



ASIA BUREAU ANALYTICAL SERVICES MIGRATION RESEARCH (PHASE IB)

November 2019

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared independently by Integra LLC under the Asia Emerging Opportunities (AEO) contract.

INTERNAL MIGRATION PROFILES OF BANGLADESH, TAJIKISTAN AND VIETNAM

Asia Emerging Opportunities – Final Report

Contract Title:	Asia Emerging Opportunities
Contract Number:	GS-10F-083CA / 7200AA18M00015
Activity Number:	AEO - 1011.1002
Submitted:	November 2019
Contractor:	Integra Government Services International LLC I 100 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 750, Washington, DC 20005
USAID Office:	USAID/Asia Bureau

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared by Integra Government Services International.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>I.</u>	INTRODUCTION	5
<u>2.</u>	COUNTRY FOCUS I: BANGLADESH	6
<u>3.</u>	COUNTRY FOCUS II: TAJIKISTAN	12
<u>4.</u>	COUNTRY FOCUS III: VIETNAM	20
<u>5.</u>	CONCLUSIONS	26
<u>AC</u>	CKNOWLEDGEMENTS	31
<u>RE</u>	FERENCES	32
	NEX I. BANGLADESH: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES	35
<u>AN</u>	NEX II. TAJIKISTAN: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES	42
<u>AN</u>	NEX III. VIETNAM: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES	45

ACRONYMS

ADB	-	Asian Development Bank
DHS	-	Demographic and Health Survey
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDI	-	Foreign Direct Investment
GBAP	-	Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province
GSO	-	General Statistics Office
HDI	-	Human Development Index
HRQOL	-	Health-Related Quality of Life
IOM	-	International Organization of Migration
IPUMS	-	Integrated Public Use Microdata Series
JSMS	-	Tajikistan Jobs, Skills, and Migration Survey
MOOP	-	Migrating Out of Poverty Survey
NHS	-	National Health Strategy
NIPORT	-	National Institute of Population Research and Training
NIMS	-	National Internal Migration Survey
RRP	-	Region of Republican Subordination
THPS	-	Tajikistan Household Panel Survey
TJS	-	Tajikistani Somoni
TLSS	-	Tajikistan Living Standards Survey
UNDAF	-	UN Development Assistance Frameworks
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	-	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	-	United National Population Fund
VHLSS	-	Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey
WASH	-	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WHO	-	World Health Organization

I. INTRODUCTION

USAID/Asia Bureau asked the Asia Emerging Opportunities (AEO) team to conduct a study of internal migration in Asia. The study was to be conducted in two phases. The purpose of Phase I was to better understand the availability of data sources on migration and factors driving internal migration in Asia. The study would help to determine the extent to which internal migration is associated with particular vulnerabilities and development needs. Phase II would further explore opportunities to strengthen social systems consistent with the Global Action Plan on the Health of Refugees and Migrants and to provide improved health, education, and economic benefits to migrants and their families.

Under Phase I, the AEO team felt it necessary to conduct the study in two sub-phases: Phase IA – Scoping and Phase IB – In-Depth Research. The scoping phase explored available data sources in a variety of USAID countries to help focus the analysis. Based on the findings of the initial scoping phase, the second sub-phase dug deeper into focus countries identified as a result of the Phase IA work.¹ The purpose of Phase IB was, as agreed upon with the Asia Bureau, to analyze a variety of internal migration issues in these focus countries, such as: 1) trends, scale, and patterns of intra-country migration within focus countries, 2) the reasons individuals or families are migrating internally, and 3) the impact of migration on access to, and provision of public and private human, social, and community services, including internet/communications; economic opportunities; and community/religious services. The principal task of the research team was to conduct primary data analysis of existing datasets to identify particular development challenges facing economic rural-to-urban migrants who are living below or just above the poverty line.²

This report is the main outcome of Phase IB and provides detailed country profiles for three focus countries: Bangladesh, Tajikistan, and Vietnam. These countries were selected by USAID/Asia Bureau based on the results of Phase IA and represent important partners in the main Asian subregions of South, Central, and South East Asia. Given Asia's vast diversity in economic structures, political systems, cultures and populations, findings from these three country studies may not be generalizable to their respective subregions. The country reports are primarily based on the research team's original data analysis, supplemented by a review of existing literature, development plans, and other available information. Thus, this research is designed to provide USAID with information on internal migration patterns and outcomes, to better understand the needs and vulnerabilities of internal migrants, and for use in programmatic planning and design.

The analysis of each focus country provides an overview of internal migration trends and patterns before highlighting key findings for poor internal migrants relating to economic activities, health, and access to electricity, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). Each chapter includes a section on the inclusion of internal migration issues into development plans and a discussion of available data and methods. Finally, this report concludes by outlining key takeaway points from each country analysis, as well as overarching reflections on using data sets to obtain information on internal migration and unanswered questions.

¹ Asian countries where USAID has a health focus include: Central Asia- Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, South Asia- India, Nepal, Bangladesh, Southeast Asia- Burma, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Timor Leste, Philippines, Papua New Guinea. Non-health focus countries for USAID with economic growth work or other strategic priorities that could be included are Sri Lanka, Maldives, Mongolia, and the Pacific Islands.

² Displaced populations, including those displaced by environmental factors, were explicitly removed from the focus of this study.

2. COUNTRY FOCUS I: BANGLADESH

OVERVIEW

The population of Bangladesh is an estimated 161 million, with 64 percent living in rural and 36 percent in urban areas (United Nations Population Division 2019). The country's urban population has an annual growth rate of 6 percent, as rural-urban internal migration plays an important role in Bangladeshi people's livelihood strategies. Rural-urban migration plays a crucial role in poverty alleviation in the country and is influenced by three main factors: 1) the country's shift from agricultural to industrial production; 2) the population's reaction to environmental challenges; and 3) differences in rural and urban living conditions (UNDP 2016). Female migration is also increasing, particularly resulting from growing work opportunities in Dhaka and Chittagong in the garment industries (USAID 2016, Biswas *et. al.* 2019).

Economic factors remain the most significant reason for migration, as there is above average population growth in the more economically-dynamic core of Bangladesh, and there is a significant negative correlation between poverty levels and population changes at district levels (lbid.). However, there is mixed evidence regarding environmentally challenged areas. Based on analysis of three districts with significant environmental problems, namely, Hoar, Monga and the coastal belt, only the coastal belt exhibited evidence of outflow (lbid.). In addition, UNDP (2016) found that variations in the quality of public services, including access to healthcare and education, did not significantly motivate populations to migrate.³

The analysis here draws on the primary data and analysis of the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) of 2007, supplemented by findings from the 2013 Migrating out of Poverty (MOOP) Survey and the Bangladesh Urban Health Survey 2013 (NIPORT 2013). The results show that, in general, migrant households are poorer on average than urban non-migrant households. Specifically, as measured by a wealth index, migrant households are somewhat more likely to be in the two poorest wealth quintiles and less likely to be in the richer quintiles than non-migrants (Figure 1).⁴ However, it is also worth noting that rural-urban migrants account for a significant share of the top two quintiles (over 64 percent), although the proportion is slightly lower than for urban residents. Therefore, it is important to examine migrants of different socioeconomic groups separately.

The Bangladesh Urban Health Survey 2013 reported that recent migrants, those who have lived in slums for two years or less, tend to be poorer than long-term migrants (NIPORT 2013). Approximately 64 percent of recent female migrants and 75 percent of recent male migrants were in the poorest wealth quintile. In contrast, 39 percent of long-term female migrants and 42 percent of long-term male migrants were in the poorest quintile. The report concluded that these findings showed the economic status of migrants improved over time.

³ Rural-rural migration can also be explained by a variety of cultural factors. For example, young women tend to move to other rural areas to enter husbands' households (known as patrilocal residence). Seasonal migration to Dhaka was more common in less educated migrants, who often engaged in irregular employment such as construction or trishaw pedaling. Better educated migrants tend to be permanent migrants to Dhaka (UNFPA 2016).

⁴ See also Table 2 in the Bangladesh Annex.

Figure 1. Wealth Index by Migration Status



DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

As per the parameters of the activity, the team restricted the data analysis of the DHS dataset to migrants living at or below the poverty line and examined their characteristics.⁵ The team found that poor migrants tend to be young (65 percent are 35 years old or younger) and that over 90 percent are Muslim, which is slightly higher than the national average. Also, these migrants tend to have received very little education. Approximately 88 percent have either no education or only some primary school education. Only 11.5 percent have a partial or complete secondary school education. In comparison, urban residents have slightly higher educational attainment, with over 14 percent having at least some secondary school education.

A report by the Institute of Migration reported that 50 percent of migrants were in the 20-30 age group (Institute of Migration 2011). The Bangladesh Urban Health Survey 2013 found that education levels of recent migrant women living in slums were higher than the levels of their male counterparts. The report stated that women tend to migrate for marriage while men who migrate are typically in search of employment (NIPORT 2013).

POVERTY AND EMPLOYMENT

In the DHS sample, about half of poor internal migrants are currently working. Among those working, the primary occupations are agricultural related, service, and manual labor. With respect to the geographic distribution of these migrants, 15 percent live in the capital city or cities with over 1 million people; 41 percent live in medium-size cities (over 50,000 people); and 44 percent live in small-size cities (fewer than 50,000 people). As for the region of residence, the most common destination among migrants in poverty is Barisal (22 percent), followed by Chittagong (18 percent), Rajshahi (16 percent), Khulna (16 percent), Dhaka (15 percent), and Sylhet (13 percent).

Based on interviews with returned migrants, the team found that about one third had negative experiences at work, defined as at least one of the following experiences: verbal abuse, sexual abuse, physical abuse, physical injury, hazardous chemicals, racial discrimination, religious discrimination, gender discrimination, and occupational discrimination.⁶ Also, the returned immigrants were asked to compare their quality of

⁵ See also Table 3 in the Bangladesh Annex.

⁶ See Table 9 in the Bangladesh Annex.

life and financial situation from five years prior. About 42 percent reported having an easier life, whereas the rest did not experience significant improvement in life. Almost 42 percent of migrants reported being worse off financially than five years prior.

According to the 2009 Monitoring and Employment Survey, 69 percent of workers have irregular employment with no written contracts, 7 percent have some form of contract, and 24 percent have regular employment with written contracts. Workers are often paid subsistence allowances instead of proper wages, with the promise of shortfalls being paid at the end of contracts, helping intermediaries to retain control over workers (Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit, 2013). The Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics shows that in 2011, 60 percent of migrants were not economically active, 39 percent were working, and 0.2 percent had jobs but did not work due to sickness/on leave.

