



Khuvsugul province, Darkhad road, 19 March 2026, in-kind distribution(Photo: MRCS)

Appeal: MDRMN021	Total DREF Allocation: CHF 349,389	Crisis Category: Yellow	Hazard: Cold Wave
Glide Number: CW-2026-000024-MNG	People Affected: 39,127 people	People Targeted: 3,700 people	People Assisted: 4,559 people
Event Onset: Sudden	Operation Start Date: 27-02-2026	Operational End Date: 30-06-2026	Total Operating Timeframe: 4 months

Targeted Regions: **Bayan-Ölgii, Darkhan-Uul, Dornod, Khentii, Khovd, Khövsgöl, Orkhon, Selenge, Sükhbaatar, Töv, Uvs, Zavkhan**

The major donors and partners of the IFRC-DREF include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Britain, China, Czech, Canada, Denmark, German, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Liechtenstein, Malta, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, and the Netherlands, as well as DG ECHO, Mondelez Foundation, and other corporate and private donors. The IFRC, on behalf of the National Society, would like to extend thanks to all for their generous contributions.

Description of the Event

Date of event

24-02-2026

What happened, where and when?

The snowstorm event started on 21 February 2026 across multiple provinces in Mongolia, particularly affecting eastern, northern, southern, and western regions, including Bayanhongor, Darkhan-Uul, Orkhon, Dornod, Dornogovi, Dundgovi, Govi-Altai, Khentii, Khuvsgul, Selenge, Sukhbaatar, Umnugovi, Tuv, Khovd, Uvs, and Zavkhan provinces. The storm brought sustained winds of up to 31 m/s, heavy snowfall, drifting snow, and extreme cold reaching -48°C . These conditions resulted in blocked roads and mountain passes, widespread mobility disruption, and life-threatening exposure risks. While immediate impacts were recorded during the storm period, 24 February marked a critical escalation in humanitarian consequences.

Livelihood impacts were particularly severe for herder households. By 24 February, authorities had reported that 89,934 livestock had strayed during the storm, while 52,199 were reported missing. Of these, 24,017 had been recovered at that stage, while 28,182 remained unaccounted for. Preliminary reports initially recorded more than 4,900 livestock deaths directly associated with the snowstorm. Subsequent national data indicated that approximately 28,000 livestock died across Mongolia during February as a result of adverse weather conditions, including blizzards, extreme cold, snow, and pasture icing. The scale of livestock mortality and displacement placed significant economic pressure on pastoral households, particularly those that had already entered the winter season with reduced coping capacity.

During the height of the emergency, authorities introduced road and transportation restrictions in affected provinces as hazardous weather and snow accumulation made travel unsafe. The closures further constrained access to markets, health services and emergency assistance and complicated search-and-rescue and livestock recovery operations. The combination of human casualties and injuries, stranded and missing people, transportation disruptions, livestock losses and the isolation of vulnerable herder households constituted the operational trigger for Red Cross action and informed the subsequent humanitarian response.

Five fatalities due to exposure and hypothermia were confirmed in connection with the snowstorm, including herders who became lost during severe weather conditions. More than 100 people, including adults and children, were rescued after becoming stranded, lost, or trapped in snow, and numerous emergency calls were received in relation to snow entrapment, missing persons, and vehicle breakdowns. A total of 56 people were reported injured in relation to the event.

Emergency response operations also addressed a serious ice-related accident on Buir Lake in Dornod Province on 24 February 2026, when a vehicle carrying six people broke through the lake ice. Two occupants survived, while four people lost their lives. Search-and-recovery teams subsequently located the vehicle using underwater surveillance, recovered it from approximately six metres below the surface, retrieved the bodies of all four victims, and transferred them to the relevant authorities, bringing the search-and-recovery operation to a close.

By the end of the DREF operation on 30 June 2026, the situation had shifted from an acute snowstorm emergency toward recovery and seasonal preparedness. Immediate risks related to extreme cold, snow blockage, and isolation had reduced compared with the initial emergency period. However, the effects of livestock losses and the depletion of household resources continued to affect the recovery capacity of some herder households, particularly those with limited livestock holdings and few alternative sources of income. The operational focus therefore increasingly moved toward supporting livelihood recovery, strengthening household and community preparedness, and reducing vulnerability ahead of the next winter season. The DREF operation concluded on 30 June 2026 after four months of implementation.





NDRT visit in the field after the event, Khentii province, 5 March 2026

Scope and Scale

The severe winter storm produced compound and cascading impacts on lives, livelihoods, well-being, and infrastructure by sharply worsening already fragile dzud conditions. For clarity, the impacts described below distinguished between (i) pre-existing seasonal dzud vulnerability that had accumulated over the winter, including constrained pasture access, weakened livestock body condition, and depleted household coping capacity; and (ii) incremental impacts arising from the acute February blizzard, including sudden isolation, immediate exposure risks, transport disruption, and short-term increases in livestock losses.

