd priority for the next months for 10%-15% of households in most oblasts and Bishkek city, except Chuy (about 5%).
- Employment was the 2nd priority for 15%-20% of households In Batken, Talas and Chuy oblasts and in Bishkek city.
- Health was ranked 2nd priority for the next months by more than 15%-20% of households in Batken and Jalalabad oblasts and in Bishkek city.
- Some 13% of households in **Naryn** oblast ranked **livestock** as their 2nd priority for the next months.



• About ¼ of households in Batken oblast mentioned food as their 3rd priority for the next months, and about 15% in Jalalabad, Osh and Chuy oblasts. Health, housing, employment, cash and security were the 3rd priority of 10-20% of households in all locations.

IV – FORECAST EVOLUTION OF THE FOOD SECURITY SITUATION

4.1 – Summary of the food security situation

4.1.1 – Prevalence and characteristics of food insecure households

The results of the EFSA confirm the main findings of the KIHS. Almost 30% of the households were food insecure, with food insecurity worse in rural areas than in urban areas. The prevalence of severe food insecurity was lower than in KIHS, mostly because the EFSA gave more importance to dietary diversity which was high at the time of the survey, coinciding with major cereal, potato, vegetable and fruit harvests. The highest prevalence of food insecurity was in **Osh** oblast (reflecting the effects of the June violence), followed by **Yssyk-Kul, Talas, Batken** and **Naryn** oblasts. The best food security situation was in Bishkek city and Chuy oblast.

The characteristics of the food insecure showed that **food insecurity** in the Kyrgyz Republic is essentially **chronic**, with **poverty** as the basic cause of poor food consumption. However, food insecurity is also **seasonal**, with the severity of food insecurity decreasing when the diet improves during harvest time, mostly for poor rural households.

Poverty and food insecurity are associated with, and compounded by other factors including: large family size; presence of vulnerable members (young children, pregnant/lactating women, elderly, chronically sick individuals); lack of education; low access to land and irrigation; lack of means to procure proper agricultural inputs to secure good harvests and ensuing low agricultural productivity; lack of or small number of animals limiting consumption of expensive animal products; difficult access to markets, unreliable trade agreements and insufficiently remunerative prices for products; and low-paid and irregular employment.

These factors combine to limit supplies of food from own production and economic access to food from market purchase, resulting in the consumption of a diet lacking varied and high quality food. In past years, food imports have grown to meet domestic demand for food, confirming that food insecurity is more a problem of low incomes than low availability of food.

In addition, poverty is related to deteriorating education services and levels of education, inadequacy of services in remote areas particularly (water, sanitation, health) affecting directly health and nutritional status, and inadequacy of the social assistance system to cater for the needs of the jobless, pensioners and large families.

The civil unrest of April and June 2010 has worsened the food security situation and prospects of already food insecure or vulnerable households throughout the country, including in oblasts not directly affected by the violence. Delayed access to inputs during the last planting season, uncertainties from financial institutions providing credit to producers and businesses, drop of tourism in Yssyk-Kul and overall depression of the economy, together with food and fuel price increases and localised natural disasters, have deteriorated households' access to food. It is likely that **transitory food insecurity** has occurred in population groups at the margin, as their income has fallen and access to land and pasture has been impaired.

Woman-headed households were not found to be more frequently food insecure than manheaded households. The characteristics of *food insecure* woman-headed households were similar to those of *food insecure* man-households: large family size, lack of land and animals, lower number of domestic and productive assets. However it seems that *food secure* womanheaded households were able to obtain higher amounts of cash per capita for all activities they were engaged in compared to *food secure* man-headed households. Reasons for this are mostly related to lower family size in food secure woman-headed households compared to food secure man-headed households (4.2 versus 5.5 members), hence cash obtained per capita ends up being higher for a same activity.

4.1.2 – Food security situation in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

The June 2010 violence in the two southern oblasts has been attributed to a conjunction of factors³⁷. They have contributed to create persistent societal stress points that have become articulated as inter-ethnic rivalry:

- competition over productive resources: agricultural land, irrigation water and pasture, commercial property and assets;
- harsh border regimes that stifle commerce and movement of people, while feeding corruption;
- transit area for the smuggling of drugs;
- widespread unemployment and under-employment, particularly of youth;
- marginal youth as a result of neglect of children whose parents have migrated,
- deteriorating education system that does not equip a large part of youth for productive employment in the market economy.

The population profile of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts is described in Table 5.

Oblast	Total			Urban			
		Kyrgyz	Uzbek	Other	Total	Kyrgyz	Uzbek
Osh	1,176,000	64%	31%	5%	272,500	34%	56%
Jalalabad	869,300	70%	24%	6%	200,800	64%	21%

Table 5- Ethnic group composition in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

Source: 1999 census

As mentioned, between 2006 and the 3rd quarter of 2009, severe and moderate food insecurity decreased in Osh oblast. It also decreased in Jalalabad oblast, although with signs of deterioration since mid-2009. The reasons for this improvement were unclear.

The Rapid EFSA conducted early July in areas affected by the violence and areas with concentration of IDPs found **alarmingly high levels of food insecurity among IDPs**, especially those non-hosted: 83% of non-hosted IDPs were food insecure, including 63%

³⁷ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

severely; 43% of hosted IDPs were food insecure, including 24% severely. Even though host families and residents presented lower levels of food insecurity, the pressure on their food and economic resources for the former, and the loss of safe access to local markets, workplaces and fields for the latter also worsened the situation of those at the margin or who were chronically food insecure before.

4.2 – Macro-economic and poverty prospects for the next 12 months

Overview: Whereas macro-economic prospects are pessimistic for the rest of 2010, some factors could ease the economic situation of vulnerable households, such as the compensation for electricity tariffs that were raised early 2010 and subsequent increase of pensions and wages, as well as the slowdown of inflation. On the negative side, winter energy shortages are expected this year, creating hardship for households and depressing industrial activities. Petrol and diesel prices are also expected to increase. Poverty is expected to rise due to the projected economic contraction. Given the strong association between poverty and food insecurity, the latter is also expected to deteriorate.

The prices of wheat flour and bread have already started to increase, and are expected to rise further in the next 12 months owing to a combination of increased price on international market, Russia's ban on exports, and downward harvests forecasts from major world suppliers. This will affect economic access to major staples consumed by the population, especially the poor.

4.2.1 – Macro-economic prospects

According to the Joint Economic Assessment (JEA) carried out by the Asian Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank³⁸ in July 2010, the Kyrgyz economy was on a recovery path from the global economic crisis early 2010, with GDP projected to rise by 4.5% in the year. The recovery was largely driven by strong gold ore yield and a pickup in industrial production and construction. External demand from Russia and Kazakhstan increased, with higher exports, and consumption rose as remittances began recovering.

However, the April and June 2010 events put a halt to the prospects for economic growth. Private sector confidence weakened, liquidity contracted in the banking system, public finances were under massive stress, infrastructure was damaged, on top of the destruction of housing and the displacement of 375,000 to 400,000 persons, of whom 75,000 were still displaced in July. As a result, the economy is projected to shrink by 3.5% in 2010, with a GDP per capita falling from the pre-crisis projection of US\$943 to US\$826. Foreign Direct Investment could slow down substantially and the fiscal balance will deteriorate, requiring external financing (see Table 6).

Indicator	Pre-crisis March 2010 projections	Post-crisis July 2010 projections for 2010	Projections for 2011
GDP growth	4.6%	-3.5%	7.1%
Non-gold real GDP growth	4.3%	-4.6%	6.8%
GDP per capita	US\$943	US\$826	US\$883
Inflation	13.0%	6.6%	8.0%
Fiscal balance	-7.2% of GDP	-14.9% of GDP	-9.0% of GDP
Foreign Direct Investment	US\$248 million	US\$144 million	Not estimated

Table 6 – Forecasted im	pact of the April an	d June 2010 violent	events on the economy
	paol of the April an		

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

³⁸ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

Higher-than-normal water reservoir levels should **ease winter energy shortages and ease constraints on economic activity** seen in 2008 for instance, but with the uncertainties about energy export agreements for summer surplus electricity, lack of firm agreements with neighbouring countries and budget deficits within the companies, power and heating supply interruptions in winter are expected.

The projected decline in inflation is mostly explained by the downward revision to 2010 economic growth and the reversal in electricity tariffs in April. However, the imposition of oil export duty by Russia in April 2010, which would likely **raise oil product prices in the country by about 30%**, would add to headline inflation.

The deterioration of the national current account could be moderated by **strong growth in worker remittances, which showed signs of robust recovery: near 30% increase in January-May period**, on a year-on-year basis.

The crisis in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts will add significantly to spending pressures. Costs associated with rehabilitation, reconstruction and resettlement as well as repair and rehabilitation of government buildings and offices, compensation for victims of the crisis, security-related spending and elections in October, are expected to be substantial. **Pensions are expected to rise appreciably (by about 30%** including for electricity tariff compensation) and are likely to have important medium-term impact. The government also planned to allocate KGS 281 million (about US\$6 million) compensation payments for tariff increase in high mountainous regions.

The JEA identified a number of risks for the above macro-economic and fiscal projections:

- Economic growth is subject to more than usual uncertainty, largely depending on political uncertainties during the transition to an elected government and the maintenance of security, law and order, particularly in the south.
- The confidence of investors has been badly shaken by the events in the south and could deteriorate further if the situation worsens.
- Banking sector uncertainties and systemic problems could adversely affect intermediation and the payment system. Troubled banks need to be re-capitalized, which could result in substantially higher costs.

A snap-shot on perspectives for 2011 is provided in Box 13.

Box 13 – Macro-economic outlook and risks for 2011

The economy is expected to recover strongly in 2011, reaching 7% growth. This would be made possible by a normalization of the security environment, continued reconstruction activity, an improvement in investor confidence, and full resumption of trade and services flows. Resurgence in agricultural activity should also provide a boost to economic activity. Continued growth pickup in larger partner countries – Russia and Kazakhstan – should spur external demand, allowing an increase in exports and yielding sustained recovery in consumption through higher remittance flows.

However, risks to the 2011 outlook include:

- Continued adverse security environment. Political uncertainty following the October 2010 elections could add to downside risks for 2011, as well as uncertainties in the banking system.
- The persistence of the breakdown in intra-regional energy sharing agreements would entail seasonal and regional implications and pose a constraint on growth.
- With the coming into effect of the Russia-Kazakhstan-Belarus customs union, Kyrgyzstan could lose its comparative advantage in shuttle trade (imports of goods from China and re-exports to neighbouring CIS countries) from its low tariffs if it joins the union. The imposition of export duty on oil products by Russia is also likely to adversely affect Kyrgyz re-exports of such products.

Source: The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

4.2.2 – Poverty and social prospects

Because the June 2010 tensions have taken on a strong ethnic dimension, the impact on the population is likely to be long-lasting.

It is not yet possible to quantify the effects of the April and June 2010 violence on poverty rates, but the JEA³⁹ provided some qualitative estimates:

- The reversal in April 2010 of the energy tariff increases effected at the beginning of the year will bolster household incomes, especially of the urban poor, though much less for the rural poor who do not benefit from district heating and hot water systems. The rise in tariffs was accompanied by **increases in public sector wages, pensions, social allowances and targeted cash transfers for the poor**, which have not been reversed though tariffs have been rolled back.
- The closure of the border with Kazakhstan for 6 weeks and the persistent closure of the Uzbek border have **affected border trade carried out by poor communities**. Farming was disrupted by delays in supply of inputs, especially during the sowing season in the northern oblasts, as well as interruptions in the supply of credit. Many rural poor households depend on agriculture for their income. Decreased availability of local produce could also lead to price rise on local markets.
- Physical damage to businesses in some cities and business closures will have an effect on employment. Moreover, the labour-intensive construction and tourism sectors will bear the brunt of the disruptions and the growth slowdown. In particular, tourism has dried up in the important region of **Yssyk-Kul**, with consequent highly significant losses in income and employment. Unemployment in southern oblasts is likely to increase from the autumn, after seasonal jobs in agriculture fade out. However, reconstruction activities if rapidly undertaken will generate jobs that may dampen the poverty-worsening effects of the recent events.

4.2.3 – Food availability and prices prospects

Domestic agricultural activity is expected to decline by 12% in 2010 compared with 2009 as security problems and lack of inputs have led to a disruption in agricultural work and trading in the southern oblasts, which account for 25% of national output. Traders' confidence may also worsen and lead to reduced imports of fertilizer and spare parts, and suspension of contracts. Investment in the sector may decline and lenders are likely to face higher delinquency rate as farmers struggle to service loans.