ELECTRICITY, WASH, AND HEALTH

Although migrants typically earn higher wages in urban areas, they are often socially and economically excluded from access to food, sanitation, education and housing (Farhana *et al.* 2016). The Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics reports that while most migrants' houses have sanitary toilets, 44 percent are sanitary with a water seal and 35 percent are sanitary with no water seal, and 3 percent are in open spaces. Electricity is available in 79 percent of migrant households, with 19 percent using kerosene and 2 percent using solar energy. The Institute of Migration (2011) shows that 64 percent of migrants reported that they had sources of drinking water in their place of origin compared to 82 percent at their present residence in Dhaka. Only 49 percent of migrants reported to have electricity before migrants reported to have access to gas after migration, compared to 13.4 percent before migration. These findings showed that the basic needs of migrants were more adequately met post-migration (Institute of Migration 2011).

Our DHS data analysis provides additional information on household standards of living (Figure 2).⁷ In general, rural-urban migrant households in poverty have extremely limited access to safe water (piped), clean toilets, and electricity. Only 10 percent of poor migrant households have access to electricity. Not a single migrant household has access to safe drinking water (piped water). Almost all of them used semi-safe water (from protected wells and springs). Only 4 percent use a flush toilet and more than half of these households share a toilet with other households.

⁷ See also Table 4 in the Bangladesh Annex.



Figure 2. Living Standards of Households of Rural-urban Migrants in Poverty

Poor migrant households also seem to have suboptimal access to health services.⁸ Studies suggest that all poor migrant households live in communities with access to health facilities and doctors, but only 82 percent of them live in communities with health and family planning workers and only 66 percent have easy access to pharmacy. These numbers are slightly lower than for poor urban non-migrant households. Islam and Gagnon (2016) show that migrants and non-migrants did not differ in their use of modern contraceptives and treatment for STIs, but migrants were less likely to receive antenatal care. The study also shows that more migrants had home births, did not take Vitamin A post-delivery, and had no medical examination post-birth. The team was not able to evaluate the health use behavior of migrants due to a lack of available information.

There are some geographical differences in the economic well-being of rural-urban migrant households.⁹ In general, migrants in medium-size cities tend to fare worse than those in both large and small-size cities. Migrants in the Dhaka region fare especially well, whereas migrants in Barisal are the poorest compared to those in other regions. Specifically, almost 78 percent of rural-urban migrants in Dhaka are in the rich (18 percent) or richest (60 percent) categories, and only 13 percent are in the two poorest groups. By contrast, almost 31 percent of rural-urban migrants in Barisal are in the two richest groups.

When the team examined destination and regional differences in standards of living among poor migrant households, it found that those in medium and small cities are relatively more disadvantaged than those living in large cities.¹⁰ One exception is access to health services, for which poor migrants in large cities are sometimes worse off than their peers in smaller-size cities. With respect to regional variations, poor migrants in the Barisal region are particularly vulnerable to poor sanitation, unsafe drinking water, and a lack of electricity. The patterns of access to health services are not entirely clear.

⁸ See Table 5 in the Bangladesh Annex.

⁹ See Table 6 and Figure 8 in the Bangladesh Annex.

¹⁰ See Tables 7 and 8 in the Bangladesh Annex.

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Internal migrants are mentioned as a priority in the national skill development strategy, as well as in the 7th five-year plan, and the UNDAF 2017-2020. The UNDAF highlights that "internal migration is particularly common among young women and girls, and male seasonal workers, and includes rural-to-rural movements as well as urbanization among those from the densely populated areas and marginal rural lands that are particularly vulnerable to natural disasters." The government's 7th five-year plan (2016–2020) on Accelerating Growth, Empowering Citizens mentions the need for technical and vocational training institutions to "create opportunities for the people to be semi-skilled and get employment by internal migration to industrial districts of Bangladesh". It also recognizes that migration and mobility (both internal and international) are also associated with urbanization, environmental and overall developmental challenges. With regard to gender equity and migration, the plan notes that "internal migrants' access to legal and social protection; strict contract monitoring; and adequate outreach, follow-up and support (shelter, legal and psychosocial support) need to be put in place. The needs of internal female migrants such as skills development and access to decent work and justice, should also be taken into account in relevant sectoral policies." It equally focuses on the need to reduce climate-change-induced internal migration and the need to curb internal migration and displacement.

DATA AND METHODS

DEMOGRAPHIC AND HEALTH SURVEY (DHS) 2007

DHS (2007) is a national representative household survey of ever-married women (age 15-49; N=10,996) in each sampled household and ever-married men (age 15-54; N=3,771) in every second household.¹¹

In our analysis, the team restricted the sample to rural-to-urban migrants and urban residents (those who have always lived in their current residence in urban areas). To determine who are rural-to-urban migrants, the team used the following questions: 1) how long have you been living continuously in the current place of residence?; and 2) Just before you moved here, did you live in a city, in a town, or in a countryside? The team defined rural-to-urban migrants as those who currently live in urban areas but who have moved from the countryside.

In the sample, there are 1,233 (34 percent) urban residents and 2,352 (66 percent) rural-to-urban migrants. Among the migrants, the average length of stay in the urban destination is 12.6 years.

Because of the interest in migrants at or below the poverty line, the team used two approaches to determine the poverty status of a household (note that there is no direct information on individual or family income to permit other operationalization). The first was a household wealth index, created by DHS using 50 items. The variable assumes five categories from the poorest to the richest. The team considered those belonging to the two poorest categories as people at or below the poverty line (DHS 2007).

As sensitivity analysis, the team created their own measure of poverty status using an asset list. The list includes 15 household items including radio, television, phone, mobile phone, refrigerator, bicycles, electricity, car/truck, watch, boat, almirah/wardrobe, table, chair, animal-drawn cart, and rickshaw/van. The team added the total number of items owned by each household, then divided all households into five equal quintiles, and took the two lowest quintiles (lowest 40 percent of households) as those who are at or below the poverty line. In general, results from the two definitions of poverty status are very similar.

¹¹ See Figure 10 in the Annex for sampling points.

Therefore, the team chose to present the main results from the first definition (wealth index) because it is more comprehensive.

MIGRATION OUT OF POVERTY (MOOP) 2013

MOOP is a survey conducted by the UK's Department for International Development, with the focus on the relationship between internal, regional and international migration and poverty. It is a national survey conducted in six districts located in six administrative divisions of Bangladesh. The sample was purposively drawn through quota sampling within each district. The survey interviewed a total of 1,205 households, of which 905 were households with migrants and 300 were without migrants.

The survey is based on the original households of migrants (sample of sending households) and contains information on both domestic out-migration and international out-migration. Many of the households have sent out international migrants and thus were not included in this analyses. The survey also includes specific questions asked of return migrants about their experiences in migratory destinations while they were away. Whereas such a survey design does not allow us to compare migrants to urban residents (as in the DHS data), the dataset does provide some useful information on the experiences of migrants when they were out for work (from reports of return migrants).

To identify return migrants, the team used the question: Has (NAME) ever lived away for 3 months or more over the past 10 years, but has returned for the last 12 consecutive months? In the sample, there are 31 domestic return migrants, all of which are included in the analysis. Note that there is no sufficient income information and sample size that permits determining migrants at or below the poverty line at their destinations.

3. COUNTRY FOCUS II: TAJIKISTAN

OVERVIEW

With a population of 9.1 million, Tajikistan is a small, landlocked, low-income country located in Central Asia. It is the poorest of the Commonwealth of Independent States (USAID 2019). Its Human Development Index (HDI) value for 2017 was 0.650— which put the country in the medium human development category— positioning it at 127 out of 189 countries and territories. To understand the challenges internal migrants face, the team relied on seven sources of information. These included three original datasets, two other sources of data, as well as literature and inquiries. Our original analysis of three nationally representative datasets provides the bedrock of our findings. Namely, the team analyzed the Tajikistan Living Standards Survey (TLSS) 2009, the Tajikistan Jobs, Skills, and Migration Survey (JSMS) 2013, and the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2017. The last section of this country report contains detailed information on the data and our methods.

In the demographic yearbook, Tajikistan's statistical agency (TajStat) provides information on internal migration based on arrival and departure tickets (residencies and statements related to the change of permanent residency) that were received from the Ministry of Internal Affairs (TajStat 2018). With technical and financial support from the EU, TajStat conducted the survey "The impact of migration and remittances on welfare in Tajikistan" in 2010, sampling 3,133 households in areas of high migration. Although the team did not have access to the raw data, it gleaned insights from a government report (TajStat 2010). Lastly, the team screened English and partly Russian language reports and literature on internal migration issues. Although Tajikistan has several good datasets, there seem to be very few research publications on internal migration. In addition, the team contacted researchers, the UN country team (resident coordinator, UNDP, IOM, FAO, WHO), and relevant government agencies (TajStat and Ministry of Labor).

Though there is no reliable source that provides the number of internal migrants in Tajikistan, the available data reveals the extent to which internal migrants are represented in the datasets. According to DHS 2017, 74 percent of the population in urban areas are non-migrants. Considering those who moved from the countryside and towns into cities as rural-to-urban migrants, 12 percent of the overall population are rural-urban migrants and 15 percent urban-to-urban migrants.¹² Thus, internal migrants represent 27 percent of the urban population in the DHS data, which is similar to what the team found in the TLSS data, where internal migrants make up a quarter of urban residents (25 percent).¹³ Based on JSMS 2013 data, a World Bank study concludes that in contrast to international migrants, domestic migration rates are very low, suggesting that labor allocation within the country may be less than optimal (Ajwad et al. 2014). In the JSMS 2013 data, the share of internal migrants is lower. About 87 percent are non-migrants and 13 percent are internal migrants. The difference may be explained by the fact that the data doesn't allow for differentiation between those in urban or rural settings. Since internal migrants tend to be concentrated in urban areas, counting populations in rural areas tends to overcount non-migrants.

¹² The team also coded a narrower definition, which counted only those whose previous residence was in the countryside and who now live in cities as rural-urban migrants. Based on this definition, 6 percent are rural-urban migrants and 21 percent urban-to-urban migrants.

¹³ The absolute number of internal migrants in the TLSS 2009 sample is 473, compared to 1,428 non-migrants.

Two thirds of all rural-urban migrants have migrated ten or less years ago, including 12 percent within the past year alone. Only ten percent migrated more than 20 years ago and the average and median years since migration are 9.3 years and eight years, respectively (DHS 2017).

Figure 3 compares the distribution of migrants in the TLSS and DHS datasets across Tajikistan's five regions. Not surprisingly, the capital region of Dushanbe emerges as the most important place of residence for urban migrants, followed by Khatlon and RRP. Although there are differences in the share of internal migrants that each region hosts, the ranking of all five regions is constant through the three indicators in two datasets.

Based on changes of permanent residence, in 2018 there were 323,000 rural-to-urban migrants.¹⁴ The 2010 TajStat survey found that, compared to international migrants, internal migrants leave less for work and money, but more for studies.¹⁵ Official statistics based on official changes of permanent residency on in- and outflows of regions show that in the period 2000-2017, only the capital Dushanbe and RRP had net-inflows, whereas all other regions had significant net-outflows, though this also includes international migrants (TajStat 2018).¹⁶





The trends are confirmed by observations in the few available studies. Azimboev (2013) observes an increase in rural-urban migration, while the majority of the population can still be classified as immobile. Babaev (2017) finds that migration takes place due to people being "pushed out" by the limited access to resources and lack of job opportunities in their regions of origin. Tajibaeva (2012) highlights that urban areas provide greater access to educational, vocational, and professional opportunities, as well as more investments opportunities and financial support for business endeavors.¹⁷ Among the factors contributing

Source: Authors' calculations based on DHS 2017 and TLSS 2009 data.