The hazard caused acute risks to life through exposure, hypothermia, and frostbite during blizzard conditions, as well as through travel-related incidents caused by low visibility and icy roads. Livelihood impacts were severe because the storm displaced large numbers of animals and accelerated livestock deaths. Authorities reported that 52,199 livestock had gone missing following the storm, of which 28,182 remained unaccounted for at the time of reporting. Subsequently, approximately 28,000 livestock deaths were reported nationwide in connection with the February blizzard events.

These losses directly reduced household income and access to food among pastoral communities. Mobility restrictions, blocked roads, and transport closures interrupted access to markets, fuel and coal, food supply chains, and health services, increasing isolation and psychosocial stress. Infrastructure impacts included the closure of road passes and disruption of transportation. Power outages were also reported in some locations, while damage to heavy equipment during road-clearing operations slowed the restoration of access. In this context, the storm was understood as an acute shock that sharply intensifies underlying dzud pressures rather than replacing them.

The people most affected were pastoral herder households in remote rural areas, particularly those living far from soum centers in snow-prone locations and along routes that became impassable during blizzards. Their vulnerability was driven by high exposure to severe weather, limited access to essential services, and heavy dependence on livestock as their primary (often sole) livelihood asset.

Risk increased during the storms because herders frequently undertook necessity-driven searches to recover displaced animals. This behavior increased the amount of time they were exposed outdoors and contributed to missing-persons cases and fatalities during the event. Vulnerability was particularly high among small-scale herders with low livestock holdings, often defined as fewer than 400 animals, as they had limited reserves and coping capacity and could rapidly resort to negative coping strategies or distress migration following significant losses.

The groups most at-risk included children, older persons, pregnant and lactating women, single-headed households, persons with disabilities, people with chronic illnesses, and families undertaking motor movements in remote areas with limited access to health care, communication, and emergency support. In addition, because the storm occurred during the Lunar New Year holiday period, increased population movement elevated exposure among travellers and contributed to longer search, rescue, and assessment timelines.

Historically, severe winter wind and snow hazards in Mongolia had consistently produced similar patterns of impact. These included loss of life and injury from exposure, including hypothermia and frostbite; missing persons associated with travel disruption and herders searching for livestock; widespread mobility restrictions caused by low visibility and blocked roads; interruptions to essential services and supply chains; and accelerated livestock loss that undermined pastoral incomes and food security.

This historical pattern also helped clarify attribution of impacts. Severe storms typically caused acute and time-bound consequences, including exposure, isolation, access disruption, and immediate livestock losses, while the broader dzud conditions caused progressive livelihood deterioration over a period of weeks or months. These recurrent impact pathways indicated a high likelihood of further deterioration where additional snowfall and blizzard conditions continued, particularly because household coping capacity had already been weakened by the ongoing dzud conditions.

Source Information

Source Name	Source Link
1. NEMA Dornod Branch	https://nema.gov.mn/post/172697?fbclid=IwY2xjawQMz8lleHRuA2FibQIxMABicmlkETJyV0E5OVFTSnVWTmlwTHo2c3J0YwZhchBfaWQQMjlyMDM5MTc4ODlwMDg5MgABHhwfgFurEBRWRa80DoCvvvVM9LWiFB32vhy1DRDyris7-gpF7Z6BSPrsxZsM_aem_Zbw7iTyAx_1VEtcd6NhlwQ
2. TV5 news	https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1RzN7YHWM1/
3. Marshall media and news	https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1DMLgtVS5X/
4. iKon news	https://ikon.mn/n/3m1t
5. NAMEM weather forecast	https://www.facebook.com/Mongolianweather

National Society Actions

Have the National Society conducted any intervention additionally to those part of this DREF Operation?	Yes
Please provide a brief description of those additional activities	Due to the occasional snowstorm, the ongoing Dzud condition was exacerbated beyond the DREF target areas; the MRCS sought financial support outside the IFRC DREF and allocated approximately MNT 196,000,000 or CHF 50,000 to support 600 more households that were not included in the DREF operation, as well as to scale up coverage in the same affected provinces, including Bayan-Ulgii, Bulgan, Dundgovi, Khentii, and Selenge provinces. The type of assistance included the distribution of multi-purpose cash, food parcels, and animal care kits. The assistance was provided with the support of the Red Cross Society of China, Erdenet Mining Corporation SOE, Major Drilling Mongolia, and Gandan Monastery.