Kazakhstan exports only 5% of its wheat grain production to Kyrgyzstan, but this amount covers about 90% of Kyrgyzstan's import requirements on average. According to the National Statistics Committee⁴⁰, **543,600 Mt of wheat grain were imported in 2009**, of which 399,500 Mt from Kazakhstan. This is more than in previous years and reflects decreasing domestic wheat production.

³⁹ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010. ⁴⁰ Ecod Security and Reventy Information Bulletin of the Kyrgyz Republic National Statistics Committee

⁴⁰ Food Security and Poverty Information Bulletin of the Kyrgyz Republic. National Statistics Committee, 1st quarter 2010.



Source: FAOStat, latest data available.

Some 9,700 Mt of food aid were distributed by WFP in 2009 under the Vulnerable Group Feeding Programme and 11,184 Mt are planned to be distributed in 2010. These amounts represent less than 2% of commercial imports.

Wheat flour and bread are the main staple consumed by the Kyrgyz population. Domestic wheat flour prices have increased since 2005, with a peak in 2008. They decreased by mid-2009 but remained above the past 5-year average, but they had already started to rise by mid-August, essentially in response to price rise by Kazakh traders. **The price of wheat flour on local markets is likely to increase further in the next 12 months** as wheat prices on international markets have already rose by 50% in June and further increase is expected in response to the Russian export bans and lower harvests in the major world suppliers of wheat, including Kazakhstan, Canada and to some extent Ukraine. Furthermore, Russia has requested Kazakhstan to follow suit on temporarily suspending wheat exports. Should Kazakhstan accept, shortage of wheat and further rocketing of prices are likely on Kyrgyz markets.

Considering the high dependence on market purchases for bread and cereal products, **any increase in price will negatively affect access to these commodities for the poor and food insecure households as well as for those at the margin**. High wheat prices will benefit farmers who produce a surplus. However, these are unlikely to be among the poor and food insecure who are usually net buyers as their wheat stocks do not last for more than 3-5 months. Any short-term gains from wheat sales will therefore not compensate for the larger expenditures on wheat and bread that will be incurred later. Most food insecure urban households buy 80% or more of their bread.

4.3 – Prospects for Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

Overview: There would be an estimated 88,400 IDP persons (12,100 households) in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, including 38,230 non-hosted presenting high levels of food insecurity. The conditions in southern oblasts remain highly volatile with a continuation of low intensity ethnic conflict, sporadic security coverage and deep scars left by the violence. The poverty and social impacts of the events will not be fully reversed by the reconstruction of infrastructure or the payment of compensation for lost livelihoods.

This EFSA estimated that there could be **44,720 displaced persons** (6,320 households) **in Osh** and **39,290 displaced persons** (5,810 households) **in Jalalabad** oblasts, reaching a **total of 84,010 IDPs (12,130 households)**. Of these, 38,230 would be non-hosted and have a very high level of food insecurity (83%) according to the assessment undertaken earlier in July. The remaining would be IDPs 45,780 hosted in other families, also with significant level of food insecurity (43%).

Forecasts for the evolution of the food security situation in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts differ from the other oblasts owing to the concentration of violence in these regions in June 2010. The large-scale population displacement and destruction of physical infrastructure (public buildings private commercial enterprises, markets, private housing) took place negatively impacted the provision of government services and for livelihoods. Severe disruptions in agricultural and retail distribution and in the supply chain for production occurred. Destruction and widespread disrepair of energy infrastructure could lead to severe winter energy shortages, threatening stability and peace⁴¹.

Unemployment is expected to rise due to the destruction of small service enterprises and in agriculture. The government's Commission for Assessment of Damages estimated that around 4,000 persons had lost their job, mostly in services and trade. Due to the high informality in these sectors, it is unlikely that the victims would be able to receive at least temporary unemployment benefits.

Many IDPs have lost their identity documents that would prove their eligibility for various benefits or services. They may not be aware of the Government issuance of temporary identification documents that are supposed to be accepted by social offices, schools and health care institutions but not valid for bank transactions (thus preventing access to cash transfers and remittances sent through this channel). Other families may feel too insecure or mistrustful of government to attempt to register for such benefits. This disruption may bring a **temporary poverty increase in the affected areas**.

Lower yields for the 2010 harvest compared with the 2009 as a result of crops being unattended, reduced trade activities and higher production costs will **decrease profits from agricultural activities**, which often contribute to a significant share of the income of the poor and food insecure in rural areas.

The Rapid EFSA of July 2010 demonstrated alarmingly low levels of food consumption and collapse of income sources among IDPs, especially those non-hosted. Most households, including host families and residents, also employed a range of coping strategies detrimental to their health and nutritional status as well as jeopardizing their future livelihoods and resilience to shocks. A number of families considered food secure at the time of the assessment are expected to become transitory food insecure and the severity of food insecurity is expected to worsen in the coming months as pressure on food and cash resources increases in a context of limited work and business opportunities, depressed agricultural output and need for additional resources in winter times to meet heating, clothing, and food expenses.

In response to the crisis, the government relaxed the fiscal stance as a counter-cyclical response to the investment and output shocks, and has applied for international support. As mentioned, temporary identification documents are being issued to the displaced and KGS 220 million (about US\$4.7 million) are planned as one-off payments for the victims of June events. The Government also accorded priority to specific public expenditures including outlays on wages and salaries, social assistance, pensions, utilities and procurement of medication and food, and paid them in full.

The revised Flash Appeal issued by the UN on 23 July aims at meeting the immediate humanitarian needs in early recovery/community restoration, education, food security and agriculture, health, protection, shelter, water and sanitation and support services.

⁴¹ The Kyrgyz Republic Joint Economic Assessment: Reconciliation, Recovery, and Reconstruction. Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank. Draft, 21 July 2010.

V – SUGGESTIONS FOR FOOD SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND FOR WFP'S OPERATIONS

5.1 – General considerations for the short- to medium-term

At macro-level, the Joint Economic Assessment of July 2010 identified the need for donors' external support estimated at about US\$1 billion over 2 and a half years, in:

- essential public expenditures and service (US\$335 million in 2010), to compensate for the increased emergency expenditures;
- social support for housing, livelihoods, social protection and other social programmes (US\$334 million, of which US\$96 million correspond to the UN Flash Appeal);
- critical investments to rebuild destroyed private commercial and public buildings, and in the energy and transport sectors (US\$350 million), until such time when the private sector resumes investing;
- support for agriculture (US\$35 million) and security-related needs (US\$11 million).

At the 27 July Donors' Conference in Bishkek, international donors pledged US\$1.1 billion through a combination of grants and favourable loans to the Interim Government over the next 30 months. The government announced that US\$600 million would be disbursed as emergency aid until the end 2010, including US\$50 million for food and agriculture⁴².

The crisis also drew attention to the economic vulnerabilities and disparities, such as pervasive youth unemployment, and the needs of people previously affected by natural disasters such as mudslides and earthquakes. As such, **both underlying structural causes of poverty and the "new" poverty that has resulted from the events need to be addressed**. This includes revisiting the current social safety net system, which proved unable to respond to a variety of needs and adapt to changes in the needs of target beneficiaries, ranging from temporary shelters to income support and service provision.

Pensions and social transfers play an important role to alleviate poverty and by extension, food insecurity. Measures that will improve the social assistance system are therefore important. The Joint Economic Assessment suggests a number of structural measures to strengthen the **social assistance system** so that it better reaches the poor and vulnerable, and better protects those it reaches. This includes an expansion of the Monthly Benefit in coverage and size, and an adjustment of the compensation/privileges budget compared to other social assistance transfers.

In the short- to medium-term, **employment creation/targeted livelihood support** for IDPs and other vulnerable and poor population groups, in areas directly affected by the April and June events, as well as other marginalized, at-risk regions is necessary. Multi-dimensional interventions are required, including local economic development grants, active labour market programmes (information, counselling, training etc.), and self-employment assistance (e.g. credit, capacity building, agricultural extension etc.).

With regards to nutrition, the World Bank/UNICEF situation analysis in Kyrgyzstan⁴³ stated that approximately ³/₄ of the economic losses from undernutrition estimated at US\$32 million could be prevented by implementing a package of evidence-based **preventive and therapeutic nutrition interventions at scale**. These include salt iodization, promotion of complementary feeding practices and zinc for the treatment of diarrhoea, and promotion of exclusive breastfeeding, supplementation to pregnant women, and fortification of salt with iodine and flour with vitamins and minerals. The study also emphasises the need to address

⁴² USAID for example pledged US\$10 mullion to address food shortages through cash vouchers and local and regional procurement to meet urgent needs, and US\$1 million to supplement supplies of fertilizer, fuel and other inputs during the summer to help safeguard the fall harvest.

⁴³ Situation Analysis. Improving Economic Outcomes by Expanding Nutrition Programming in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Draft. World Bank/UNICEF, May 2010.

the underlying and basic causes of undernutrition through social protection (see paragraph 3.7.3) and agricultural sectors (see Box 14)⁴⁴, so as to improve both the availability and affordability of food at household level.

Box 14 – Potential for agricultural interventions to reduce under-nutrition

According to the World Bank, 5 pathways link food production to food consumption and nutrition, and illustrate how agriculture interventions can reduce under-nutrition:

- 1) subsistence-oriented production for households' own consumption;
- 2) income-oriented production for sale in markets;
- 3) reduction in food prices associated with increased production;
- 4) empowerment of women as agents instrumental to household food security; and
- 5) indirect relationship between the contribution of agricultural production to increased national income and economic growth, and improved nutrition outcomes.

Source: From Agriculture to Nutrition: Pathways, Synergies and Outcomes. The World Bank, 2008.

5.2 – Ongoing food security assistance

WFP has been implementing a Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF) programme in Kyrgyzstan since 2009 targeting between 50,000 and 66,000 households (between 250,000 and 333,000 individuals) depending on the distribution cycle (spring or winter). Distributions take place twice a year, in 6 oblasts identified from previous food security assessments as presenting high prevalence of food insecurity: Yssyk-Kul, Naryn, Batken, Talas, Jalalabad and Osh. VGF beneficiaries are selected on the basis of family size, low income, lack of or low acreage of non-irrigated or irrigated land, lack of or low number of cattle and small ruminants owned, and lack of or low number of productive assets. They receive a 3-month ration of 75 kg of wheat flour and 8 litres of oil for a 5-member family.

Until the June 2010 events in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, WFP programme covered only rural areas. Since then, assistance has been extended to additional beneficiaries in these two oblasts in both rural and urban areas affected by the violence, including IDPs and host families as well as residents presenting a food security profile similar to the one of VGF beneficiaries. In July/August, WFP provided blanket food rations⁴⁵ to some 532,400 IDP, host family and resident individuals. A switch will be made to targeted distributions in September using the results of the Rapid EFSA⁴⁶ to determine criteria for selection of food insecure IDPs, host families and residents. Targeting is done on the basis of a combination of conflict-related (destruction of housing, loss of family member, hosting status), demographic (presence of vulnerable members, large families) and economic criteria (ownership of productive assets, access to land and animals, income level). With the exception of conflict-related criteria, the remaining ones are consistent with the criteria used for the 'regular' VGF programme.

WFP is also preparing a cash transfer project for Osh and Jalalabad areas aimed at IDPs most severely affected by the violence. Both cash and in-kind food would be provided on a monthly basis. A progressive increase of the amount of cash transferred from 350 KGS to 450 KGS/person/month (US\$7.5 to US\$10) is envisaged for the winter months when work opportunities are reduced and food stocks are depleted.

Other agencies are also engaged in cash transfers to the affected population of Osh and Jalalabad, mostly targeting IDPs and small businesses.

⁴⁴ According to the World Bank, 5 pathways link food production to food consumption and nutrition, and illustrate how agriculture interventions can reduce under-nutrition: 1) subsistence-oriented production for households' own consumption.

⁴⁵ The food basket consisted of 333 gr. wheat flour, 30 ml vegetable oil, and 33 gr. pulses, providing about 1,550 kilocalories per person per day. Sugar will be added as from November 2010, increasing the kilocalorie value of the ration at 1,610 kcal/person/day.

⁴⁶ Rapid Emergency Food Security Assessment in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, Kyrgyz Republic. World Food Programme, July 2010.