¹⁴ See Table 10 in the Tajikistan Annex.

¹⁵ See Table 12 in the Tajikistan Annex. The high share of other internal migration is mainly explained by military service (TajStat 2010).

¹⁶ See Table 11 in the Tajikistan Annex.

¹⁷ Azimov (2012) provides a theoretical analysis of the economic situation in Tajikistan, as well as the country's migration trends and a general categorization of causes of internal migration, without providing evidence on the drivers of actual flows.

to internal migration, the Tajikistan Ministry of Labor and Social Protection (2010, p.35) identifies environmental causes¹⁸ and increasing poverty rates.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Internal migrants are made up of 40 percent men and 60 percent women (the shares for non-migrants are 43 percent and 57 percent) (DHS 2017). This is confirmed by TLSS 2009, which found 41 percent are men and 59 percent women. Further, 65 percent of internal migrants are married, 5 percent divorced, and 21 percent are not married (JSMS 2013).

Internal migrants are older than non-migrants. The median age of non-migrants in all three datasets is 28-30 years, whereas the age of migrants is three years higher in the DHS 2017,¹⁹ four years higher in the JSMS 2013 data, and eight years higher in the TLSS 2009 data. The median age of migrants is 31, 34, and 38 years, respectively. TajStat (2010) finds that international labor migrants are slightly older than internal migrants.²⁰

Rural-to-urban migrant women have a slightly higher level of 'no education' than the two comparison groups, but with only 1.9 percent of migrants lacking any education, this is not alarming. While most rural-to-urban migrants have completed secondary education, they have less higher education than non-migrants and urban-to-urban migrants (DHS 2017). In the JSMS data, 24 percent of migrants have completed higher education, compared to 15 percent of non-migrants. This is especially true for migrant men, 38 percent of which have a higher education degree, compared to 14 percent of women. A quarter of migrant women lack more than basic education up to grade 8.

POVERTY

In 2017, 29.5 percent of Tajikistan's population was living below the poverty line (ADB 2019). A key focus of our analysis was to understand who among internal migrants count as poor, and what could be said about those below or just above the poverty line. In general, the poor are concentrated in rural Tajikistan and in three regions of Khatlon, Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Province (GBAP) and RRS. Indeed, almost four out of five poor persons lives in a rural household. Also, almost two thirds of the poor are in the regions of Sogd and Khatlon (World Bank 2015).

There is no uniform standard to assess poverty levels in the three datasets. The TLSS 2009 includes measures on subjective poverty, namely satisfaction with the financial situation and perceived food insecurity. DHS 2017 features a combined wealth index while JSMS 2013 has a measure of income.

To determine migrants' poverty and wealth status, the team used the DHS' combined wealth index that provides information on five wealth quintiles (poorest, poorer, middle, richer, richest). A surprising finding from the analysis of the DHS data is that the narrowly defined rural-to-urban migrants (only those from the countryside) are by-and-large among the richest households. The broader definition (including those from towns) are still much better off than urban non-migrant households. Among broadly (narrowly) defined rural-to-urban migrants, 81 percent (87 percent) are in the "richest" and another 12 percent (ten percent) are in the "richer" category of the combined wealth index. Only one percent (0.7 percent) are 'poorest' and another 0.6 percent (0.5 percent) "poorer". Urban-to-urban migrants are similar, though

¹⁸ For environmental factors and migration in Tajikistan, see Olimova and Olimov (2012).

¹⁹ The age profile for urban-to-urban migrants is similar to that of rural-to-urban migrants.

²⁰ See Table 13 in the Tajikistan Annex.

not as good. Non-migrant urban residents are also surprisingly well off (especially compared to rural areas, but significantly less than rural-to-urban migrants).

This contrasts with the TLSS 2009 data, where 52 percent of migrants in urban areas say that they are not satisfied with their current financial situation and about 31 percent consider the current level of food consumption of their family as inadequate. One reason for this finding may be that the sampling strategy for a general health survey, such as DHS, focuses on established households only and migrants who would reside in shops, tents close to their workplaces, or other informal housings may not be sufficiently covered. As mentioned in the introduction, both datasets only include a low number of internal migrants, which reduces the representativeness of the findings.

The TLSS includes two measures on subjective poverty. Respondents rate both how satisfied they are with their current financial situation and the current level of food consumption of their family. Forty two percent of migrants are less satisfied with their financial situation and ten percent not at all, compared to 45 percent and seven percent of non-migrants. Still, 15 percent of migrants and 16 percent of non-migrants are fully satisfied. Thirty one percent of migrants and 28 percent of non-migrants consider their family's level of food consumption less than adequate, while 66 percent and 64 percent respectively, feel that it is 'just adequate.' Of those whose financial situation is unsatisfactory, 96 percent also report that their families' food consumption. Among those whose financial situation is less than satisfactory, almost half experience food issues (46 percent) and even among those who are rather satisfied financially, 10 percent are food insecure.²¹ In fact, the country's multidimensional poverty index indicates that non-monetary deprivations in the country are widespread.

A breakdown by region shows the vast majority of those who are not at all satisfied (81 percent) and less than satisfied (67 percent) live in the capital Dushanbe (Figure 4). Overall, almost half of migrants in Dushanbe (47 percent) fall in these two categories. The highest level of food insecurity among migrants is in Khatlon (55 percent), followed by RRP (45 percent), Dushanbe (27 percent), and Sogd (21 percent). In terms of overall numbers, of all migrants who assess their family's food consumption as less than adequate, 67 percent live in Dushanbe and 25 percent in Khatlon. This is echoed by the World Bank (2005), which speculates that high levels of internal migration may have been a contributing factor to the almost constant number of poor people in Dushanbe and to the increase in the number of extremely poor. On the other hand, the World Bank (2005) contemplates that declining poverty in the sparsely-populated mountainous region GBAP may have been due to out-migration of extremely poor people from the region.

²¹ See Table 14 in the Tajikistan Annex.

Figure 4: Share of Migrants Who Report that the Level of their Family's Food Consumption is Adequate or Less than Adequate, by Region (Oblast)



Source: Authors' calculations based on TLSS 2009

According to JSMS 2013 income information, seven percent of migrants have an income of not more than 100 TJS/month, which places them in the extreme poor category. An additional eight percent earn not more than 200 TJS/month, and thus live below or just above the poverty line (compared to ten percent and 11 percent of the non-migrant population).²² As would be expected from the employment profile, migrant women have a lower income, one that is similar to the income of non-migrants (ten percent up to TJS100 and 12 percent TJS101-200/month).

EMPLOYMENT

Seventy eight percent of rural-to-urban migrant women are currently not working, and 76 percent have not worked in last 12 months. As a reminder, this sample only contains women. About seven and a half percent of rural-to-urban migrants' husbands/partners did not work in last 12 months (DHS 2017). In the TLSS 2009 sample, almost two thirds of internal migrants did not work in the past 14 days. Interestingly, the number is very similar to the non-migration population. A sex-disaggregated analysis shows that three fourths of migrant women and about half of men do not work. Thus, the share of non-working women is similar to the DHS data but the share of non-working men is significantly higher in the TLSS data. In the JSMS 2013 data, 25 percent of migrants are employed and eight percent self-employed (compared to 20 percent and six percent of non-migrants). Twenty-six percent of all migrants are full-time homemakers and only 14 percent are not working (compared to 19 percent of non-migrants). The unemployment rate for migrant men and women is not significantly different (15 and 14 percent, respectively), though women tend to work more as homemakers (44 percent), and less in employed or self-employed positions (18 percent and five percent respectively).²³ Babaev (2017) observes that often people migrate to the cities without information about job opportunities, which increases the informal sector of the economy.

²² It should be noted that the measurements are not entirely the same. The JSMS survey provides information on the monthly net income in the past four weeks, whereas the relevant poverty line is based on the average real percapita consumption aggregate. Furthermore, the information in the JSMS is not provided by the migrants themselves, but rather by their households of origin, which is likely to be influenced by certain information asymmetries. See Tajikistan Agency on Statistics (2015).

²³ While it is impossible to say what prompts the differences between the employment profile of migrant women in the DHS 2017 and the JSMS 2013, it deserves mention that the sample size of migrant women in the DHS dataset is small. In addition, differences in the sampling methods may have led to reaching different populations. The JSMS survey aimed *inter alia* at migrants, which was not a specific objective of the DHS survey. On the other hand, JSMS data cannot be restricted to rural-to-urban migrants and thus provides a profile of *all* internal migrants in the country.

ELECTRICITY, WASH, AND HEALTH

According to the survey data analyzed, almost all people in urban areas have access to electricity. Migrant households do not deviate much and only 1.3 percent do not have electricity. Similarly, the survey data suggests that there is no issue with access to drinking water, as 88 percent of migrant households have access to piped water and another seven percent to borewells and public wells. Rural-to-urban migrants have better toilet facilities than the comparison groups (DHS 2017).²⁴

This is confirmed in TLSS 2009 data. Ninety-nine percent of non-migrants and 88 percent of migrants have paid an electricity bill in the previous 12 months. Eighty-eight percent of internal migrants in urban settings get their drinking water and water for other uses from urban plumbing and 0 percent from unprotected wells, though four percent utilize lakes, rivers, and streams. Ninety-three percent of migrants pay for their water, compared to 88 percent of non-migrants. The remaining seven percent who do not pay consists of merely 32 individuals in the sample. Among those, seven (22 percent) do not pay because the household cannot afford it and 19 (60 percent) because service is free. Whereas these results do not reveal specific information on the quality of water, whether households obtain sufficient amounts of water, or on what trade-offs they make to obtain access, the information available in the datasets suggests that access to water is not a significant challenge for migrant households in Tajikistan.

There are few indicators on health in our datasets. Migrant women were less likely to visit a health facility in the last 12 months (21 percent of rural-urban migrant women did, 27 percent of urban-urban migrants and 35 percent of non-migrant urban women). However, the team did not know whether this is due to barriers to access or because they were in better health conditions. Only 2.5 percent of rural-to-urban migrants had ever been told that they had high blood sugar or diabetes, compared to 3.7 percent of urban-to-urban migrants and three percent of non-migrants (DHS 2017). Migrant women are less likely to have a voice on their own health. For 45 percent, it is their partner/husband or someone else alone who makes health-related decisions, compared to 38 percent for non-migrant women (DHS 2017).

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The current and the previous UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) mention international migration but does not discuss either internal migration or urbanization. The National Development Strategy 2016-2030 highlights that activities in the area of productive employment policy should (among other) lead to a "reduction of territorial disparities of employment; and reduced pressure on internal migration." In comparison, international migration is referenced 24 times. Urbanization and urban development are highlighted as a focus area though. Though the team contacted various UN agencies, the team did not get information on any programmatic activities focusing on internal migrants in Tajikistan. As the current National Health Strategy of the Republic of Tajikistan for 2010–2020 (NHS 2020), which mentions migrants but not internal migrants, comes to an end, the Ministry of Health and Social Protection of Population has launched a new health policy development process that is planned to feed into the process of developing the National Health Strategy for 2021–2030. This process could provide opportunities to include discussions about internal migrants.

²⁴ According to MICS 2005, 70 percent of Tajiks use improved sources of drinking water, but variation between urban and rural is wide at 93 percent and 61 percent respectively. GBAP and Khatlon fare poorer than other regions, at 51 percent and 55 percent respectively. The survey also reported that 94 percent of the population use improved sanitation facilities with 97 percent in urban and 92 percent in rural areas.

DATA AND METHODS

Table I summarized the key difference of the datasets that are critical for our analysis.

			······	
Sample size	Our sample modifications	Migration definition/question	Rural to urban migration definition	Notes
Living Standa	rds Survey (TLS	S) 2009 (TajStat)		
1,500 households with 10,069 individuals	Restrict to working age and urban settings. Exclude international migrants.	Have you have previously lived in different rayon?	No information on place of origin. All migrants in urban areas, including urban-urban included.	There are only 473 internal urban migrants in the sample.
Jobs, Skills, an	d Migration Sur	vey (JSMS) 2013 (Wo	orld Bank, GIZ & TajStat)
6,300 households with 35,770 individuals	Restrict to working age. Exclude international migrants.	ls [name of member of the household] a current migrant?	Only information on location of migrants' household of origin, not migrant. Information extracted is for all internal migrants.	Migrants are not asked but their households of origin.
Demographic	and Health Surv	vey (DHS) 2017 (DHS	S/USAID)	
10,718 women aged 15-49	Exclude international migrants and temporary visitors.	How long have you been living in this place?	2 definitions: rural-urban migrants in the narrow sense: whose previous residence was in the countryside. Broader sense: Those from the countryside <u>and</u> <u>towns</u> , who now live in cities.	Data on length of stay available. Few rural-urban migrants captured in the data: 479 (228) women are rural-to-urban migrants in the broader (narrower) sense.

Table I. Key Characteristics about Analyzed Datasets in Tajikistan

TAJIKISTAN LIVING STANDARDS SURVEY (TLSS) 2009

The TLSS included 1,500 households and observations for 10,069 individuals. The sample is representative at the national, regional (four regions and Dushanbe), and urban/rural levels. From the survey question on whether people have previously lived in different regions or abroad, the team created a variable for internal migrants and international immigrants. In the sample, 91 percent are non-migrants, nine percent internal migrants, and one half of a percent moved to the area from abroad. Restricting the sample to the working-age population, the share of internal migrants increases to 12 percent. Further restricting the analysis only to urban settings, internal migrants make up a quarter of urban residents (25 percent). The absolute number of internal migrants in the sample is 473, compared to 1,428 non-migrants.

TAJIKISTAN JOBS, SKILLS AND MIGRATION SURVEY (JSMS) 2013

The JSMS 2013's sample size of the core questionnaire is 6,300 households with a total of 35,770 individuals. In addition, a skills questionnaire was answered by 7,929 individuals from the overall sample. The purpose of the survey was to collect data on employment, migration, cognitive and non-cognitive skills as well as consumption. The survey collected comprehensive information not typically captured by traditional household surveys. It included two distinct instruments: a core questionnaire and a skills questionnaire.

In the JSMS, migrants are not asked directly, but rather households are asked if any of their household members are migrants and then the head of the household answers questions about them. The survey provides some interesting insights, but it comes with some key limitations. While the data shows where the households are located, the survey does not contain information on where the migrants are in Tajikistan. Therefore, the team can neither say anything about rural-to-urban migrants, nor about specific provinces in which migrants would need particular attention. Households of migrants (not migrants themselves) are 86 percent in urban areas and 14 in rural areas, as opposed to a 50-50 split for non-migrants. In addition, the team only used the individual part of the questionnaire to gain information about migrants, whereas the household part of the questionnaire would provide information about the household in communities of origin. According to this data, 76 percent of Tajikistan's population were non-migrants, 13 percent were international migrants, and 11 percent domestic migrants. Among domestic migrants, 32 percent were heads of household, 30 percent were wives, husbands or partners of heads of HH, 26 percent sons or daughters, and seven percent son or daughter in law (JSMS 2013).

DEMOGRAPHIC AND HEALTH SURVEY (DHS) 2017

In Tajikistan, DHS only collects migration information in their questionnaires for women (not for households and there is no sample for men). The DHS 2017 dataset comprises data on 10,718 women aged 15-49.

Migrants are identified based on the question, "How long have you been living in this place?" Persons who have lived in the current place all their lives are considered to be non-migrants, while those who have moved to the area are considered as migrants. The team excluded persons who were temporary visitors to the surveyed household. In the total sample there are 8,500 non-migrants (80 percent), 2,100 internal migrants (20 percent), and 41 international migrants (0.4 percent). For better comparisons, the team also dropped international immigrants from the analysis.

Based on USAID's preferences to focus on rural-urban migrants, the team only kept observations in urban areas. The team coded two indicators for rural-to-urban migration. In the narrower definition, the team counted only those whose previous residence was in the countryside. In the broader definition the team included those from the countryside and towns, who now live in cities. Seventy-four percent of the population in urban areas are non-migrants, 12 percent (six percent) wider (narrower) rural-urban migrants, and 15 percent (21 percent) narrower (wider) urban-to-urban migrants. One problem is that with these specifications, the migrant population in the sample is rather small. Only 479 women are considered rural-to-urban migrants in the broader, and 228 in the narrower definition.

4. COUNTRY FOCUS III: VIETNAM

OVERVIEW

In 2016, Vietnam's population was over 94 million, with 34 percent of the population living in urban areas and a large majority of the poor living in rural areas (UNESCO 2017). According to the 2015 National Internal Migration Survey (NIMS), 14 percent of the Vietnamese population were internal migrants (General Statistics Office, UNFPA 2015). The proportion of internal migrants significantly outnumbered the proportion of international migration (three percent). From 2009-2014, three-tenths of internal migrants were rural-to-urban migrants and an identical percentage were rural-to-rural migrants (UNESCO 2017). From 2010-2015, 36 percent of migration was rural-to-urban, 32 percent was urban-to-urban, 20 percent was rural-to-rural, and 13 percent was urban-to-rural. Rural-to-urban migration fuelled rapid urbanization, with urban population growing by 3.4 percent per year (GSO 2009).

Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) data, based on the 2009 census, provided insight into individuals who had migrated during the five years preceding the census. While 95 percent of the population in Vietnam were not considered recent migrants, two percent of the population moved within the same province and three percent migrated from one province to another.

Coxhead et al. 2016 reported that migrants learn about job opportunities, cost of resettlement and other crucial decisions about destination cities before making the decision to move. Nearly half (47 percent) of migrants were aware of the current place of residence before moving, through their family or friends. However, very few migrants received such information from official sources such as employers or job centres. This should have been an important source of information, as most migrants move for economic reasons (General Statistics Office, UNFPA 2015).

The increase in internal migration can be attributed to the đổi mới policies, which are economic reforms that were initiated in Vietnam in 1986, with the goal of creating a "socialist-oriented market economy." Dổi mới policies have boosted employment opportunities in urban areas and expanded foreign direct investment (FDI) (Pham et al. 2017). The United Nations reports that 70 percent of Vietnamese migrate for economic reasons, including to gain better employment and improve living conditions. The NIMS 2015 reported that the four main reasons for migrating were: economic (35 percent), family (26 percent), education (23 percent), and other causes including returning after education, environmental and health reasons (16 percent). A large majority of migrants (90 percent) make their own decision to migrate, while others were influenced by their spouses or parents.

Figure 5. Reasons for Migrating (N = 6,129)



Source: VHLSS 2012

Data from the 2012 Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey (VHLSS), which collects data at the individual level, confirms that Vietnamese residents migrate for economic and social reasons and to improve living conditions (Figure 5). According to the survey, the most common reasons for migrating included getting married (41 percent), work (28 percent), and forming a new household (18 percent).

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In general, migrants were more educated than non-migrants.²⁵ Both rural-to-urban migrants and urbanto-urban migrants were nearly twice as likely as urban non-migrants to have completed a secondary education. Migrants were also more likely to have completed a university education and less likely to have less than a primary education compared to urban non-migrants.



Figure 6. Highest Level of Education Completed Among Urban Residents (N = 3,253,394)

Findings from our literature review suggests that the children of migrants would benefit from better access to education. Recent studies have reported that without permanent household registration, access to schooling for children may be more difficult. The NIMS 2015 shows that 13 percent of migrants have school aged children who do not attend school, which is a higher percentage than among non-migrants. Similarly, a report by UNESCO in 2017 shows that 13 percent of school aged children who migrate with parents do not attend school. Sawamoto et. al. (2014) reported that internal migrants' status as non-permanent residents hinders them from accessing public services and state-sponsored care. As a result, migrant children do not meet the regulatory requirements needed to enter formal education. They then tend to seek informal education and remain trapped socioeconomically with little social mobility.

POVERTY

Using a household asset score to measure poverty status in urban areas,²⁶ the team found that, on average, recent migrants were poorer than non-migrants (Figure 6). Additionally, our analysis revealed that rural-to-urban and urban-to-urban migrants tended to own a similar number of assets.

Source: IPUMS 2009

²⁵ See Table 14 in the Vietnam Annex.

²⁶ Household asset score is a sum score of possession of the following assets: dwelling, cooking fuel, phone, air conditioning, computer, washer, refrigerator, TV, radio, and toilet. Each item was given equal weight and the range of possible scores is zero to ten.



Figure 7. Household Asset Scores among Urban Residents (N = 3,267,436)

Source: IPUMS 2009

After restricting the IPUMS sample to rural-to-urban migrants in poverty and examining their characteristics,²⁷ the team found that they tended to be relatively young (80 percent were 29 years old or younger). These recent poor migrants have very little education. Fifty-five percent have completed only a primary education or less. An additional 35 percent have completed a secondary education and only the remaining nine percent have completed a university-level education. Slightly more than half of the population was employed (57 percent). Among those who were employed, approximately 80 percent were salaried workers, 18 percent were self-employed, and the remainder were unpaid workers. These rural-to-urban migrants in poverty were distributed throughout the country, with 39 percent in the southeast (where Ho Chi Minh City is located), 18 percent in the Red River Delta (where Hanoi is located), 13 percent in the Central Coast, 12 percent in the Northeast, and the remaining 18 percent in either the Northwest, North Central, Central Highlands, or Mekong River Delta regions. Additionally, findings from the VHLSS confirmed that the majority (60 percent) of migrants in poverty at the time of the survey lived in the Southeastern Area (Figure 7).²⁸ Notably, the VHLSS identified Ho Chi Minh City as the home of nearly 40 percent of Vietnam's migrants in poverty.