5.3 – Food security assistance requirements during the next 12 months

5.3.1 – Food security assistance in oblasts not directly affected by civil violence

Even though violent events in June 2010 were concentrated in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, violence also took place in **Naryn**, **Yssyk-Kul** and **Talas** oblasts last April. This is reflected in a number of households reporting damage to their house due to stoning, as well as high proportion of households in these oblasts feeling insecure to reach pasture, fields and markets, and ranking security as a top priority. As such, close monitoring of the socio-political situation in these 3 oblasts is recommended.

Modalities of food security assistance

Even though the availability of food from various harvests enabled poor households to consume mostly an acceptable diet at the time of the survey, this is not expected to last in winter months and pre-harvest time in 2011 when food stocks are exhausted and there is no scope of households to expand sources of cash. Food security assistance to the chronically food insecure as well as to those facing hardship due to the economic downturn caused by the unrest is definitely required to avoid further deterioration and increased number of chronically food insecure households. This assistance should concentrate on the winter and pre-harvest months.

Food security assistance is understood as a range of support activities, including agricultural interventions, productive safety nets (e.g. employment in times of low seasonal work opportunities and community asset creation), income-generation activities, and social safety nets including food and cash transfers, school feeding and assistance to specific vulnerable groups.

WFP can be involved in food/cash support in conjunction with agricultural interventions (e.g. canals repairs, tree nurseries), productive safety nets (temporary food/cash-for-work activities for community asset creation), food/cash transfers for those unable to work, complementary assistance to the government's school feeding programme, and food/cash targeted to particularly vulnerable groups such as those affected by HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. However for durable solutions, other interventions as mentioned in the paragraph above are also required, implemented by the Government of Kyrgyzstan and other organisations.

In-kind food aid and/or cash transfers (conditional or unconditional) are relevant for those unable to secure sufficient access to food and income through agricultural activities and labour. With regards to cash, it must be noted that the vast majority of **severely food insecure** households were not using money transfer systems and only 12% sometimes used bank or postal services for cash transactions. This may reflect difficult access and awareness of these services and should be taken into account when designing cash transfer interventions targeted to the most food insecure households.

Productive safety nets, including cash/food-for-work activities, in periods of slack employment opportunities (end fall to early spring) are appropriate for those able to work. They can help occupying idle manpower while offering a self-targeting modality to select those most in need. Works of interest include disaster-risk prevention measures (e.g. to prevent or mitigate damages caused by floods and land slides) and restoration/improvement of agricultural and community infrastructures (e.g. irrigation systems, drainage, schools, health centres, storage facilities, markets, rural roads). For those unable to work (e.g. single-headed large families, the elderly, the chronically sick) **unconditional transfers** are appropriate⁴⁷.

If cash is provided (e.g. in poor urban areas where markets are easily accessible), food prices need to be closely monitored to ensure that the cash remuneration remains

⁴⁷ Conditional transfers involving attendance to health centres or schools are also an option but more difficult to set up, administer and monitor in a relief phase. They could be envisaged for the medium-and longer term.

significant despite inflation or to switch to in-kind transfers if needed. This is particularly important in view of the expected rise of price of wheat, bread and substitute commodities.

Many of the chronically food insecure households rely on agriculture for a significant part of their income and food. As witnessed in previous periods of economic hardship, it is likely that a number of the transitory food insecure will turn to agriculture in the absence of alternative income-earning activities. **Support with agricultural inputs and services** (e.g. fertilizer, fuel, irrigation, machinery, veterinary services etc.) contributes to maximize yields and increase the availability of agricultural products for own consumption and for sale. This will require close collaboration with FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure that food insecure households benefit from these interventions. Agricultural assistance will also contribute to lessen long-term needs for in-kind food aid or cash transfers.

Chronically food insecure households, especially in urban areas where most of the food has to be purchased, highly depend on social assistance for their income, particularly pensions and to some extent social benefits for children. Both coverage of the poorest sectors of society and the amounts paid through pensions and allowances should be increased to include a greater number of eligible households and provide a more significant transfer. 'Top-up' cash transfers such as those implemented by the World Bank and the European Union in the past 2 years are a step in that direction and should ideally be mainstreamed in the formal government social assistance system. WFP and partners may complement these transfers for those not enrolled or still unable to cover their needs with the amounts received. This intervention would represent a **complementary safety net** to cater for those excluded from the system, and to top up the assistance for those receiving low benefits.

The main challenge with external interventions geared towards chronically food insecure households is to develop a phasing-out strategy. One option is to intensify collaboration with government social services (and donors) in order to ensure enrolment of those eligible and improve targeting - using WFP criteria for example in addition to the current income-based criteria - and to advocate for higher levels of transfers. The planned AIDCO-funded project to be jointly implemented by FAO and WFP to strengthen the government's food security information system offers an opportunity to **build food security data collection and analysis capacities** of government counterparts as well as of local institutions and WFP Cooperating Partners, to improve identification and inclusion of food insecure households.

Another food security assistance intervention worth considering is to **complement the government's school feeding programme** in areas of high prevalence of food insecurity. The assessment did not review the government's programme but apparently the snack provided to children is of low nutritional value and may be insufficient to make a difference both in terms of alleviation of short-term hunger for children in food insecure households who may not receive a proper breakfast or other meals at home, and in terms of encouraging food insecure and poor households to send their children regularly to school. Complementing the government's programme to provide a more significant nutritional input to primary school children may encourage attendance for households lacking economic means or preferring their children to work at home. However, the other constraints mentioned with regards to teaching personnel and school facilities (especially in Talas and Jalalabad oblasts) also need to be addressed for this programme to be effective in encouraging regular child attendance to school.

WFP could use its comparative advantage in procurement and delivery of **fortified wheat flour and oil** to supplement government-provided commodities. UNICEF and the government's efforts to develop fortification facilities in the country should also be pursued.

WHO reported about 7,100 tuberculosis-affected individuals and UNAIDS indicated some 4,000 HIV/AIDS cases (estimates ranging from 2,000 to 8,000) in Kyrgyzstan in 2007. WFP has been providing **food or voucher assistance to tuberculosis- and HIV/AIDS-affected patients** in several countries of the region (e.g. Tajikistan, Georgia). This experience could be used to appraise the relevance and feasibility of engaging in a similar programme in Kyrgyzstan, in collaboration with WHO and the Ministry of Health.

Target groups and targeting criteria

WFP's assistance could focus on the following categories of households:

- 1. households not able to benefit from agricultural support either because they have lost access to land or animals (e.g. due to displacement, violence or natural disaster), or because the acreage cultivated and capacity to raise animals are too low;
- 2. households who receive agricultural support but whose benefits will not be felt until the next harvest (temporary support);
- **3.** households who cannot work and whose income from social allowances is too low to enable them to cover their food requirements (assuming that the Government's social benefits are not increased);
- 4. households momentarily unemployed, e.g. when the seasonal agricultural labour season is over, and whose income from social allowances or irregular labour is too low to enable them to cover their food requirements (temporary support);
- 5. households who have lost access to their 'regular' livelihoods (food and cash sources) due to violence and displacement.

The presence of 'aggravating factors' such as large family size and vulnerable members (e.g. under-5 children, pregnant and lactating women, chronically sick or handicapped individuals) would provide an additional targeting criteria (see Table 7 below).

Chronically food insecure households (mostly in categories 1 and 3, and possibly 5 if prospects for recovery are distant) can be identified using the current VGF programme criteria, which were validated by this EFSA.

The same criteria should be able to capture households whose food security situation deteriorates and become **transitory food insecure** as a result of violence and displacement, contraction of the economy, or localized natural disasters (categories 1, 3, 4 and 5). However, some flexibility is required in terms of animal and asset ownership so as to enable providing assistance **before** these households start depleting their animal herd or assets. Such 'newly' food insecure include households whose income and/or food sources have been lost or decreased as a result of attacks, market contraction, business closure, depressed activity (e.g. tourism), unfavourable climatic conditions, mudslides etc. Targeting criteria for these households should include decreased harvest, impaired access to markets and to workplaces, loss of job and unexpected loss or health problems for the main bread-winner.

The vast majority of Key Informants interviewed considered large families, lonely pensioners, households with disabled members and households with orphans as the groups facing the most difficulties to access food and income. About half of the Key Informants also concurred with the finding that households without land or without animals had difficulties to procure food and income. As expected, about 60% of Key Informants in Osh and Jalalabad also identified IDPs as the most vulnerable. Key Informants also tended to mention womanheaded households as a priority group, though less frequently in Bishkek city and Jalalabad oblast.

Targeting criteria can be derived from a <u>combination</u> of the main characteristics of food insecure households summarized in Table 7.

Tahle 7 .	<u> </u>	characteristics	of food	insecure	households
	LIVCIIIOOU	una autoristius	01 1000	mocourc	nouscholus

Livelihood assets	Characteristics of food insecure households
Human and social	 Headed by an adult older than 60 years of age, especially if woman; Include under-5 children, pregnant or lactating woman, and/or chronically sick member(s); Large family size (7 or more) – 3 or more children
Physical and natural	 IDP: house destroyed or severely damaged by violence last April or in June; also living in temporary shelter/tent in their house compound; Likely to use wood or animal dung as main cooking fuel; No food stocks, or stocks for less than 2 weeks; No access to garden or land for cultivation and to fertilizer; Lost/decreased harvest and low duration for own consumption (3 months or less) for those who can cultivate; No animals (may have been lost in recent unrest) or less than 9 poultry, less than 9 sheep, less than 4 cattle; Loss/no animals or less than 9 poultry, less than 9 sheep, less than 4 cattle; No/small stocks of animal fodder/feed; No (may have been lost in recent unrest) petty trade stock, or shop; Impaired access to markets and to workplaces.
Financial assets	 Only 1 member able to earn cash; Loss of life or health problems of a bread-winner; Reliance on charity, sale of crops, sale of vegetables, irregular unskilled wage labour and pensions/allowances as main sources of cash and income, providing low, unreliable and/or unsustainable income.

5.3.2 – Food security assistance in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

A specific programmatic approach remains necessary in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts to address the severe food insecurity conditions among IDPs and account for the volatility of the situation. Non-food assistance is essential to repair or rebuild houses, commercial establishments and markets, replenish lost productive equipment and other assets, and resume pre-crisis income-earning activities in shops, services and agriculture. Safety for the population to move and access to markets, workplaces, land and pasture is an utmost priority. Food security and resumption of livelihood activities will not be achievable if peace and confidence are not re-established.

WFP current emergency operation (EMOP) for the conflict-affected population in Osh and Jalalabad foresees food/cash relief assistance until at least December 2010. A follow-up **Rapid EFSA** is planned to update knowledge on the food security situation of IDPs, host families and vulnerable residents and adjust the programme accordingly. Targeting criteria identified on the basis of the July Rapid EFSA may also need to be revised.

<u>IDPs</u>

Emergency food security assistance in-kind and in cash is required until IDPs return to their home place and/or recover access to food and income by their own means. Such assistance is critical to prevent a deterioration of the health and nutritional status of their vulnerable members.

Given the downward forecast on employment, business activities and agriculture for the next months, a number of IDPs will not be able to replenish their assets and resume incomeearning activities by end December 2010 and will remain in need of relief assistance in 2011. This comprises those unable to return to their homes, to access their fields, to re-start their businesses or to be employed again.

Chronically food insecure residents

The WFP project includes provisions for food security assistance to chronically food insecure resident households living in conflict-affected areas. This support acknowledges

the worsening of the food security situation of these vulnerable households due to the indirect effects of the crisis on access to markets and fields, as well as on food prices. The provision of food security assistance based on assessed needs rather than limited to those who have suffered during the crisis was also deemed important to ensure equity and social peace.

Chronically food insecure resident households - and IDPs who will become so - will continue to need assistance after December 2010, similarly as households chronically food insecure in non-conflict affected oblasts. As such, the same modalities of food security assistance as described in paragraph 5.3.1 would apply.

Modalities of food security assistance in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

Cash/food-for-work activities in conflict-affected areas can be designed to contribute to social peace by identifying works of interest to both Uzbek and Kyrgyz communities. **Unconditional transfers** will be appropriate for those that have lost their ability to work (e.g. loss of bread-winner, conflict-related handicap). As recovery may not be possible on the medium- or longer-term, the profile of this group is likely to become similar to chronically food insecure households, even though conflict will have been the primary factor of food insecurity.

Cash transfers are appropriate in Osh and Jalalabad provided access to markets is safe, trade is functioning as usual, inflation is contained and delivery mechanisms are available. These conditions were considered in the cash transfer project prepared by WFP in July/August. **In-kind food aid** is suitable in alternative conditions. A combination of cash and food may be best as it ensures access to a fixed amount of food even if prices rise while cash enables households to access fresh food items and to stimulate the local economy, but entails administrative and logistics additional costs.