Figure 8. Share of Rural-Urban Migrants in Poverty by Region of Residence

Source: IPUMS 2009

²⁷ See Table 17 in the Vietnam Annex.

²⁸ See Table 18 in the Vietnam Annex.

The income of migrants remains lower than that of non-migrants, and male migrants earn more than their female counterparts. Migrants to Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City earn the highest mean income (UNESCO 2017). However, a study by Nguyen *et al* reported than there is no difference in wages between non-migrants after adjusting for differences in age and education (Nguyen *et al*. 2016).

Migrants perceived themselves to be better off at the place of destination, and migration has had positive income growth effects. This has helped migrant households to move out of poverty and also improved the overall poverty situation in rural areas (Nguyen et al. 2015). Similarly, according to the NIMS 2015, 54 percent of migrants felt that they have better, or much better employment compared to before migration, while approximately ten percent felt their employment was worse. Fifty-two percent of migrants felt they had better, or much better income compared to before migration, while 12 percent perceived that they had lower or far lower income after migration.

EMPLOYMENT

Migrants are roughly equally likely to be employed as non-migrants in urban areas.²⁹ Among those who are employed, migrants are more likely to be salaried workers than urban non-migrants.³⁰ They are also less likely to be unpaid workers or self-employed compared to urban non-migrants.



Figure 9. Employment Status Among Urban Residents (N = 2,771,241)

Source: IPUMS 2009

According to NIMS 2015, 75 percent of migrants aged 15-59 are in paid employment. They are mainly employed as "Workers who assemble, operate machinery & equipment", "Clerical staff", "Manual skill workers", "Medium-skilled professionals", and "Unskilled workers". The Central Highlands region has the highest rate of migrants and non-migrants working as unskilled workers at more than 50 percent. Migrants are more likely to work in industrial/construction sector compared to non-migrants (40 percent and 26 percent respectively), they are also more likely to be employed in private and foreign direct investment sector (41 percent versus 21 percent). In contrast, non-migrants are more likely to be engaged in the services sector. These results suggest that there is a segmented labor market in Vietnam based on

²⁹ See Table 15 in the Vietnam Annex.

³⁰ More specifically, rural-to-urban migrants and urban-to-urban were 1.6 times more likely to be salaried workers than urban non-migrants. See Table 16 in the Vietnam Annex.

migration status.

ELECTRICITY, WASH, AND HEALTH

Analysis of VHLSS data revealed that more than half of migrants in poverty did not have a health insurance card or a free health care certificate in the year prior to the census. However, the vast majority of migrants reported at least sufficient access to either food, electricity, water, and housing.³¹

NIMS 2015 showed that self-reported health of migrants was better than before migrating and this was attributed to higher incomes, better nutrition, and access to better quality health care service providers in urban areas. However, Pham et. al. (2017) show significantly lower HRQOL (an individual's perception of physical, psychological and social conditions) and a higher number of health issues in migrants compared to non-migrant counterparts. There still remain healthcare inequalities between migrants and non-migrants. Some factors that increase health vulnerabilities in migrants include lack of access to information, lack of social networks, poor living conditions, lack of access to clean water and sanitation, as well as limited knowledge of urban diseases (UN 2010).

A study by GSO in 2015 showed that more than 70 percent of migrants have health insurance, a figure similar to what was reported by the NIMS 2015 (Le 2015; General Statistics Office, UNFPA 2015). However, this percentage varied among regions. Among both migrants and non-migrants in the Central Highlands region, and in the Southeast, only 50 percent of people have health insurance. Most migrants without health insurance consider it unnecessary (50 percent) or too costly (25 percent). The NIMS 2015 reported that in the event of an illness, 63 percent of migrants paid for the treatment out of pocket and 50 percent used health insurance for payment. Despite many migrants having health insurance, they still seemed to have to pay for health care services, either in part or in full. This may be due to the fact that they have health insurance in their places of origin, and do not register for residence in their places of destination (Le 2015; General Statistics Office, UNFPA 2015).

DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The Government of Vietnam has initiated comprehensive reform of the social protection system to respond to increased migration from rural to urban areas, and the large informal labor market. These reforms aim for a more inclusive, effective and coherent system to main the trajectory of accelerated social and economic development (UN 2017). UN's strategic plan 2017-2021 in Vietnam also includes strengthening institutional mechanisms and policy frameworks by providing technical assistance and policy advice to support national policies. These efforts will be working towards building a more inclusive national social protection system that will protect vulnerable groups, including migrants and informal sector workers.

DATA AND METHODS

2009 INTEGRATED PUBLIC USE MICRODATA SERIES (IPUMS)

The team used data from the 2009 Vietnam Population and Housing Census, taken from IPUMS. It utilizes a stratified systematic sample of residents in Vietnam (N = 14,177,590). The sample included 6,964,175 men and 7,213,415 women.

In our analysis, the team used the full sample of Vietnamese residents to determine the proportion of residents who migrated in the previous five years. Next, the team restricted the analysis to residents who

³¹ See Table 18 in the Vietnam Annex.

had migrated from one province to another in the five years prior to the census to determine the proportion of recent migrants who moved from rural and urban areas (N = 385,379). Individuals who moved from one home to another within the same province were not counted as "migrants." Instead, they were categorized as individuals who "Moved within Province," shown in Tables 14 and 15 in the Annex. Then, the team restricted the sample to individuals residing in urban areas (N = 3,621,262) to compare outcomes between migrants and non-migrants living in urban areas.

To gain insight into rural-to-urban migrants living in poverty, the team restricted the sample to residents of urban areas who migrated from one province to another within the past five years, migrated from a rural province, and possessed a household asset score between zero and three (which represents the poorest 43 percent) (N = 67,649). Descriptive characteristics are presented in Table 17 in the Annex.

2012 VIETNAM HOUSEHOLD LIVING STANDARDS SURVEY (VHLSS)

The 2012 VHLSS represents the eighth round of data collection of a nation-wide survey. It was conducted by the General Statistical Office (GSO) with technical support from the World Bank in Vietnam. This survey employed a two-stage stratified cluster design sampling technique with a total sample of 36,655 individuals and 9,402 households. The survey contains individual-level data on migration, demographics, and socioeconomic status, as well as household-level data on income and participation in government programs.

Since this data provided valuable information on income, the team used it to study migrants living in poverty. To do so, the team restricted the data to respondents who answered the migration module of the survey and who also earned an income that fell into one of the two lowest quintiles, based on income earned in the past 12 months. The characteristics of these individuals is presented in Table 19 in the Annex.

5. CONCLUSION

Research into these three focus countries has revealed a range of important insights. The below observations highlight key points from each country analysis before drawing overarching takeaways, elaborating on data limitations, and providing suggestions for next steps.

KEY POINTS FOR BANGLADESH

The analysis shows that rural-to-urban migrants on average are slightly worse off economically than urban residents who have continuously stayed in cities. In the meantime, a notable share of rural-urban migrants attain relatively high socioeconomic status. It is important to pay attention to the heterogeneity of the migrant population. Among rural-urban migrants at or below the poverty line, a key source of disadvantage lies in limited access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and electricity. Whereas the team found migrants to have suboptimal access to health services, this analysis was considered preliminary because of the lack of quality information on health-related indicators. A large fraction of these migrant households have children, and the limited access to sanitation can have significant detrimental consequences for the next generation. There are also large differences in access to health or sanitation services by the type of destination and by region. Migrants in small- and especially medium-sized cities are the most vulnerable, as are migrants residing in the Barisal region. Overall, findings suggest the emphasis on the utility of targeted interventions.

KEY POINTS FOR TAJIKISTAN

The analysis of existing data does not show that rural-to-urban migrants are particularly vulnerable. While their levels of subjective poverty and food insecurity are higher than that of other urban residents, internal migrants do not seem to have a very high propensity to be poor. Their education and employment characteristics, as well as access to electricity or WASH services, do not suggest the need for specific interventions. However, migrant women have lower educational achievements than all comparison groups and there may be a need to focus on their health services, though the data is scarce on health issues.

The highest number of poor internal migrants live in the capital Dushanbe, followed by Khatlon. However, the share of poor among migrants is highest in Khatlon, RRP, and Sogd.

The team triangulated results through all existing sources wherever possible, which increases the generalizability of our findings. However, the three datasets used for this analysis have important limitations. In particular, the number of rural-urban migrants in the data is small.

Whereas international migration (to Russia in particular) receives a lot of attention in terms of public policies, development cooperation, and research, internal migration issues are virtually absent from the discussion and no specific programming by development partners has been found. In the absence of implementation partners who have already worked on this area, identifying strong partners to implement future programming may be challenging. On the other hand, should future research confirm specific needs of internal migrants, USAID programming would represent a novel and unique approach to development challenges in the country.

KEY POINTS FOR VIETNAM

In Vietnam, migrants are better off than non-migrants in some, but not all respects. Importantly, there is room for targeted interventions. In urban areas, migrants are more educated and more likely to be salary workers than non-migrants. Migrants are also just as likely to be employed as non-migrants. However, recent migrants are poorer than non-migrants and children of migrants are attending school at lower rates than non-migrants. Due to their status as non-permanent residents, these children had difficulty accessing certain public services, which prevented them from meeting the regulatory conditions required to enter formal education.

Migrants in poverty tend to be relatively young and have low levels of education. They were distributed throughout the country, with the largest share residing in the southeast (where Ho Chi Minh City is located), followed by the Red River Delta (where Hanoi is located). Ho Chi Minh City hosts an especially large number of Vietnam's migrants in poverty.

While most migrants report sufficient access to food, electricity, water, and housing, a large proportion do not have access to health insurance. Further, lack of access to information, social networks, clean water, and sanitation—in addition to poor living conditions and limited knowledge of urban diseases—have contributed to additional inequalities in health between migrants and non-migrants.

GENERAL TAKEAWAYS

UNESCO, UNDP, IOM, and UN Habitat (2018, p.3), summarize the current conventional wisdom on internal migration:

In the absence of a comprehensive policy framework, internal migrants face social exclusion and discrimination, poor labor arrangements and working conditions, as well as obstacles in their access to basic necessities and public services, such as education, healthcare, sanitation, shelter, drinking water and food.

The team expected to detect specific vulnerabilities for internal migrants in the three countries analyzed. Given the specific focus on rural-to-urban migrants, the team started with the hypotheses that they are at a disadvantage when compared with non-migrant urban dwellers. The disadvantage can be derive from: weaker social networks; lack of access to certain services; a perceived education disadvantage; discrimination based on stereotyping of certain rural populations, which can be visible to insiders through social markers, such as language and accent, behavior, and dress choices; or being forced to live in areas of the city that are less desirable. This is what is referred to as migration-specific vulnerabilities that are a focus of efforts to leave no one behind, which is a key principle of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Whereas the team did not expect this to be the case for all internal migrants, it comes as a surprise that based on the statistical profile, internal migrants do not appear to be considerably more vulnerable than our comparison groups. Looking at rural-to-urban migrants in Bangladesh, Tajikistan, and Vietnam, the team found that their vulnerability profile is not fundamentally different from non-migrants. Migrants tend to be slightly poorer and slightly less educated, but the difference to non-migrant populations in urban areas is not striking.

There are two possible explanations with different implications. First, it is possible that in the three countries, a combination of existing policy frameworks and social forces guarantee that internal migrants do not face significant barriers to better development outcomes. In this regard, the research could contribute to a more nuanced understanding that internal migration does not necessarily lead to enhanced vulnerabilities. It could be interesting to expand the research beyond these three countries to see if migrants' statistical profile in other countries support the assumption of migrant-specific vulnerabilities.

On the other hand, it is possible that the analysis of available datasets is misleading. First, there are important limitations that come with each of the analyzed datasets. These are discussed in the final section of each of the three country foci above and in the reflections on data below. In addition, general

observations about internal migration may prompt the assumption that even if their poverty rate and vulnerability assessment is similar to that of non-migrants, they face different barriers. If this were true, development interventions addressing their health, livelihoods, or education needs would need to be carefully targeted. While our data analysis does not provide clear guidance whether this can be expected or not, the team included a few references and studies that indicate that this may be the case. It appears that this would need to be assessed by qualitative research methods, including interviews and focus group discussions in key provinces of the concerned countries.

It should also be added that while internal migrants do not show considerably higher poverty rates than non-migrants, especially in Bangladesh and Tajikistan, overall poverty levels are high. This means that it might be alarming if a sub-group, such as internal migrants, experience even lower development gains. For example, our analysis of internal migrants in Bangladesh reveals that rural-urban migrant households in poverty have extremely limited access to safe water, clean toilets, and electricity, as well as suboptimal access to health services.

One of the most important results of the data analysis is a spatial profile of internal migrants who live around the poverty line. This report has identified provinces and cities that host a large share of those defined as poor or near-poor. These outcomes of our analysis could allow for targeted research in areas that host particularly poor internal migrants.

DATA AND DATA LIMITATIONS

In addition to the key points for the three focus countries, the mapping and subsequent analysis of existing datasets reveals important insights on the available data and their limitations. There are three types of data.

First, in some countries, such as Tajikistan, the government collects official population registries that capture the number of people who declare moves between provinces. While it is an interesting source on the magnitude of internal migration, it can be expected to undercount migrants, as not all will officially register with the relevant authorities. In addition, this data source does not provide any information on the demographic profile or other important indicators.

Second, census data is important to assess population dynamics. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) are important to gain an understanding of key characteristics.

Third, social surveys provide key information. This is the case for general social surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Tajikistan Living Standards Survey, Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey, or specific migration surveys.

In this report, the team has attempted to triangulate information from all existing sources. However, it needs to be stressed that there are challenges to directly comparing different data sources.

First, there are important differences in the definition of who counts as a migrant. Whereas the United Nations (1970) issued recommendations on how to define internal migration,³² several variations exist. Some datasets, such as IPUMS data, are based on residents five years prior to the survey, whereas others are based on migration at any time in respondents' past. This is further complicated by different information on the place of origin or destination of internal migrants. While some datasets indicate

³² According to the UN manual on methods of measuring internal migration, internal migration is "a movement from one migration-defining area to another or a move of some specified minimum distance that was made during a given migration interval and that involved a change of residence".

whether migrants come from rural or urban areas and whether they now live in rural or urban areas, others provide such details only for the current residence of migrants or only for the residence of their household of origin. Other surveys only contain information on the region of migrants' origin, without specifying whether they hail from urban or rural areas. For this reason, in some cases, the analysis can directly infer information about rural-to-urban migrants, in some cases only about internal migrants in urban settings, and sometimes about internal migrants more broadly. Needless to say, these disparities may mask significant differences in the underlying living conditions and development outcomes.

Second, there are differences in the sampling methods. General surveys may undercount poor migrants if they live in temporary and informal housing structures. For this reason, even though the overall sample size of all datasets analyzed for this report is relatively high, in several cases the number of internal migrants, especially rural-to-urban migrants, is low, leading to certain limitations in the generalizability of the conclusions drawn from the analysis. Among migration-specific surveys, some sample among migrants, such as the Vietnam's National Internal Migration Survey, whereas others sample in migrants' households of origin, such as the Tajikistan Jobs, Skills, and Migration Survey, and the Migrating Out of Poverty Survey in Bangladesh. Some surveys only collect data from women, such as DHS 2017 in Tajikistan, whereas the majority of surveys include data on both women and men.

Third, survey data stems from different years. While small intervals may not change the relevant population dynamics, differences between surveys between which lie 5-10 years, may be caused by changes in the underlying realities.

Fourth, there are no comparable indicators to identify those living around the poverty line. Some datasets include a wealth index or specific items that can be combined to an item list (DHS and IPUMS). Others include subjective poverty measures, such as reported satisfaction with income or food intake levels (TLSS), or even include a discreet income measure (JSMS and VHLSS). Importantly, none of these measures is directly comparable to official poverty statistics and threshold that are published by the respective government or the World Bank.

These elaborations are not meant to discourage using the data, but they urge applying a certain caution when drawing wide conclusions from the data. The team echoes the recommendation by UNESCO, UNDP, IOM, and UN Habitat (2018, p.6) that "All comparisons should be taken with careful consideration of the limitations of disaggregating internal migration datasets." Given the limitations of each of the data sources, it seems paramount to triangulate information as much as possible by relying on different sources. However, the use of different sources has the inherent potential to lead to contradicting results and it is not always possible to explain what causes these differences.

CRITICAL QUESTIONS THAT REMAIN UNANSWERED

Engaging in in-depth analysis of available datasets and reviewing the existing literature has answered some of the questions the team set out to investigate. It has also revealed that several important questions remain unanswerable with the existing data. This is in spite of the fact that the three focus countries were chosen because data sources were not only available, but they were also considered reliable and robust.

A more comprehensive analysis would allow one to capture more details of migrant patterns, including the economic and development levels before migration and differences between migrants moving alone or with their families.

Most existing survey data does not allow us to distinguish between seasonal migrant labor, more shortterm, long-term and permanent migration. This distinction does not only depend on migration questions asked in survey instruments, but also on the sampling strategies that would need to be designed differently if short-term movements were to be captured adequately. In addition to portraying different categories of migrants, it would be interesting to investigate how time shapes outcomes among migrants.

From a policy and programming perspective, the team may learn about outcomes in the areas of health, education, employment, water, or sanitation. However, at this time the team cannot speak to how these relate to the existence, non-existence or quality of related public (or private) services and barriers to access them. It would be important to have accurate data on where social services can be accessed: including healthcare services, health insurance, education for migrant children, social protection, employment information before migration, household registration services, housing services, and other social protection programs. There is little information available on skills and labor market needs that would enable designing programming activities.

Several indicators are not well-suited to reveal qualitative aspects. For example, whereas the type of water source is a standard in many datasets, this information does not provide insights into the water quality, quantity, and tradeoffs needed to obtain this access. Even surveys that nominally focus on health often do not provide detailed information on migrants (or any respondent's) health care access. Often times, health questions are only asked when the respondent is pregnant or has a specific type of illness (e.g., STDs), which limits the scope of assessing health care more broadly.

NEXT STEPS: ENLARGING THE EVIDENCE BASE

This research has unearthed important information about internal migrants in Bangladesh, Tajikistan, and Vietnam. However, as discussed above, the findings come with a range of caveats and limitations. Importantly, while the analysis suggests certain vulnerabilities of rural-to-urban migrants, the statistical profiles do not provide a sufficient basis to plan development interventions.

To further enlarge the evidence base for designing programming activities and supporting public policies at the local level that take into consideration the needs of migrant women and men, two complementary research strategies could be designed.

First, additional datasets could be analyzed. While this report is based on the currently available information, there may be more datasets that could shed light on the relevant questions. This includes the forthcoming data from the JSMS 2018 survey that was conducted by TajStat, in cooperation with JICA and that is supposed to become available in November 2019. Also, the Bangladesh Urban Health Survey 2013 reportedly contains a migration module, though it is not yet clear, under what conditions data access can be obtained.

Second, the results presented in this report would enable USAID to plan on-the-ground research activities. Based on the locations identified as having a large number of poor or near-poor internal migrants, USAID could opt to cooperate with local research partners to engage in additional research activities. This could include expert interviews, small-scale surveys, participatory observation, and focus group discussions. This report could inform both the selection of spatial units to focus research endeavors, as well as the selection of areas of inquiry and the development of discussion guides and interview questions. Such research tools would need to be developed in close collaboration with local experts and piloted in the local context to ensure their validity, as well as cultural and technical appropriateness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The AEO team would like to acknowledge a host of individuals and institutions for their contributions to this research.

We are grateful for the substantive support by Vinod Mishra, Patrick Gerland, and Philipp Ueffing at the UN-DESA's Population Division, Sabrina Juran at UNFPA, Marina Faetanini and Juan Pablo Ramirez-Miranda at UNESCO, Sabine Henning at the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, and Reuben Lim and Yujin Park from the IOM Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific. Professor Priya Deshingkar not only provided access to the Migrating Out of Poverty (MOOP) dataset but also shared important insights on research questions related to internal migration with the team. We are grateful for the information we received from Frank Laczko and Marzia Rango at the IOM's Global Migration Data Analysis Centre and Edi Setiawan at BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

With regard to our research on Tajikistan, we thank the UN resident coordinator Pratibha Mehta for sharing information on UN country team programming, as well as Gulnora Hasanzgd, the Director of the Agency on Statistics (TajStat) for valuable information on available data. We equally appreciate the support by Rukhshona Qurbonova at IOM Tajkistan. Andres Vikat at the UN Economic Commission for Europe shared valuable information on the analysis of household surveys on migration in Central Asia and administrative sources and sample surveys to measure international migration in CIS countries. Ilhom Abdulloev and Mohamed Ihsan Ajwad at the World Bank provided important clarifications on the Tajikistan Jobs, Skills, and Migration Survey (JSMS) 2013 and William Seitz at the World Bank shared insights on the Listening to Tajikistan survey and the 2018 round of the Tajikistan Jobs, Skills, and Migration Survey. Umed Kasymov at the Japan International Cooperation Agency kindly provided information on forthcoming information and Barbara Dietz and Alexander Danzer provided access to the Tajikistan Household Panel Survey. Saodat and Muzaffar Olimov at the Sharq think tank in Dushanbe were helpful to understand the lack of research and Nigina Khaitova provided critical research assistance to find and summarize Russian-language publications on internal migration in Tajikistan. Lastly, we extend our thanks to Professors Zvi Lerman, Mashura Akilova, Caress Schenk, Malika Bahovadinova, Hélène Thibault, Karolina Kluczewska, and Stéphane A. Dudoignon who all shared information and contacts on migration in Tajikistan.