Vulnerable residents in rural areas are more likely to have access to land and animals than IDPs. **Agricultural support**, including access to inputs that have become inaccessible due to economic losses incurred (e.g. fertilizer, quality seed) as well as extension services (e.g. advice on best cultivation and animal raising practices, irrigation network repairs, veterinary services, facilitated access to agricultural machinery) will be particularly valuable. Fuel vouchers are being considered by the Ministry of Agriculture using a donation from the Russian government, at a subsidized price. In the medium- and long-term, investment in rural communities to improve equitable access to natural resources for both Uzbek and Kyrgyz communities, increase agricultural productivity and stimulate trade between the two communities will also contribute to the peace process.

Similarly as for the other oblasts not directly affected by the conflict, **supplementary assistance to the government's school feeding programme** may also be relevant, especially in areas where households may now be hesitant to send their children to school for lack of economic means.

5.4 – Estimated number of people needing food security assistance

Overview: Based on the EFSA results, an estimated 1,387,430 persons were food insecure at the time of the assessment, including 201,900 severely and 1,185,500 moderately food insecure. All of them should be targeted for food security assistance (agricultural support, productive and social safety nets, including from the Government) given the absence of positive developments expected in the next 12 months. This includes some 95,000 IDP and host family persons in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts.

In addition, considering the economic difficulties anticipated from rising food and fuel prices and depressed trade, and the proportion of households already using coping strategies that entail risks for the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members, it is estimated that 339,760 currently food secure households are at risk of becoming food insecure in the coming in winter months. Food security assistance to this group would also be important to prevent them from becoming food insecure. However assistance may be of a different nature, e.g. more livelihoods-oriented than food- or cash-based social safety nets. Using EFSA estimates of non-hosted and hosted IDPs in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts and assuming that the prevalence of food insecurity in these groups has not improved significantly since early July, there would be some 95,000 IDPs and host families in need of food security assistance in these oblasts in the coming months (winter particularly).

Estimations of the number of households and people requiring food security assistance (including agricultural support, productive and social safety nets, including from the Government) were made considering both current prevalence and forecast deterioration of food security in the various oblasts. The extent of use of coping strategies likely to put health, nutrition and eventually lives at risk was also considered especially among the currently food secure households. On this basis, an estimated **1,387,430 persons were currently food insecure**, including some 95,000 IDP and host family persons in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. An additional **339,760 persons are at risk of becoming food insecure** in the coming months.

Assumptions made and details of the estimates are provided in Table 8 below.

Population as of 1 st January 2010			
Total	5,159,200		
Urban	1,612,200		
Rural	3,547,000		
Yssyk-Kul	441,300		
Batken	433,800		
Naryn	259,300		
Talas	229,000		
Osh	1,117,900		
Jalalabad	1,023,200		
Chuy	808,200		
Bishkek city	846,500		
Source: Census 2009, Na	tional Statistics Committee, 2010		

 Table 8 – Assumptions to estimate the number of persons needing food security assistance in winter/pre-harvest time during the next 12 months

Prevalence of food insecurity

- Proportions of severely and moderately food insecure persons were derived from EFSA results per oblast.
- The average prevalence of food insecurity was applied for Osh (55%) and Jalalabad (28%) oblasts. However the prevalence of food insecurity among IDPs is likely to be higher, as per the estimates of the Rapid EFSA conducted in these oblasts earlier in July: 83% of non-hosted IDPs were food insecure and 43% of hosted IDPs.

Targeting considerations and forecasting

- Considering that the EFSA is likely to have underestimated the severity of food insecurity, **all the currently food insecure households** are considered in need of food security assistance.
- The number of food insecure persons needing assistance in conflict-affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts will be updated based on the results of the planned follow-up Rapid EFSA. The present nation-wide EFSA estimated that there were 38,230 non-hosted IDPs and 45,800 hosted IDPs in both Osh and Jalalabad oblasts. Given the high prevalence of food insecurity among *non-hosted IDPs*, the Rapid EFSA early July concluded that targeting would not be cost-effective or socially acceptable within this group. Targeting food insecure *hosted* IDPs (43%) and 30% of food secure hosted IDPs to account for the forecast deterioration of the situation, leads to an estimated 28,400 hosted IDPs in need of assistance in the coming months. It is also agreed that host families should be entitled to some assistance since hosting IDPs was putting pressure on their own resources, hence 28,400 additional persons would be entitled to assistance. At total, there would be **95,000 IDPs and host families in need of food security assistance in direct relation to the civil violence in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts**. This is 18,000 more than the estimated number early July 2010.
- In Osh and Jalalabad oblasts, about 15% of *food secure* households (mostly residents) were using severe coping strategies that may jeopardize the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members. It is suggested to include these households among those needing food security assistance in winter months, to account for the planned deterioration of the economic and food situation. This would

represent some **150,680 additional persons to be assisted in Osh and Jalalabad oblasts** (excluding 28,400 host family members already counted above, most of whom are likely to be food secure).

 The proportion of food secure households using highly negative coping strategies that may jeopardize the health and nutritional status of vulnerable members was lower in other oblasts. Nevertheless, using the same reasoning of anticipated worsening of economic conditions, and based on the proportion of food secure households using such strategies in each oblast, there would be 160,680 food secure households in Yssyk-Kul, Batken, Naryn, Talas and Chuy oblasts and in Bishkek city who would benefit from food security assistance in winter months due to the forecast deterioration of their food security situation in the next 12 months.

The bulk of food insecure and at risk persons are located in **Osh** oblast, followed by **Jalalabad** and **Yssyk-Kul** oblasts, reflecting higher levels of food insecurity as well as large population in these oblasts.

	Severely food insecure	Moderately food insecure	Total food insecure	Food secure using coping strategies risks to lives
Total ⁴⁸	201,936	1,185,496	1,387,432	339,759
Urban	48,366	209,586	257,952	105,325
Rural	141,880	1,028,630	1,170,510	234,434
Yssyk-Kul	48,543	127,977	176,520	10,591
Batken	21,690	112,788	134,478	12,182
Naryn	0	31,116	31,116	141
Talas	2,290	84,730	87,020	3,664
Osh	78,253	536,592	614,845	80,848
Jalalabad	51,160	235,336	286,496	98,227
Chuy	0	48,492	48,492	35,713
Bishkek city	0	8,465	8,465	98,393



5.5 – Duration of food security assistance for WFP interventions

WFP EMOP for the Vulnerable Group Feeding programme and EMOP for crisis-affected households both end in December 2010. As mentioned, needs for food security assistance go beyond that period, especially considering the increased hardship during winter times when seasonal agricultural jobs are unavailable, food stocks are being depleted, and extra expenditures are incurred for heating and clothing.

Food/cash transfers are therefore suggested for an **additional period of 6 months until June 2011** to cover the winter period as well as the beginning of the spring before new harvests become available. A unification of both programmes will make sense thereafter, as

⁴⁸ The total per column is obtained from the sum of the oblast figures. The sum of urban+rural figures differs slightly, due to the weights attributed to the sample.

the remaining caseload of conflict-affected food insecure households is likely to resemble the VGF caseload of chronically food insecure households.

For the period **June 2011 and beyond**, the aim of food security assistance would be to ensure adequate food consumption and protect the nutritional status of vulnerable household members of food insecure households until such time as income and food access are recovered in violence-affected areas and benefits of longer-term interventions in agriculture and social assistance are being felt. These outcomes are unlikely to be achieved before a 2-3 years period of time. A Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) could be designed to that effect.

During 2011-2012, the **sentinel-based Food Security Monitoring System** envisaged under the AIDCO-funded project should assist with further identification of the main factors contributing to changes in the food security situation and with phasing and design of interventions accordingly.

5.6 - Food security assessments and monitoring

5.6.1 – Follow-up Emergency Food Security Assessment in Osh and Jalalabad

A follow-up EFSA is recommended for Osh and Jalalabad to ascertain the food security situation of IDPs, host families and residents in conflict-affected areas. This update is indispensable to adjust targeting criteria, caseload and modalities of assistance according to the extent of return and of assets and livelihood recovery.

In order to enable comparisons with the Rapid EFSA of July, the follow-up EFSA should continue to sample and analyse the situation of distinct population groups, including non-hosted IDPs, hosted IDPs, host families and residents. However, **a statistically representative approach at population group level** and possibly at urban/rural level is suggested to enable extrapolations to non-sampled groups. This was not possible in the Rapid EFSA due to constraints of time and resources.

Two options are proposed, according to time and resources available. Modalities, advantages and limitations are described in Table 9. Option 2 follows a methodology recently developed and tested for rapid statistically representative surveys in emergencies⁴⁹ and entails a smaller sample size, thus may be the best.

	Option 1	Option 2
Represen- tativity	 Population groups: non-hosted IDPs, hosted IDPs, host families, residents Urban and rural levels 	 Population groups: non-hosted IDPs, hosted IDPs, host families, residents
Sampling frame	 Urban strata: directly violence-affected neighbourhoods of Osh and Jalalabad cities Rural strata: Ayl okmutu/villages with IDPs 	 Directly affected neighbourhoods of Osh and Jalalabad cities combined with Ayl okmutu/villages with IDPs
Cluster sampling	 25 clusters per strata, proportional to size Total 50 clusters. 	 33 clusters, proportional to size separate cluster sampling in (i) areas with IDPs (hosted or non-hosted), and (ii) areas without IDPs but close to locations where IDPs are found (e.g. neighbouring village or urban neighbourhood with IDPs)⁵⁰

Table 9- Options for follow-up EFSA in affected areas of Osh and Jalalabad oblasts

 ⁴⁹ Alternative Sampling Designs for Emergency Settings: A Guide for Survey Planning, Data Collection and Analysis. FANTA-2 Project, Academy for Educational Development, USAID. September 2009.
 ⁵⁰ To perform cluster sampling proportional to size in areas with IDPs, a separate estimate of the

number of IDPs and number of residents in each location will be necessary. For each location with IDP included in the sampling frame, the cumulative number of IDPs should be used to select IDP clusters proportional to size, and the cumulative number of residents should be used to select resident clusters proportional to size.

	Option 1	Option 2
Household sampling	 20 households per cluster, divided into 4 categories: 5 non-hosted IDPs, 5 hosted IDPs, 5 host families and 5 resident families. 500 households per strata, including 125 households in each category Total: 1,000 households 	 24 households per cluster, divided into 4 categories: 6 non-hosted IDPs, 6 hosted IDPs, 6 host families and 6 resident families In areas with IDPs, the 3 households categories are sampled, while in areas without IDPs only residents are sampled 198 households in each category Total: 792 households
Modalities of household selection	 Enumerators randomly select 40 households in each cluster in order to allow sufficient probability that 5 households in each category will be found. Once the quota of households in one category is reached, no further households in this category are interviewed (i.e. if another randomly selected household falls in the same category, it is skipped and the next randomly selected household is visited). To randomly select households, enumerators can either use a list of households if it exists at city administration or village level (provided it also includes IDPs) or apply the 'spin-the- bottle' or 'right-hand' method⁵¹. 	 In areas with IDPs, enumerators randomly select 48 households in order to allow sufficient probability that 6 households in each category will be found. Once the quota of households in one category is reached, no further households in this category are interviewed (i.e. if another randomly selected household falls in the same category, it is skipped and the next randomly selected household is visited). In areas without IDPs, enumerators randomly select 6 resident households To randomly select households, enumerators can either use a list of households if it exists at city administration or village level or apply the 'spin-the-bottle' or 'right-hand' method⁵².
Advan- tages	 Extrapolation of results is possible to urban and rural population categories of IDPs, host families and residents in non- sample areas. 	 Extrapolation of results is possible to categories of IDPs, host families and residents in non-sampled areas Sample size per population category (198) is fairly sufficient for a proper description of the 3 food security groups⁵³.
Limitations	 Relatively small sample in each population category (125) may limit a proper description of the 3 food security groups per category⁵⁴. 	• Not possible to extrapolate results to non-sampled population categories at urban and rural levels.