The research team would like to acknowledge Professor Vu Hoang Linh and Cuong Nguyen Viet's support on the Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey (VHLSS) data set and related resources, who provided guidance on utilizing the dataset, which was critical for our analysis. In addition, the team would like to thank Anne Nguyen for her assistance in translating the labels in the data set from Vietnamese to English. We also extend our gratitude to Elizabeth T. Robinson for sharing information on the Bangladesh Urban Health Survey.

Lastly, during the time of this research, the team benefitted from advice and support from the Integra team, and colleagues at USAID, especially Micaela Arthur, Sashikala Jayatileke and Jean-Jacques Frere.

REFERENCES

- Ajwad, Mohamed Ihsan Stefan Hut, Ilhom Abdulloev, Robin Audy, Joost de Laat, Sachiko Kataoka, Jennica Larrison, Zlatko Nikoloski, and Federico Torracchi. 2014. "The Skills Road: Skills for Employability in Tajikistan." World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Asian Development Bank. 2019. Poverty in Tajikistan, see https://www.adb.org/countries/tajikistan/poverty.
- Azimboev A. 2013. "Migration Behavior of the Population of the Republic of Tajikistan and Its Peculiarities." *Vestnik*, pp. 81-86 (in Russian).
- Azimov, Abdumavlon. 2012."Migration Situation in Tajikistan in Market Conditions." *Economics*, pp. 40-49 (in Russian).
- Babaev A. 2017. "The State of Labor Market in the Republic of Tajikistan and Impact on Migration Streams." International Politics and Diplomacy: Traditions, Trends, Experience, pp. 112-119 (in Russian).
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics 2015. Population Distribution and Internal Migration in Bangladesh. Population Monograph: Volume-6. Statistics and Informatics Division. Ministry of Planning. Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
- Biswas, RK., Kabir, E., Khan, HTA. 2019. Causes of Urban Migration in Bangladesh: Evidence from the Urban Health Survey. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 38:593-614.
- Coxhead, I., Vu, L., Nguyen, C. 2016. Migration in Vietnam: New Evidence from Recent Surveys. Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MPRA). Available at: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/969411468197949288/Migration-in-Vietnam-newevidence-from-recent-surveys.
- Demographic and Health Survey Program. 2007, 2017. Wealth Index Bangladesh. Available at: https://www.dhsprogram.com/programming/wealth percent20index/Bangladesh percent20DHS percent202007/bangladesh percent202007.pdf.
- Farhana, KM., Rahman, SA., Rahman, M. 2012. Factors of migration in urban Bangladesh: an empirical study of poor migrants in Rajshahi City. *Bangladesh e-journal of Sociology*. 9(1):105-117.
- General Statistics Office Vietnam. UNFPA. 2015. The 2015 National Internal Migration Survey: Major Findings. Vietnam News Agency Publishing House. Available at: https://vietnam.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/PD_Migration percent20Booklet_ENG_printed percent20in percent202016.pdf.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, General Economics Division (GED), Planning Commission. 7th Five Year Plan (FY2016 – FY2020): Accelerating Growth, Empowering Citizens. Available at: https://www.unicef.org/bangladesh/sites/unicef.org.bangladesh/files/2018-10/7th_FYP_18_02_2016.pdf
- Institute of Migration, Al Amin. 2011. Aspects at the back of internal migration and exploring the changes in migrant's livelihood after their arrival in Dhaka City, Bangladesh. Web Reports 68.
- Islam, MM. and Gagnon, AJ. 2016. Use of reproductive health care services among urban migrant women in Bangladesh. *BMC Women's Health*. 16:15.
- Le, ATK., Vu, LH., Schelling, E. 2015. Utilization of health care services among internal migrants in Hanoi and its correlation with health insurance: a cross sectional study. *PMC*. 3(2):44-56.

- National Institute of Population Research and Training (NIPORT), MEASURE Evaluation. 2013. Bangladesh Urban Health Survey 2013: Final Report. Available at: https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/tr-15-117.
- Nguyen, CV., Minh, TP. 2016. Are migrants in large cities underpaid? Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of Migration*. 5(20):1-23.
- Nguyen, LD., Raabe, K., Grote, U. 2015. Rural-urban migration, household vulnerability, and welfare in Vietnam. World Development. 71:79-93.
- Olimova, Saodat, and Muzaffar Olimov. 2012. Environmental Degradation, Migration, Internal Displacement, and Rural Vulnerabilities in Tajikistan. Dushanbe: International Organization for Migration.
- Pham, KTH., Nguyen, LH., Vuong, QH., Ho, MT., Vuong, TT., Nguyen, HKT., Vu, GT., Nguyen, HLT., Tran, BX., Latkin, CA., Ho, CSH., Ho, RCM. 2019. Health inequality between migrant and non-migrant workers in an industrial zone of Vietnam. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.* 16(1502):1-11.
- Pham, NNK., Do, M., Bui, VH., Nguyen, GT. 2017. Rural-to-urban migration in Vietnam: conceptualized youth's vulnerabilities in the city. *International Journal of Migration Health and Social Care*. 14(1):117-130.
- Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit. 2013. Policy Brief 11: Internal migrant workers and the construction sector in Bangladesh: Tackling informality and exploitative labour practices. Migrating out of Poverty, UKAID. Available at:

http://migratingoutofpoverty.dfid.gov.uk/files/file.php?name=rmmru-rp002-bangladesh-policy-brief-11-sep14.pdf&site=354.

- Sawamoto, A. 2014. Vietnam's Rural-to-Urban Migrant Families: Educational and Social Inequalities in a Transitional Society. Ph.D. Thesis. Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.
- Tajibaeva, Mavjuda. 2012. "Internal Migration and Its Impact on Socio-Economic Processes of the Republic of Tajikistan." *Economics*, pp. 175-180 (in Russian).
- Tajikistan Agency on Statistics (TajStat). 2010. The impact of migration and remittances on welfare in Tajikistan. Results from a sample survey in August 2010, Dushanbe.
- Tajikistan Agency on Statistics (TajStat). 2015. Poverty Measurement in Tajikistan: A Methodological Note, Dushanbe.
- Tajikistan Agency on Statistics (TajStat). 2018. Annual Demographic Yearbook, Dushanbe.
- Tajikistan Ministry of Labor and Social Protection. 2010. The Politics of Labor in Tajikistan. Analytical Report, Dushanbe (in Russian).
- UNDP, Marshall, R., Rahman, S. 2016. Internal Migration in Bangladesh: Character, Drivers and Policy Issues. Available at: https://www.bd.undp.org/content/dam/bangladesh/docs/Publications/Pub-2013/Internal%20Migration%20in%20Bangladesh%20UNDP%20Final.pdf.
- United Nations. 2010. Internal Migration: Opportunities and challenges for socio-economic development in Vietnam. Available at: http://www.un.org.vn/en/publications/doc_details/173-internal-migration-opportunities-and-challenges-for-socio-economic-development-in-viet-nam.html.
- United Nations. 2017. One Strategic Plan 2017-2021 between The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and The United Nations in Vietnam.

- United Nations. 2019. United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects: 2019 Revision. Available at: https://data.worldbank.org.
- UNESCO, UNDP, IOM, and UN Habitat. 2017. Overview of Internal Migration in Vietnam. Available at: https://bangkok.unesco.org/sites/default/files/assets/article/Social percent20and percent20Human percent20Sciences/publications/vietnam.pdf.
- UNESCO, UNDP, IOM, and UN Habitat. 2018. Internal Migration in Southeast Asia: Towards Better Inclusion of Internal Migrants. Key Messages & Recommendations. Bangkok. Available at: https://bangkok.unesco.org/sites/default/files/assets/article/Social%20and%20Human%20Sciences/publi cations/Brief%201%20-%20Key%20Messages%20and%20Recommendations.pdf.
- UNFPA. 2016. Urbanization and Migration in Bangladesh, available at: https://bangladesh.unfpa.org/en/publications/urbanization-and-migration-bangladesh.
- USAID. 2019, Tajikistan. Economic Growth and Trade, available at: https://www.usaid.gov/tajikistan/economic-growth-and-trade.
- USAID. 2016. USAID/Bangladesh Comprehensive Risk and Resilience Assessment, available at: https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1861/BNG_resilience_assessment_report_4Apr2_017_final.pdf.
- United Nations. 1970. Methods of Measuring Internal Migration. Manuals on Methods of Estimating Population. Manual VI. New York. United Nations.
- World Bank. 2005. Republic of Tajikistan. Poverty Assessment Update. Report No: 30853-TJ, Human Development Sector Unit, Central Asia Country Unit.
- World Bank. 2015. Tajikistan Partnership Program Snapshot. Available at: http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/645741444794465533/Tajikistan-Snapshot.pdf.

ANNEX I. BANGLADESH: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 10. Map of DHS 2007 Bangladesh Urban and Rural Sampling Points



Source: DHS 2007.

Table 2. Wealth Index by Migration Status

Percentile	Urban residents	Rural-urban migrants
Poorest	6.8	7.5
Poor	10.9	11.8
Middle	13.1	16.4
Rich	23.8	21.7
Richest	45.4	42.6
N	542	1,994

Source: DHS 2007

Table 3. Characteristics of Rural-urban Migrants in Poverty (N=445)

	Percentage
Age	
15-19	10.1
20-24	15.7

25-29	18.9
30-34	20.0
35-39	15.1
40-44	11.0
45-49	8.3
50-54	0.9
Education	
No education	51.0
Some or complete primary	37.1
Some or complete secondary	11.9
Religion	
Islam	92.8
Hinduism	7.2
Currently working	47.6
Currently working Occupation (among those working)	47.6
Currently working Occupation (among those working) Agricultural	47.6 38.1
Currently working Occupation (among those working) Agricultural Home manufacturing	47.6 38.1 13.5
Currently working Occupation (among those working) Agricultural Home manufacturing Manual labor	47.6 38.1 13.5 27.8
Currently workingOccupation (among those working)AgriculturalHome manufacturingManual laborService	47.6 38.1 13.5 27.8 10.8
Currently workingOccupation (among those working)AgriculturalHome manufacturingManual laborServiceProfessional and managerial	47.6 38.1 13.5 27.8 10.8 9.9
Currently workingOccupation (among those working)AgriculturalHome manufacturingManual laborServiceProfessional and managerialDestination type	47.6 38.1 13.5 27.8 10.8 9.9

Medium-size city (over 50,000 population)	41.1
Small-size city (<50,000 population)	44.3
Region of residence	
Barisal (I)	21.6
Chittagong (2)	17.5
Dhaka (3)	15.1
Khulna (4)	16.2
Rajshahi (5)	16.4
Sylhet (6)	13.3

Table 4. Living Standards of Households of Rural-urban Migrants in Poverty (N=385)