⁵¹ With these methods, the total number of houses located along a random direction or following a righthand transect is counted. This number is divided by the number of households to sample (e.g. 48) to determine the sampling interval. A number is then randomly chosen between 1 and the sampling interval value to determine the 1st household to visit. Subsequent households are found by adding the sampling interval to the selected household. ⁵² With these methods, the total number of houses located along a random direction or following a right-

⁵² With these methods, the total number of houses located along a random direction or following a righthand transect is counted. This number is divided by the number of households to sample (e.g. 48) to determine the sampling interval. A number is then randomly chosen between 1 and the sampling interval value to determine the 1st household to visit. Subsequent households are found by adding the sampling interval to the selected household. ⁵³ Assuming for example 30% severely food insecure and 15% moderately food insecure in some of the

 ⁵³ Assuming for example 30% severely food insecure and 15% moderately food insecure in some of the population categories, this would represent about 59 severely food insecure households and 37 moderately food insecure households.
 ⁵⁴ Assuming for example 30% severely food insecure and 15% moderately food insecure in some of the

⁵⁴ Assuming for example 30% severely food insecure and 15% moderately food insecure in some of the population category, this would represent about 37 severely food insecure households and 19 moderately food insecure households, which are low figures to enable valid descriptions of these groups.

5.6.2 - Set up of the sentinel-site Food Security Monitoring System

Selection of priority oblasts with high prevalence of food insecurity for the establishment of a 'light', sentinel-site Food Security Monitoring System (FSMS) can be done using the results of this nation-wide EFSA and previous results of the KIHS. **Annex 3** provides a summary of the salient, distinctive food security characteristics of each oblast.

Osh oblast or Yssyk-Kul oblast would seem the most appropriate to start the FSMS:

- KIHS re-analysis revealed relatively high levels of food insecurity in Osh oblast and the EFSA found the highest level, reflecting the negative effects of the civil violence and high food insecurity among IDPs; based on the EFSA, 44% of the total number of food insecure persons in the country would live in Osh oblast;
- Yssyk-Kul oblast presented a high prevalence of food insecurity in both KIHS and EFSA; based on the EFSA it would comprise 13% of the total number of food insecure persons in the country.

Other potential oblasts to consider for an expansion of the FSMS are **Naryn**, **Batken** and **Talas**:

- KIHS re-analysis found a high prevalence of food insecurity in Naryn oblast while it was low in the EFSA, but this is likely to reflect large food availability at the time of the assessment favouring adequate food consumption; poverty rates are high in Naryn (44%) and diet and food insecurity are expected to worsen in winter months when households have exhausted their food stocks and lack cash to purchase similar amounts and variety of food;
- the prevalence of food insecurity in Batken oblast was high in KIHS and relatively high as well in the EFSA; according to UNDP, conditions of extreme deprivation are worse than in other oblasts;
- the prevalence of food insecurity in Talas oblast was relatively high in both KIHS and EFSA; use of coping strategies jeopardizing health and nutritional status is widespread, cash income is low and food is a key priority for households.

Draft Terms of Reference for the set-up of the FSMS have been developed for the AIDCOfunded project. They envisage the launch of the FSMS in one pilot oblast, using an approach akin to the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) of Food Security to select and achieve a consensus on priority city neighbourhoods and Ayl okmutu/villages to serve as sentinel sites. A preliminary list of indicators and severity thresholds that could be used to apply the IPC for this selection has also been prepared.

Technical assistance will be required to organize IPC workshops in the selected oblast, formalize the process of selection of sentinel sites, develop a sampling methodology to select households, and prepare data collection tools (including anthropometric measurements to evaluate the nutritional status situation alongside household food security) and analysis plan. This should take place preferably **between December 2010 and February 2011**. It is proposed to expand the FSMS to up to 4 oblasts of high food insecurity prevalence by 2012 (e.g. Osh, Yssyk-Kul, Naryn and Batken).

As results of the FSMS will only be available for one oblast in most of 2011, rapid EFSAs may be required to check upon the situation in localised areas of other oblasts in the course of next year, especially in case of further violent events or natural disasters.

ANNEX 1 - HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

Household Questionnaire

Code Oblast : _	Code Rayon :	Code Aiyl Okurgs :
Name of the location		
Questionnaire number:	_ _ _	Date : _ _ / 0 _ 2010
Code enumeration team	: _ _	uay / monun
Name	of	enumerators :/

Consent:

We are assessing the living situation of families in Kyrgyzstan. As it is not possible to meet everybody, we have selected at random localities and families in order to have an idea of the general situation. None of the localities or families visited will be privileged to receive particular assistance, and we do not register names. However, this information will be used to take decisions on programmes to contribute to improving the living conditions of the population in the country.

The interview should not last more than 30 minutes. The answers you will give will remain strictly confidential and will not be given to others. You can refuse to participate or to answer to some of the questions. But we hope that you will accept to participate, as your answers are very important to take the best decisions possible. Do you have questions for us? Can we start?

Ask if several families share the same house without eating together and without sharing their income. If there are distinct families, select one at random for the interview.

Who is making the decisions for the household? 1= Man/ 2 = Woman	1.1	
How old is he/she?	1.2	years
How many children and adults live in your family ?		•
Children below 5 years	1.3	
Primary school-age children 6-11 years	1.4	
Secondary school-age children 12-18 years	1.5	
Adult men 19-60 years	1.6	
Adult women19-60 years	1.7	
Adults above 60 years of age	1.8	
Write total number of persons, or 0 if there are none		
1.9 Are there persons who have long-duration sickness (e.g. diabetes)?		chronic sick
1.10 Are there pregnant women ?		_ pregnant
1.11 Are there lactating women ?		lactating

I – HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

II - HOUSING SITUATION

	Where is your family living NOW? (at the time of the interview)	
2.1	 1= in own or in rented house 2= hosted in house of a relative, friend or neighbour (displaced or returnee) 3= in temporary shelter (e.g. tent) within former house compound or garden 4= in a collective centre such as school (displaced or returnee) 	

2.2	Including your own family, how many other families live here? Families are considered separate if they do not eat together and do not share their income	
	Has your house been affected by the violence in April or June?	
2.3	 1= not touched 2= partly destroyed but can live in it 3= partly destroyed and needs repairs before living in it 4= fully destroyed 	_
2.4	Were do you get your water for drinking and cooking? 1 = <u>Safe source</u> (private tap, public tap, tank, bottle, rain water, protected well) 2 = <u>Unsafe source (non protected well, canal, river, swamp)</u>	_
2.5	What are you using mainly for cooking food? 1= gas 2= electricity 3= wood 4= animal dung 5= other (specify)	

III – <u>CROPS AND LIVESTOCK</u>

Can you cult	Can you cultivate a land or a garden?											4		1	1	
	1:	= Yes/	2 = NO	If No	o, go ta	Que	stion 3.	.45 on a	ani	imals	3	.1		Ι_	_	
How much la	and do yo	u cultiv	ate?								3	.2		hectares		
Do you use fertilizer?											3	22				
1= Yes/ 2= No																
Do you have a functioning irrigation system ? 1 = yes, fully functional 2 = yes, partially functional 3 = no									3	3.4						
Which crops will you harvest in the next months? 1= Yes / 2= No If No, go to next crop				In which month will you harvest? Note the calendar number corresponding to the earliest month Write 99 if the harvest is continuous each month				Approximately how much of it will you sell? (in %)				Appro rest famil amou Note Write	Approximately how long will the rest of the harvest last for family consumption if the amount is as usual? Note the total number of months. Write « 0 » if less than 1 month			
Wheat	3.5			3.6				3.7			%	3.8			m	onths
Maize	3.9			3.10				3.11			%	3.12			m	onths
Potatoes	3.13		_	3.14				3.15			%	3.16			m	onths
Cotton	3.17			3.18				3.19			%	3.20			m	onths
Vegetables	3.21			3.22				3.23			%	3.24			m	onths
Fruit trees	3.25		_	3.26				3.27			%	3.28			m	onths
Lucerne	3.29		_	3.30				3.31			%	3.32			m	onths
What are you	ur main c	onstra	ints at	the mo	oment	with c	rop cu	Itivatio	n?	?			1= Yes/ 2= No			
Cost of seed												3.33		r		
Quality of see	ed											3.34				
Cost of fertiliz	er											3.35			_	
Lack of irrigat	ion											3.36			_	
Security to ac	cess field	ls										3.37				
Security to Irr	igate field	<u>IS</u> obinom										3.38				
Cost of mach	inerv serv	vices										3.39			-	
Lack of manp	ower to c	ultivate										3.41			-	
Varving, unst	able price	s of cro	os hat	are so	ld							3.42			-	
Unreliable ag	reements	with bu	ivers o	r trade	rs for ci	rops th	nat are	sold?				3.43			_	
Other (specify	/):											3.44				
Do you have	animals?)						1 = Ye	es/	2 = No)	3.45	lf I	 Vo, go	 to S	ection IV
Do you have	adequate	winter	fodde	e r ?				1 = Ye	s/ 1	2 = No)	3.46		Т		

Will you buy supplementary feed (such as combicorn)? 1 = Yes/ 2 = No	3.47				
How many poultry do you have?	3.48				
How many sheep and goats do you have?	3.49				
How many cows and bulls do you have?	3.50				
How many horses do you have?	3.51				
How many donkeys do you have?	3.52				
What are your main constraints at the moment with animal raising?	1= Yes/ 2= No				
Lack of adequate good quality winter fodder	3.53	[<u> </u>		
Cost of animal feed	3.54				
Lack of adequate pasture land	3.55				
Lack of security to access pastures	3.56				
Animal pests and diseases	3.57				
Cost of veterinary services	3.58				
Lack of security to access markets to sell animal products or live animals	3.59				
Low price obtained when selling animal products or live animals	3.60				
Theft of animals	3.61				
Lack of shelter to keep animals	3.62				
Lack of manpower to keep animals	3.63				
Other (specify):	3.64				

IV – <u>EXPENDITURES</u>

What are your 4 largest expen	iving?		Ranking		Amount per week (KGS)					
1= Food 2= Water 3= Gas, electricity, other cooking fu			4.1	Largest expe	nditure	4.2	 KGS/week			
 4= Soap, hygiene products 5= Clothing 6= Rental of housing 7= Telephone communications 8= Transportation, diesel for car or truck 9= Health care, drugs 10= Schooling 11= Ceremonies (including funerals) 12= Debt or credit repayment 13= Agricultural inputs, animal feed, irrigation 14= Rental of land 15= Material to remove rubbles 16= Material to repair or reconstruct housing 17= Other (specify) 						2 nd expe	 KGS/v	KGS/week		
						3 rd expe	 KGS/v	KGS/week		
						│ <u> </u> 4 th expe	 KGS/v	LKGS/week		
Do you have some loans or cro	edit to re	eiml	ours	e?	1=	Yes / 2= No	4.9	=	If No, go to \$	Section V
What are the main expenditur	es that y	/ou	hav	e cover	ed wit	h this money?		1 = Yes /	2 = No	
Food	4.10			Trans	sporta	tion, diesel for c	4.11			
Water	4.12			Healt	th care	e, drugs			4.13	
Gas, electricity, other cooking fuel	Gas, electricity, other cooking fuel 4.14 Schooling								4.15	
Soap, hygiene products	giene products 4.16 Ceremonies (including funerals)								4.17	
Clothing 4.18 Agriculture					ultural	inputs, animal f	4.19			
Rental of housing	4.20			Rent	al of la	nd			4.21	
Material to remove rubbles	4.22			Mate	rial to	repair of recons	4.23			

V – INCOME SOURCES AND ASSETS

How many persons in the family can earn some cash?	5.1			_	_		
What are the 3 main sources of cash for the family?		Rank	ting	Amount per month (KGS)			
 1= Sale of harvest of wheat, maize, potatoes, cotton etc. 2= Sale of vegetables or fruits 3= Sale of animal products or animals 4= Irregular wage labour unskilled r (e.g. seasonal, temporary) 5= Regular wage labour unskilled (e.g. driver, cleaner, guard) 6 = Regular wage labour skilled (e.g. employee in factory) 7= Independent worker (e.g. carpenter, taxi driver) 	5.2	L	 Largest source		KGS/month		
 8= Government employment (e.g. police, administration, health, school) 9= Employment in UN agency or NGO 10= Sale of handicraft 11= Petty trade (street or market vendor without shop) 12= Small business (shop) 13= Large business 14= Rent of land or rent of property 15= Pension, allowances 	5.4	2n	 d source	5.5	 KGS/month		
 16 = Remittances 17= Sale of humanitarian assistance 18 = Sale of assets, sale of domestic belongings 19= Use of personal savings, sale of jewellery 20= Credit, loans from organizations, banks, money lenders 21 = Charity from relatives, friends, neighbours 98 = No 2nd source of income (only one source) 99= No 3rd source of income (only 2 sources) 	5.6	Зro	 d source	5.7	LKGS/month		
Do you have family members who live outside Kyrgyzstan? 1=	Yes / 2 =	= No	5.8				
If yes, do they help you out with money or goods ? 1= Y	'es/ 2 =	No	5.9 ↑ If	5.9 5.9 5.11			
If yes, how many times a year do you receive this help?	5.10						
Are you sometimes using money transfer systems (companies)?		5.11					
Are you sometimes using bank or postal services to receive or send	d mone	y?	5.12				
				4 V			