	Percentage
Has electricity	10.1
Drinking water	
Piped water (safe)	0.0
Protected well or spring (semi-safe)	99.0
Unprotected, surface water (unsafe)	1.0
Toilet	
Flush toilet	4.4
Pit toilet/Latrine	71.2
No facility/bucket	24.4
Share toilet with other households	51.4
Whether children age 0-15 living in the households	70.7

Table 5. Access to Health Services for Kurai-urbail Higrants II	1 Foverty (14-445)
	Percentage

Table 5. Acces	s to Health	Services for	Rural-urban	Migrants i	n Poverty	(N=445)
----------------	-------------	--------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------	---------

	Percentage
Has health facilities in the community	100
Has health and family planning workers in the community	81.6
Has pharmacy in the community	65.6

Percentage	Poorest	Poor	Middle	Rich	Richest
Destination type					
Capital, large city (over I million population)	2.8	5.8	10.8	22.9	57.6
Medium-size city (over 50,000 population)	13.0	18.5	18.5	21.4	28.7
Small-size city (<50,000 population)	8.0	12.5	19.7	20.8	39.1
Region of residence					
Barisal	11.4	19.4	25.1	22.1	22.1
Chittagong	4.8	11.6	20.8	24.8	28.0
Dhaka	7.1	5.6	10.0	17.7	59.7
Khulna	8.0	12.4	4.7	24.8	40. I
Rajshahi	9.0	11.2	15.6	20.9	43.3
Sylhet	5.9	6.	6.	21.2	40.7

Table 6. Wealth Index of Rural-urban Migrants by Destination Type and Region (N=1,994)

Source: DHS 2007

Figure 11. Wealth Index of Rural-urban Migrants by Destination Type



Percentage	Large city	Medium size city	Small city
Has electricity	13.8	10.6	8.4
Drinking water			
Piped water (safe)	0	0	0
Protected well or spring (semi-safe)	98.3	99.4	98.8
Unprotected, surface water (unsafe)	1.7	0.6	1.2
Toilet			
Flush toilet	5.7	3.1	5.4
Pit toilet/Latrine	75.9	69.4	71.3
No facility/bucket	19.0	27.5	23.4
Has health/family planning workers in comm.	62.1	81.3	89.2
Has pharmacy in the community	67.2	73.1	59.3

Table 7. C	Characteristics	of Poor	Migrant H	louseholds by	Destination	Type ((N=385)
------------	-----------------	---------	-----------	---------------	-------------	--------	---------

Figure 12. Electricity Access of Poor Migrant Households by Destination Type



Figure 13. Toilet Quality of Poor Migrant Households by Destination Type



Table 8. Characteristics of Poor Migrant Households by Region (N=385)

Percentage	Barisal	Chittagong	Dhaka	Khulna	Rajshahi	Sylhet
Has electricity	2.5	8.1	13.1	10.9	18.5	9.6
Drinking water						
Piped water (safe)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protected well or spring (semi-safe)	100	98.4	100	98.4	100	96.2
Unprotected, surface water (unsafe)	0	1.6	0	1.6	0	3.9
Toilet						

Flush toilet	0	9.7	4.9	1.6	3.1	9.6
Pit toilet/Latrine	74.1	51.6	82.0	87.5	69.2	59.6
No facility/bucket	25.9	38.7	13.1	10.9	27.7	30.8
Has health/family planning workers in comm.	87.7	88.7	82.0	90.6	64.6	75.0
Has pharmacy in the community	79.0	50.0	57.4	100.0	49.2	55.8

Table 9. Negative Experiences and Subjective Well-being of Return Migrants (N=31)

	Percentage
Negative experiences at work	29.0
Compare quality of life between now and five years ago	
Much easier	3.2
Easier	38.7
Neither easier nor harder	35.5
Harder	22.6
Compare household's financial situation between now and five years ago	
Adequate	22.6
Just adequate	35.5
Inadequate	41.9

Source: MOOP 2013

ANNEX II. TAJIKISTAN: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES

Year	Total	Migration to study	Migration to work	
1990	121.8	285	933	
1992	153.7	260	127.7	
1994	188.3	•••	•••	
2002	164.0	483	115.7	
2004	207.6	448	162.8	
2006	153.2	456	107.6	
2008	278.5	530	225.5	
2010	281.1	518	229.3	
2012	266.1	560	210.2	
2014	295.4	577	237.7	
2016	293.0	553	237.7	
2018	323.0	853	237.7	

Table 10: Internal Migration from rural areas to cities, by the start of the year, in thousands

Source: TajStat (2018)

Table	I: Aggregate	number	of internal	in and	out-migration	(2007 - 2017)	bv	region
i abic i	11 7881 68466	Inditio	or meeting.			(2007 2017)		1081011

Region	In-migrants		Out-migrants	Net-	
	#	Share of total	#	Share of total	migration
GBAP	4,728	2 percent	13,800	5 percent	-9,072
Sogd	56,383	22 percent	65,06 l	24 percent	-8,678
Khatlon	84,603	33 percent	118,956	43 percent	-34,353
Dushanb e	41,189	16 percent	24,587	9 percent	16,602
DRS	67,846	27 percent	54,403	20 percent	3,443
Total	254,749	100 percent	276,807	100 percent	

Source: Author's calculations, based on TajStat (2018)

Note: Data for 2011-2012 missing.

Table I 2: Migrants	s by purpose o	of migration, percent
---------------------	----------------	-----------------------

Reason for being away	All	Extern al	Interna I
Earn (more) money	93,9	96,3	59,8
Better use of own competence	0,3	0,2	١,7
Study	2,9	1,7	20,5
Marriage	0,3	0,3	0,4
Vacation or family matters	0,7	0,7	0
Other	١,9	0,7	17,6
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0

Source: TajStat 2010

Age group	International			Internal			
	Men	Women	All	Men	Women	All	TOTAL
16-20	9	5	8	8		7	8
21-30	48	47	48	54	47	53	48
31-40	24	32	25	26	47	28	25
41-50	15	12	15	8	6	8	14
51+	5	3	4	5		4	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Men/women	91	9	100	89		100	

Source: TajStat (2010)

Table 14: Food and financial insecurity, percent

How satisfied are you	Would you consider food consumption:					
with your current						
financial situation?	More than adequate	Just adequate	Less than adequate	_		
Fully satisfied	1	99	0	100		
Rather satisfied	1	89	10	100		
Less than satisfied	1	53	46	100		
Not at all satisfied	0	4	96	100		
	More than adequate	Just adequate	Less than adequate	_		

Fully satisfied	20	23	0	
Rather satisfied	40	43	10	
Less than satisfied	40	33	60	
Not at all satisfied	0	Ι	30	
	100	100	100	

Source: TLSS 2009.

Note: n=453. This excludes responses that refused to provide an answer or answered "I don't know"

ANNEX III. VIETNAM: ADDITIONAL TABLES AND FIGURES

	Less than primary	Primary	Secondary	University	Row Total
Urban Non-Migrant	0.27	0.48	0.15	0.10	1.00
Rural-to-Urban Migrant	0.10	0.45	0.31	0.14	1.00
Urban-to-Urban Migrant	0.10	0.44	0.28	0.18	1.00
Moved within Province	0.11	0.42	0.25	0.22	1.00

Table 15. Highest Level of Education Completed Among Urban Residents

Source: IPUMS 2009

Note: N = 3,253,394.

	Employed	Unemployed	Inactive	Row Total
Urban Non-Migrant	0.66	0.02	0.32	1.00
Rural-to-Urban Migrants	0.61	0.02	0.38	1.00
Urban-to-Urban Migrant	0.65	0.02	0.33	1.00
Moved within Province	0.61	0.02	0.37	1.00

Table 16. Employment Status Among Urban Residents

Source: IPUMS 2009

Note: N = 2,771,241.

Table 17. Employment Status Among Urban Residents

	Self- employed	Salary worker	Unpaid worker	Othe r	Row Total
Urban Non-Migrant	0.42	0.47	0.11	0.00	1.00
Rural-to-Urban Migrants	0.18	0.77	0.05	0.00	1.00
Urban-to-Urban Migrant	0.19	0.76	0.05	0.00	1.00
Moved within Province	0.20	0.75	0.05	0.00	1.00

Source: IPUMS 2009

Note: N = 1,814,354

	Percent age		Percent age
Age		Type of employment (among those working)	
15-19	24.4	Self-employed	17.5
20-24	40.2	Wage/salary worker	78.9
25-29	15.2	Unpaid worker	3.5
30-34	6.4	Other	0.0
35-39	4.2		
40-44	2.7	Occupation (among those working)	
45-49	1.7	Legislators, senior officials and managers	0.1
50-54	1.0	Professionals	4.4
55-59	0.6	Technicians and associate professionals	5.9
60-64	0.2	Clerks	2.2
65-69	0.2	Service workers and shop and market sales	18.3
70-74	0.1	Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	4.5
75-79	0.0	Crafts and related trades workers	21.9
80+	0.0	Plant and machine operators and assemblers	30.2
		Elementary occupations	12.4
Education		Armed forces	0.0
Less than primary completed	10.6		
Primary completed	45.1	Region of residence	
Secondary completed	35.2	Red River Delta	17.5
University completed	9.1	Northeast	11.7
		Northwest	3.1

Table 18. Characteristics	of Rural-Urban	Migrants in Poverty
---------------------------	----------------	----------------------------

Employment status		North Central	3.2
Employed	57.1	Central Coast	13.2
Unemployed	1.1	Central Highlands	4.0
Inactive	41.7	Southeast	38.6
		Mekong River Delta	8.8

Source: IPUMS 2009

Note: N = 67,649

Table 19. Characteristics of Migrants in Poverty

	Percentage
Region	
Red River Delta	14.5
Midlands and Northern Mountainous Area	4.9
Northern and Coastal Central Region	7.7
Central Highlands	3.1
Southeastern Area	59.8
Mekong Delta	10.1
Province (and region)*	
Hµ Néi City (Red River Delta)	8.5
§μ N ¹ /2ng City (Northern and Coastal Central Region)	3.0
B×nh D-¬ng Province (Southeastern Area)	9.6
§ång Nai Province (Southeastern Area)	5.8
Bμ RÞa - Vòng TÇu (Southeastern Area)	2.9
Hå ChÝ Minh City (Southeastern Area)	36.7
An Giang Province (Mekong Delta)	2.1
CÇn Th¬ Province (Mekong Delta)	2.4
Access to health insurance	
Yes	48.8

No	51.2
Access to food	
Insufficient	2.8
Sufficient	89.4
More than sufficient	7.8
No comment	0.1
Access to electricity	
Insufficient	2.9
Sufficient	91.7
More than sufficient	5.1
No comment	0.3
Access to water	
Insufficient	1.8
Sufficient	91.4
More than sufficient	5.9
No comment	1.0
Access to housing	
Insufficient	4.3
Sufficient	90.9
More than sufficient	3.3
No comment	1.5

Source: VHLSS 2012.