Do you have	1 = Yes / 2 = No
Stove	5.13
Television	5.14
Radio	5.15
Cell phone	5.16
Sewing machine	5.17
Bicycle	5.18
Motorcycle	5.19
Car, truck	5.20
Tractor	5.21
Food or other commodity stock for petty trade	5.22
Shop	5.23

VI- FOOD CONSUMPTION

How many meals do	you eat each day	?			6.1							
Consider only meals home or in public kit private restaurants o	How the cons	How many days for the last 7 days did your family consume these food items?					What was the main source of these food?					
Do NOT count food o very small amount (le teaspoon per person	0 = N 1 = 1 (c) 2 = 2 (c) 3 = 3 (c) 4 = 4 (c) 5 = 5 (c) 6 = 6 (c) 7 = 7 (c)	u = Not eaten 1 = 1 day 2 = 2 days 3 = 3 days 4 = 4 days 5 = 5 days 6 = 6 days 7 = 7 days					 1= Own production/garden 2= Purchase in shops, markets, petty traders 3= Purchase at credit, borrowed 4= Received against work (in-kind payment) 5= Bartered against other goods 6= Received as gift from family or neighbours, begged 7= Humanitarian food aid 99= Not eaten during the 7 past days 					
Bread		6.2				6.3						
Wheat (grain, flour), rid	ce, maize, pasta	6.4				6.5						
Biscuits, High Energy	Biscuits	6.6				6.7						
Potatoes, sweet potato	Des	6.8		<u> </u>		6.9						
Beans, chickpeas, lent	tils, peas	6.10				6.11						
Vegetables		6.12				6.13	3					
Fruits		6.14		<u> </u>		6.15	5					
Nuts, walnuts, hazelnu	uts	6.16				6.17	7					
Meat (red, poultry)		6.18				619						
Eggs		6.20				6.21						
Fish		6.22				6.23	3					
Dairy products (yogurt	, cheese, milk)	6.24				6.25	5					
Vegetable oil, butter, g	jrease	6.26				6.27	7					
Sugar, honey, jam		6.28				6.29)					
Do you have stocks of food? 1= Yes / 2								6.30	If No stocks, go to Section VII			
How long will your st	tocks last for the	family	consu	mpt	ion?			Writ	te number of days (0 if no stock)			
Wheat (grain, flour)	Pota potat	toes toes	, swee	days								
Rice	6.35	days	Oil, b	outte	er, grea	se		6.36	days			
Beans, peas, chickpeas, lentils 6.37 I days Sugar								6.38	days			

VII – <u>COPING STRATEGIES, ASSISTANCE AND PRIORITIES</u>

In th enou to:	e past 7 days, if there have been times when you did not have Igh food or money to buy food, how often has your family had	Number of days	Severity weight	Score= Number of days x severity Supervisor to fill in	
7.1	Rely on less preferred and less expensive foods?		1		
7.2	Borrow food, or rely on help from a friend or relative?		2		
7.3	Limit portion size at meal times?		1		
7.4	Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat?		3		
7.5	Reduce number of meals eaten in a day?		1		
During the past 30 days, have there been times when your family had to do the following in order to get money or food?		 1= Never 2= Rarely (less than once per week) 3= Once in a while (1-2 days/week) 4= Often (3-6 days/week) 5= All the time 			
--	---	--	--	--	--
7.6	Send family members elsewhere to eat?				
7.7	Spend whole days without eating?				
7.8	Consume seed stocks?				
7.9	Decrease expenditures for agricultural inputs or animal feed?				
7.10	Sell household assets (e.g. radio, TV, furniture etc.)?				
7.11	Sell productive assets (e.g. work equipment etc.)?				
7.12	Sell animals more than usual?				
7.13	Gather wild food, hunt or harvest immature crops?				
7.14	Decrease health expenditures?				
7.15	Migrate more than usual to look for work or food?				

During	the past 3 months, what are the major problems that you have faced:	1= Yes / 2= No
7.16	Poor weather for agriculture	
7.17	Low harvest or no harvest obtained this season	
7.18	Mudslide	
7.19	Loss of employment	
7.20	Decrease of salary	
7.21	Health problems	
7.22	High food prices	
7.23	High fuel prices	
7.24	High cost of agricultural inputs for crops and/or animals (e.g. fertilizer, fuel, seed, fodde	er)
7.25	Violence, insecurity	
7.26	Other (specify)	
During	the past 3 months, have you received any of the following assistance:	1= Yes / 2= No
7.27	Food	
7.28	Hygiene kits (soap etc.)	
7.29	Household items (kitchen set, blankets)	
7.30	Seed	
7.31	Fertilizer	
7.32	Agricultural tools	
7.33	Cash grant from NGO, UN agency or caritative association	
7.34	Other	

What are your 3 main priorities ?			In the immediate	For the next months		
1= Food2= Housing3= Employment, work4= Cash5= Health6= Schooling7= Water8= Sanitation		7.35	1 st priority	7.36	││ 1 st priority	
 9= Cooking utensits 11= Agricultural inputs 13= Livestock 15= Security 16= Other (specify) 	Cooking utensils 10= Bedding, furniture - Agricultural inputs 12= Land to cultivate - Livestock 14= Pastures for animals - Security - Other (specify)		2 nd priority	7.38	2 nd priority	

ANNEX 2 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Key Informants Questionnaire

Code Oblast :	Code Rayon :	Code Aiyl Okurgs : _
Name of the location		
Questionnaire number:	_ _ _	Date : _ _ / 0 _ 2010
Code enumeration team	n: _ _	uay / month
Name	of	enumerators :/

I - IDENTIFICATION

The interview can take place with only one Key Informants or more, but preferably no more than 4-5 at the same time. A balanced representation men/women is recommended (ask if some women can participate).

	Name (optional)	M = man W= woman	Title/Function
1.1			
1.2			
1.3			
1.4			
1.5			

II – POPULATION IN THE LOCALITY

2.1	How many people are living in this village (or city neighborhood)?	persons
2.2	How many families are living in this village (or city neighborhood)	families
2.3	How many of these families are permanent RESIDENT?	resident families
2.4	How many of these families are DISPLACED from the April or June events?	displaced families If 0, go to Section III
2.5	Where are these displaced families living? 1= Mostly in host families 2= Mostly in temporary shelters/empty houses 3= Mostly in collective centers/public buildings	

III - MAIN OCCUPATIONS

ASK FOR THE RESIDENTS AND FOR THE DISPLACED IF THERE ARE SOME IN THE VILLAGE/LOCALITY

What is the proportion of people receiving most of their food or income from:	RESIDENTS			DISPLACED			
Cultivation of crops, vegetables or fruit trees	3.1		%	3.2	%		
Raising of animals	3.3		%	3.4	%		
Trade (petty trade, small shops)	3.5		%	3.6	%		
Government employment (police, administration, health, school etc.)	3.7		%	3.8	%		
Irregular or seasonal labour (unskilled)	3.9		%	3.10	%		
Pensions, allowances	3.11		%	3.12	%		
Remittances	3.13		%	3.14	%		
Humanitarian assistance	3.15		%	3.16	%		

IV – MARKETS

How long does it take to go to the nearest market to buy food or to sell goods, using the most usual means of transportation? 1= Less than 15 mn 2= 15-30 mn 3= 30 mn-1 hour 4= More than 1 hour					
What is the current price of:		Current price (KGS)			
Wheat	4.2	/ kg			
Bread	4.3	/ piece			
Chicken meat	4.4	/ kg			
Beef meat	4.5	/ kg			
Milk	4.6	/ liter			
Vegetable oil	4.7	/ liter			
Fuel	4.8	/ liter			
Fertilizer urea	4.9	/ kg			
Fertilizer ammonium nitrate	4.10	/ kg			
Breeding cow or cow after first or second calf	4.11	/ cow			
Breeding ewe after first lambing	4.12	/ ewe			
What are the wage levels for:		KGS per day of work			
Agricultural casual labour (e.g. harvesting)	4.13	KGS/ day			
Non-agricultural casual labour (e.g. construction)	4.14	KGS/ day			

V- <u>HEALTH</u>

What do most households do when they are sick to receive health treatment ? 1= go to health center within the village or in neighbouring village (or city neighbourhood) 2= go to private clinic or to private doctor 3= go to traditional healer, village curer 4= use home-made treatment 5= do nothing				_
How long does it take to go to the nearest health centre using the most usual means of transportation? 1= Less than 15 mn 2= 15-30 mn 3= 30 mn-1 hour 4= More than 1 hour 4= More than 1 hour				
What are the main diseases that affect the population? 1= Acute respiratory infections 2= Malaria, high fever 3= Diarrhoea 4= Tuberculosis 5= Chronic diseases such as diabetes, high blood pressure 6= Other (specify)				
What are the main constraints for households to receive health treatment?		1 = Yes / 2	2 = No	
Far away	5.4			
Lack of money to pay for drugs or for treatment 5.5				
Lack of drugs within the health centre				
Lack of doctors and other health agents within the health centre				
Insecurity to reach the centre	5.8		_	

VI - EDUCATION

Where do most children go to primary school ? 1 = primary school within the village (or in the same area of the city) 2 = primary school in neighboring village (or in neighboring area of the city)		_
How long does it take to go to the nearest primary school using the most usual means of transportation?1= Less than 15 mn 2= 15-30 mn 3= 30 mn-1 hour 4= More than 1 hour	6.2	_
What are the main constraints for households to send their children to primary school?	1= Yes / 2= No	
Far away	6.3	_
Lack of money to pay for clothing, uniform, textbooks etc.	6.4	_
Lack of teachers	6.5	
Poor school facilities (heating, water, sanitation)	6.6	_
Insecurity to reach the school	6.7	
Children often sick or hungry	6.8	
Children have to work or to help with household chores, agriculture, animals etc.	6.9	

VII – SHOCKS, PRIORITIES AND INTERVENTIONS

ASK FOR THE RESIDENTS AND FOR THE DISPLACED IF THERE ARE SOME IN THE VILLAGE/LOCALITY

During the past 3 months , what have been the main difficulties or	RESIDENTS 1 = Yes/ 2= No		DIS	SPLACED Yes/ 2= No
Adverse climatic conditions (e.g. late rains, floods, drought, hail)	7.1		7.2	
Mudslide	7.3		7.4	
Pests on crops	7.5		7.6	
Animal diseases	7.7		7.8	
High cost of agricultural inputs (for crops and/or animals)	7.9		7.10	
High fuel prices	7.11		7.12	
Decrease of employment	7.13		7.14	
Decrease of salaries	7.15		7.16	
Decrease of remittances sent by migrants	7.17		7.18	
High food prices	7.19		7.20	
Health problems, physical difficulties to work	7.21		7.22	
Violence, insecurity	7.23		7.24	
Other (specify)	7.25		7.26	
Which population groups face the most problems to access food and inco	ome?	1 = Ye	s / 2 = N	lo
Large families	7.27	ll_		
The elderly, pensioner living alone	7.28	ll_		
Households with disabled members	7.29	l		
Households headed by a woman	7.30	I		
Households with orphans	7.31	II		
Households with no land	7.32			
Households with no animals	7.33			
Households with no migrants sending remittances, or no migrants at all	7.34			
Displaced families	7.35	l_		

During the past 3 months, has this assistance been provided in	F	RESIDENTS	DISPLACED		
the village (or city neighborhood):	1	= Yes/ 2= No	1 = Yes/ 2= No		
Household food rations	7.36		7.37		
Food-for-work	7.38		7.39		
Cash-for-work	7.40		7.41		
Cash grants from NGOs or other agencies	7.42		7.43		
Micro-credit	7.44		7.45		
Seeds	7.46		7.47		
Fertilizer	7.48		7.49		
Agricultural tools	7.50		7.51		
Fodder, animal feed	7.52		7.53		
Veterinary services from an NGO or other agency	7.54		7.55		
Material for house repair, temporary shelter	7.56 7.57				
What are the main priorities to improve the situation of households in this village (or city neighbourhood)?	1 = Yes/ 2= No				
Employment	7.58				

Security to move (to go to work, to market., to land, to school etc.)	7.59	
Irrigation	7.60	
Subsidies or other help with fertilizer	7.61	
Agricultural equipment	7.62	
Veterinary services	7.63	
Health centre upgrading or construction	7.64	
Domestic water supply	7.65	
Sanitation facilities	7.66	
Primary school upgrading or construction	7.67	
Roads repair or roads construction	7.68	
Transportation facilities	7.69	
Housing for the displaced		
Improvement of housing for the residents		
Other (specify):	7.72	

ANNEX 3 – DISTINCTIVE FOOD SECURITY CHARACTERISTICS OF OBLASTS AND BISHKEK CITY

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	 Relatively older heads of household (48 years) Relatively small family size (4.8 members)
	 Relatively high proportion of households obtaining their drinking water from unsafe sources (12%)
	 Mostly using electricity for cooking, 14% using animal dung
	Higher prevalence of stunting than national average (2006)
	High prevalence of food insecurity (40%)
	 Relatively lower average number of daily meals (3.3) Below average kilocalorie intake/capita (2,220 kcal) Lower fat intake per capita (51 g)
	 Relatively high proportion of households consuming poor (7%) or borderline (9%) diet Less frequent consumption of other cereals than bread (3-4 times), meat (less than 3 times) and vegetables/fruits(3 times) and rare consumption of pulses (less than once) during previous 7 days
	 Lower proportion of households having food stocks (50%) High proportion of households having consumed potatoes from their own production (56%)
	 Higher poverty rates (46%) Worse conditions of extreme deprivation (7.8 vs. national average 6.9) Expected increased level of unemployment (tourism collapse) due to April and June violence
Yssvk-Kul	 Lower average number of household members able to earn cash (1.6)
	 High proportion of households relying on irregular unskilled wage labour (15%) or pensions (28%) as their largest source of cash Low proportion of households relying on remittances as their largest source of cash
	 (less than 1%) Below average income levels per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (by 529
	 Lower monthly wage per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (4,265 KGS) High proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita below extreme poverty level (64%)
	 Low amount of food expenditure (115 KGS/cap./week)
	 Lower proportion of households with external migrants receiving goods or cash (57%)
	 Low proportion of farming households with access to fertilizer (31%) High proportion of farming households cultivating wheat (51%) Low proportion of the wheat harvest generally sold (20%) Long duration of potato harvest for family self-consumption (6.8 months) Low proportion of faming households cultivating vegetables (36%), fruit trees (39%) High proportion of farming households mentioning high cost of fertilizer and seed (82%), lack of high quality seed (76%), lack of irrigation (45%) and unstable selling prices (71%) as constraints for cultivation
	 Low average number of poultry owned (8), horse (1) High proportion of animal owners mentioning animal disease (62%) and low prices of animal sales (55%) as a constraint for animal raising Relatively high proportion of animal owners mentioning animal theft (36%) as a constraint for animal raising

Nation-wide EFSA, August 2010

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	 Low proportion of households owning a radio (48%), a car (26%), a bicycle (23%) Relatively high proportion of households owning a sewing machine (56%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning high food prices (86%), health (66%) as difficulties faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	 Relatively high frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (4.5)
	 Relatively high proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for future livelihoods (17%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning food as their 1st immediate priority (54%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (33%)
	 Low proportion of female-neaded households (18%) Relatively older heads of household (48 years) Large family size (6.8 members)
	 High number of vulnerable members (under-5 children, pregnant/lactating women, elderly, chronically sick) (1.54 vulnerable), especially pregnant/lactating women (0.20)
	 High levels of displacement and housing destruction High proportion of households obtaining their drinking water from unsafe sources (21%)
	Mostly using wood/charcoal for cooking
Jalalabad	 Relatively low average number of daily meals (3.1) Relatively high proportion of households consuming a 'borderline' diet (10%) Less frequent consumption of other cereals than bread (3-4 times), vegetables/fruits (about 4 times), dairy products (3 times) and oil/fats (3-4 times), and rare consumption of pulses (less than once) during previous 7 days Lower proportion of households having food stocks (53%)
	 Shorter duration of food stocks High proportion of households having consumed vegetables from own production (44%)
	 Higher poverty rates (37%) Expected increased levels of unemployment due to June violence Below average income levels per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (by 230 KGS)
	 High proportion of households relying on sale of vegetables (12%) or regular unskilled wage labour (9%) as their largest source of cash Relatively high proportion of households relying on civil service (16%) as their largest
	 Relatively high proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita
	 below extreme poverty level (53%) High proportion of households indebted for food purchase (57%)
	• Expected downward harvest (by 20%-30%) in farms of areas affected by the violence
	 High proportion of farming households with access to only partially functioning irrigation system (56%)
	 High proportion of households cultivating wheat (45%), maize (67%), cotton (21%) Low duration of potato harvest for family self-consumption (3.8 months) High proportion of the vegetable barvest generally sold (33%)
	 High proportion of farming households mentioning high cost of fertilizer (90%) and seed (75%), lack of high quality seed (67%), high cost and lack of agricultural machinery (73%) as constraints for cultivation
	 High average number of poultry owned (12), sheep (11), cattle (3) Low proportion of bauseholds sultivating lucerne as fedder (18%)
	 High proportion of animal owners mentioning lack of adequate winter fodder (53%),

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	animal disease (75%), animal theft (57%) and insecurity to access markets (43%) as
	constraints for animal raising
	• Relatively high proportion of animal owners mentioning lack of manpower (37%) and
	lack of animal shelter (44%) as constraints for animal raising
	 High proportion of households owning a sewing machine (61%)
	Relatively high proportion of households owning petty trade stocks (18%) small shop
	(16%)
	High proportion of households mentioning high food prices (84%), violence/insecurity
	(67%), health (65%), loss of job (50%), decrease salary (51%) and mudslides (28%)
	as difficulties faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	 High frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced
	Coping Strategy Index (5.1)
	Relatively high proportion of households reduced expenses for agricultural inputs
	(16% rarely, 7% once in a while), sold domestic assets (13%), sold productive assets
	(12%), sold animals more than usual (28%) and sent migrants to look for work or food
	High properties of bouseholds using coping strategies entailing risks for bealth and
	nutritional status of vulnerable members (20%)
	 High proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for future
	livelihoods (33%)
	 High proportion of households having received food assistance (22%) during 3 months provious to the survey (May, July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households having received fertilizer (21%) during
	previous 3 months
	• Relatively high proportion of households mentioning food as their 1 st immediate priority
	(27%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning security as their 1° immediate priority (36%) and as their 1st priority for the payt months (32%)
	Mostly using electricity for cooking
	······································
	 Lower fat intake per capita (56 g)
	Rare consumption of pulses (less than once) and less frequent consumption of
	vegetables/fruits (3-4 times) during previous 7 days
	 Shorter duration of households baking bread at home (93%)
	 High proportion of households baking bread at none (30%) High proportion of households baking consumed wheat from their own production
	(32%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households having consumed potatoes (9%) and
	vegetables (12%) received as gift
	 High proportion of households having consumed meat from own production (64%) High proportion of households having consumed dairy products from own production
	(67%)
	High proportion of households having consumed fat from own production (66%)
Naryn	Relatively high proportion of households having consumed sugar/jam/honey from own
	production (12%)
	 High poverty rates (44%)
	Worse conditions of extreme deprivation (8.2 vs. national average 6.9)
	 Below average income levels per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (by 576)
	KGS)
	 Figh proportion of nousenoids relying on sale of crops (24%) of civil service (32%) as their largest source of cash
	 Low proportion of households relving on independent work (2%) or any kind of wage
	labour (1%-2%) as their largest source of cash
	• High proportion of households relying on civil service as their 2 nd source of income
	(22%)
	 Average proportion or nousenoids obtaining monthly cash income per capita below extreme poverty level (34%)

Main distinctive food security characteristics
 Very low proportion of households mentioning food as their largest expenditure (13%). High proportion of households mentioning agricultural inputs/animal feed/irrigation (42%) and construction material for housing (16%) as their largest expenditures Low share of food expenditure out of 4 largest expenditures (20%) Relatively high amounts of 4 main expenditures (610 KGS/cap./week)
 High proportion of households sometimes using a money transfer service system (38%) and bank or postal services to transfer or receive money (61%) High proportion of households indebted (35%)
 Low proportion of households with access to garden or land (48%) Large acreage of garden/land cultivated per capita (0.76 ha/cap.) High proportion of households self-sufficient in theory (85% above 0.17 ha/cap.) Relatively low proportion of farming households with access to fertilizer (66%) High proportion of farming households with access to only partially functioning irrigation system (55%) High proportion of farming households cultivating wheat (65%)
 Low proportion of farming households cultivating vegetables (42%), fruit trees (25%) High proportion of farming households mentioning lack of irrigation (59%), high cost and lack of agricultural machinery (84%), lack of manpower (81%), lack of security to access fields (35%) or to irrigate (40%) and unreliable trade agreements with buyers (71%) and unstable selling prices (75%) as constraints for cultivation
 High proportion of animal owners (72%) Low average number of poultry owned (8-9) High number of sheep owned (13), cattle (3), horses (3) Low proportion of households with access to adequate winter fodder (27%) High proportion of animal owners mentioning the lack of manpower (66%), lack of animal shelter (52%), low prices of animal sales (56%), animal theft (62%) and insecurity to access markets (47%) as constraints for animal raising
• Low proportion of households owning a sewing machine (36%), a bicycle (12%)]
 High proportion of households mentioning high food prices (80%), violence/insecurity (64%) as difficulties faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July) Relatively high proportion of households mentioning mudslides as a difficulty in previous 3 months (14%)
 Low frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (0.3)
 High proportion of households having received food assistance (36%) during 3 months previous to the survey (May-June) Relatively high proportion of households having received fertilizer (24%) during previous 3 months
 High proportion of households mentioning employment as their 1st immediate priority (16%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (17%) Relatively high proportion of households mentioning livestock as their 1st immediate priority (11%)
 Low proportion of female-headed households (14%) Relatively older heads of household (49 years) Large family size (7.1 members)
 Mostly using wood/charcoal for cooking, 16% using animal dung
 Higher prevalence of stunting than national average (2006)
 Relatively high prevalence of food insecurity (31%)
 Below average kilocalorie intake/capita (2,200 kcal), without much variation across poverty quintiles Less frequent consumption of oil/fat (4-5 times) during previous 7 days

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	Shorter duration of food stocks
	 High proportion of households having consumed vegetables from own production
	(46%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households having consumed sugar/jam/honey from own production (10%)
	Worse conditions of extreme deprivation (7.9 vs. national average 6.9) Delaw everage income levels per conits according to KIUS 3 rd guerter of 2000 (by
	Below average income levels per capita according to KIHS 3 quarter of 2009 (by 152 KGS)
	 Lower monthly wage per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (3,343 KGS)
	 High proportion of households relying on regular unskilled wage labour as their largest source of cash (9%)
	 High proportion of households relying on sale of vegetables (15%) or independent work (18%) as their 2nd source of income
	work (10%) as then 2 - source of income
	High proportion of households relying on sale of crops (31%) or sale of vegetables
	(10%) as their largest source of cash
	 Relatively high proportion of households relying on remittances (11%) as their largest source of income
	 Relatively high proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita
	below extreme poverty level (58%)
	 Low amount of food expenditure (125 KGS/cap./week)
	High proportion of external migrants (31%)
	 High proportion of households sometimes using a money transfer service system
	(33%)
	 High proportion of households indebted to pay for transportation costs (83%), for
	agricultural inputs and irrigation (62%) and for land fental (71%)
	 High proportion of households self-sufficient in theory (68% above 0.17 ha/cap.)
	 High proportion of households cultivating wheat (51%), maize (47%)
	Low proportion of households cultivating potatoes (35%)
	 High proportion of the potato harvest generally sold (44%) and vegetable harvest (40%)
	 High proportion of farming households mentioning high cost of fertilizer and seed as
	constraints for cultivation (90%), lack of high quality seed (79%)
	 Relatively high number of cattle owned by animal raisers (3)
	High proportion of animal owners mentioning that they will buy complementary animal
	feed (85%)
	 High proportion of animal owners mentioning lack of adequate winter fodder (51%) and animal disease (63%) as constraints for animal raising
	• High properties of boughted owning a cowing machine (71%) a big/glo (55%) path/
	trade stocks (33%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households owning a small shop (21%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning health (65%) as a difficulty faced in the
	3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	Relatively high proportion of households mentioning decreased salary (40%) and
	mudslides (15%) as difficulties in previous 3 months
	• Low frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced
	Coping Strategy Index (2.6)
	 High proportion of households sold animals more than usual (22%) during 30 days previous to the survey (July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for
	future livelihoods (21%)
	Relatively high proportion of households having received food assistance (10%)
	fertilizer (32%) during 3 months previous to the survey (May-July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households mentioning food as their 1st immediate priority

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics	
	 (35%) High proportion of households mentioning security as their 1st immediate priority (50%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (48%) 	
	 Relatively older heads of household (49 years) High number of vulnerable members (under-5 children, pregnant/lactating women, elderly, chronically sick) (1.57 vulnerable), especially elderly (0.61) and pregnant/lactating women (0.23) 	
	 High levels of displacement and housing destruction Relatively high proportion of households obtaining their drinking water from unsafe sources (9%) Mostly using wood/charcoal for cooking, 19% using animal dung 	
	 High prevalence of food insecurity (55%) 	
	 Relatively lower average number of daily meals (3.2) Below average kilocalorie intake per capita (2,050 kcal) Relatively high proportion of households consuming a 'borderline' diet (7%) Rare consumption of pulses (less than once) and less frequent consumption of vegetables/fruits (about 4 times), dairy products (2-3 times) and oil/fat (4-5 times) during previous 7 days Shorter duration of food stocks 	
	 Low amounts of 4 main expenditures (218 KGS/cap./week) High amount of food expenditure (105 KGS/cap./week) 	
Osh	 Higher poverty rates (38%) Worse conditions of extreme deprivation (9 vs. national average 6.9) Expected increased level of unemployment due to June violence Lower average number of household members able to earn cash (1.8) Lower levels of cash obtained from various activities Lower monthly wage per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (3,484 KGS) 	
	 High proportion of households relying on independent work as their largest source of cash (28%) High proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita below extreme poverty level (89%) 	
	 High proportion of external migrants (29%) 	
	 High proportion of households indebted for food purchase (54%), to pay for utilities (52%), health expenses (41%) and for hygiene items (50%) 	
	 Expected downward harvest (by 20%-30%) in farms of areas affected by the violence in June 2010 High proportion of farming households without access to irrigation (26%) High proportion of farming households cultivating wheat (54%), maize (61%) High proportion of the potato harvest generally sold (42%) Low proportion of farming households cultivating vegetables (52%) High proportion of the vegetable harvest generally sold (43%) High proportion of farming households mentioning high cost of fertilizer (93%) and seed (88%), lack of high quality seed (69%), lack of irrigation (47%), high cost and lack of agricultural machinery (72%-79%), lack of security to access fields or to irrigate (40%), unreliable trade agreements with buyers (69%) and unstable selling prices (76%) as constraints for cultivation 	
	 Low average number of poultry owned (9) Relatively high number of cattle owned (2-3) Relatively high proportion of animal owners mentioning lack of adequate winter fodder (37%) and animal theft (42%) as constraints for animal raising High proportion of animal owners mentioning lack of manpower (54%), animal disease (71%), low prices for animal sales (53%) and insecurity to access markets (43%) as constraints for animal raising 	

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	 Low proportion of households owning a radio (42%), sewing machine (42%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households owning a small shop (18%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning high food prices (79%), violence/insecurity (70%), health (76%), loss of job (48%), decrease salary (50%) and mudslides (30%) as difficulties faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	 High frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (7.2)
	 High proportion of households decreased expenditures for agricultural inputs (31% rarely, 9% once in a while), sold productive assets (9%), sold animals more than usual (22%) and sent migrants to look for work or food more than usually (30%) during 30 days before the survey (100)
	 High proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for health and nutritional status of vulnerable members (21%)
	 High proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for future livelihoods (43%)
	 High proportion of households having received food assistance (42%), fertilizer (34%), agricultural tools (40%) during the 3 months previous to the survey (May-July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households mentioning food as their 1st immediate priority (38%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning security as their 1st immediate priority (33%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (28%)
	Large family size (5.7 members) Lick number of unknowned members (under 5 shildren programt/logisting upmen
	 Figh number of vulnerable members (under-5 children, pregnand/actating women, elderly, chronically sick) (1.51 vulnerable), especially elderly (0.51) and chronically sick (0.55)
	Mostly using electricity for cooking
	 Higher prevalence of stunting than national average (2006)
	 High prevalence of food insecurity (38%)
	 High proportion of households baking bread at home (71%) High proportion of households having consumed potatoes from their own production (64%) and relatively high proportion received them as gift (10%) High proportion of households having consumed beans from own production (30%) High proportion of households having consumed dairy products from own production (51%)
Talas	 High proportion of households having consumed vegetables from own production (54%)
	 Lower average number of household members able to earn cash (1.5) Below average income levels per capita according to KIHS 3rd quarter of 2009 (by 731 KGS)
	• Lower monthly wage per capita according to KIHS 3 rd quarter of 2009 (4,663 KGS)
	 High proportion of households relying on sale of crops (20%) or irregular unskilled wage labour (12%) or civil service (21%) as their largest source of cash Low proportion of households relying on remittances as their largest source of cash
	 (less than 1%) High proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita below extreme poverty level (68%)
	 High proportion of households indebted (43%) High proportion of households indebted for agricultural inputs and irrigation (60%) and for ceremony-related expenditures (35%)
	 Large acreage of garden/land cultivated per capita (1.17 ha/cap.) Low proportion of households cultivating wheat (17%)

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	High proportion of the wheat harvest generally sold (67%)
	 High proportion of the potato harvest generally sold (51%)
	High proportion of the vegetable harvest generally sold (46%)
	• Low proportion of fruit trees (19%)
	seed (97%) lack of high quality seed (87%), high cost and lack of agricultural
	machinery (83%-88%), lack of security to access fields (58%) or to irrigate (63%) and
	unstable selling prices (87%) as constraints for cultivation
	High average number of poultry owned (12), sheep (17-18)
	 Low number of noises owned (1) Relatively high proportion of animal owners mentioning the lack of adequate winter
	fodder (31%) and the lack of manpower (43%) as constraints for animal raising
	• High proportion of animal owners mentioning animal disease (91%), high cost of
	veterinary services (83%), low prices of animal sales (59%), animal theft (81%),
	insecurity to access pasture (70%) and insecurity to access animal markets (55%) as
	constraints for animal raising
	High proportion of households owning a sewing machine (60%), petty trade stocks
	(42%)
	 High proportion of nousenoids mentioning high food prices (90%), violence/insecurity (59%), health (68%) as difficulties faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households mentioning decreased salary (46%) as a
	difficulty in previous 3 months
	 Low proportion of households mentioning poor weather and loss of harvest (41%-
	44%)
	High frequency of use of food-related coping strategies as measured by the Reduced
	Coping Strategy Index (5.4)
	• Relatively high proportion of households had reduced expenses for agricultural inputs
	(17% rarely, 5% once in a while), sold domestic assets (11%), sold productive assets
	(12%) during 30 days previous to the survey (July)
	livelihoods (30%)
	• Relatively high proportion of households having received cash assistance (10%), food
	previous to the survey (May-July)
	• High proportion of households mentioning food (65%) and cash (19%) as their 1 st
	Immediate priority (65%) High proportion of households mentioning food (46%) as their 1 st priority for the next
	months
	High proportion of female-headed households (27%)
	 Relatively small family size (4.9 members)
	Mostly using gas and electricity as main cooking fuel
	 Low prevalence of food insecurity (6%)
	High proportion of households having consumed potatoes from their own production
	(50%)
Chuv	High proportion of households having consumed meat from own production (53%)
5	 High proportion of households having consumed dairy products from own production (519())
	High proportion of households having consumed vegetables from own production
	(61%)
	vvorse conditions of extreme deprivation (8.2 vs. hational average 6.9) low proportion of bouseholds obtaining monthly cash income per capita holew
	extreme poverty level (22%)
	 Low proportion of households mentioning food as their largest expenditure (59%)
	• High proportion of households mentioning agricultural inputs/ animal feed/irrigation as

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	their largest expenditures (19%)
	High amounts of 4 main expenditures (1,081 KGS/cap./week)
	 High proportion of households relying on sale of animals/animal products (20%) or regular upskilled wage labour (0%) or regular skilled wage labour (0%) as their largest
	source of cash
	 Relatively high proportion of households relying on civil service (14%) as their largest source of cash
	 Very low proportion of households relying on remittances as their largest source of cook
	 High proportion of households relying on sale of vegetables as their 2nd source of cash
	 Higher levels of cash obtained from various activities
	• High proportion of external migrants (27%)
	 Lower proportion of households with external migrants receiving goods or cash (40%)
	 High proportion of households indebted for agricultural inputs and irrigation (63%) and for education-related costs (32%)
	 High proportion of households with access to garden or land (72%)
	 High proportion of households not self-sufficient in theory (89% below 0.17 ha/cap.)
	 Low proportion of households cultivating wheat (5%)
	 High proportion of households cultivating maize (40%)
	 Low proportion of the potato harvest generally sold (17%)
	- High overage number of poultry owned (16, 17)
	 High average humber of poulity owned (10-17) Low number of sheep owned (5)
	 Low number of sheep owned (5) Low proportion of households cultivating lucerne as fodder (21%)
	Relatively high proportion of animal owners mentioning the lack of adequate winter
	fodder as a constraint for animal raising (36%)
	• High proportion of animal owners mentioning high cost of veterinary services (69%)
	and insecurity to access markets (39%) as constraints for animal raising
	 High proportion of households owning some petty trade stocks (39%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning violence/insecurity (67%) as a difficulty
	faced in the 3 months prior to survey (May-July)
	 Low proportion of households mentioning poor weather and loss of harvest (30%-
	35%)
	I ow frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced
	Coping Strategy Index (1.7)
	 Relatively high proportion of households mentioning food as their 1st immediate priority (32%)
	 High proportion of households mentioning employment as their 1st immediate priority (18%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (18%)
	High proportion of female-headed households (35%)
	 Small family size (4.2 members)
	 Mostly using gas and to a lesser extent electricity as main cooking fuel
	 Low prevalence of food insecurity (1%)
Bishkek	High proportion of households relying on regular unskilled wage labour (12%) or
city	regular skilled wage labour (12%) or independent work (22%) as their largest source
	of cash (12%)
	• Relatively high proportion of households relying on civil service (18%) as their largest
	source of cash
	Very low proportion of households relying on remittances as their largest source of
	Cash (less than 1%)
	 migh proportion of nousenolas relying on civil service as their 2 source of income (17%)

Oblast/town	Main distinctive food security characteristics
	 Higher levels of cash obtained from various activities Low proportion of households obtaining monthly cash income per capita below extreme poverty level (10%)
	 Very low kilocalorie intake in the poorest quintile Lower proportion of households having food stocks (60%) Shorter duration of food stocks
	 High proportion of external migrants (31%) Lower proportion of households with external migrants receiving goods or cash (62%)
	High amounts of 4 main expenditures (1,080 KGS/cap./week)
	 High proportion of households indebted to pay for health expenses (30%) and for education-related costs (30%)
	 Low proportion of households with access to garden or land (15%) Low acreage of garden/land cultivated per capita (0.15 ha) High proportion of households not self-sufficient in theory (92% below 0.17 ha/cap.) Relatively low proportion of households with access to fertilizer (57%) Low proportion of households cultivating potatoes (46%) Low proportion of the potato harvest generally sold (15%)
	 Low proportion of animal owners (7%) High average number of poultry owned (13) Low number of sheep owned (3-4) High proportion of animal owners mentioning that they will buy complementary animal feed (94%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households owning a sewing machine (54%) and petty trade stocks (26%)
	 Low proportion reporting difficulties with high cost of fuel in previous 3 months (May- July) (30%)
	 High frequency of use of food-related coping strategy as measured by the Reduced Coping Strategy Index (5.4) Relatively high proportion of households sold domestic assets (10%), sold productive assets (9%) during 30 days previous to the survey (July) Relatively high proportion of households using coping strategies entailing risks for health and nutritional status of vulnerable members (12%)
	 Relatively high proportion of households having received food assistance (16%) during 3 months previous to the survey (May-July)
	 Relatively high proportion of households mentioning food as their 1st immediate priority (39%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (28%) High proportion of households mentioning employment as their 1st immediate priority (23%) and as their 1st priority for the next months (28%)