IFRC Network Actions Related To The Current Event

Secretariat	The IFRC supported the MRCS through its IFRC Country Cluster Delegation (CCD) for East Asia based in Beijing and Asia Pacific Regional Office based in Kuala Lumpur and provided technical assistance to the MRCS's response to the event, including the procurement of in-kind assistance.
Participating National Societies	There are no Participating National Societies physically present in Mongolia for this operation. All activities were implemented directly by the Mongolian Red Cross Society (MRCS) through its branch network. However, the Australian Red Cross provided technical support to MRCS on the development and strengthening of Early Action Protocols (EAPs) for Dzud and other hazards, contributing to anticipatory action capacity and longer-term preparedness.

ICRC Actions Related To The Current Event

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) is not present in Mongolia.

Other Actors Actions Related To The Current Event

Government has requested international assistance	No
National authorities	Provincial authorities activated Emergency Commissions and operated under heightened readiness following the severe weather event, including the declaration of "Orange" alert level in Sukhbaatar and Dornod provinces. Search and rescue units, police, border protection forces, fire and rescue services, and local professional teams were mobilized with vehicles and heavy equipment to respond to emergency calls, rescue stranded and missing persons, clear blocked roads, and reopen mountain passes. Early warning and precautionary messages were disseminated through official communication channels. Movement along key transport routes was temporarily restricted during the severe weather, while authorities subsequently deployed personnel and heavy equipment to clear snow-blocked roads and mountain passes and restore access to affected communities. State Emergency Commission working groups also conducted field assessments and supported response measures in provinces classified as being at high or very high risk. As part of the broader government response to the February storm and difficult winter and spring conditions, 20 high-mobility vehicles, two motor graders and five loaders were deployed, while 796 tonnes of hay and 8,154 tonnes of livestock feed were released from the state reserve, together with 50 tonnes of fuel for each province, to support affected communities, maintain essential services and facilitate access to snow-affected areas.

Are there major coordination mechanism in place?

At the national level, coordination was led by the State Emergency Commission (SEC) through the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC), chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister. The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) served as the technical and operational lead for disaster response coordination, including information management, oversight of search and rescue, and inter-agency tasking.

The MRCS participated in the national coordination structure in its auxiliary role to the Government in humanitarian affairs and as a member of the national emergency coordination platform. MRCS contributed field-level assessment data, participated in response-planning discussions, and aligned its humanitarian interventions with national response priorities. Although MRCS did not lead the national coordination mechanism, it played a recognized role as an operational partner within the EOC framework. No formal humanitarian cluster system was activated, as coordination remained government-led. Consequently, sectoral coordination, including for livelihoods, shelter, and mental health and psychosocial support, was managed through the relevant government ministries and agencies rather than through cluster co-lead arrangements.

At the local level, coordination was managed by Provincial Emergency Commissions and Local Emergency Management Agencies (LEMAs) under the authority of provincial governors. At the soum level, local emergency commissions coordinated immediate response activities, including search and rescue operations, road clearance, livestock carcass disposal, and the distribution of government-supported assistance. MRCS mid-level branches actively participated in provincial and soum emergency commission meetings and contributed to local coordination and response planning.

Needs (Gaps) Identified



Livelihoods And Basic Needs

At the onset of the operation, the February snowstorm significantly worsened existing dzud conditions and placed additional pressure on pastoral livelihoods. More than 10,000 herder households across affected provinces faced severe wintering conditions, while livestock losses and displacement, depleted hay and fodder reserves, blocked roads and movement restrictions reduced household coping capacity and temporarily constrained access to markets and essential services.

The DREF operation addressed the most immediate needs of 1,000 highly vulnerable herder households through a combination of multi-purpose cash assistance and animal care kits. The livelihood support helped households meet priority expenses and protect their remaining livestock, while all 1,000 targeted households received the planned animal care kits and cash assistance.

By the end of the operation, the planned assistance had been fully delivered to the targeted households and the acute winter conditions had eased. However, broader livelihood recovery needs remained among affected communities. The Lessons Learned Workshop highlighted continued financial pressure on some rural households, including debt burdens and difficulties maintaining access to banking services.

Participants also identified poor road conditions, high transportation and fuel costs, and continued physical isolation of some households as constraints affecting access to markets and essential services.

These challenges extended beyond the scope and timeframe of the DREF operation and remained relevant for longer-term livelihood recovery and preparedness.



Multi purpose cash grants

At the beginning of the operation, affected herder households required immediate and flexible financial support to meet essential needs, including food, heating fuel, transportation, hay and fodder, medicines and other household expenses. Although markets remained functional in most soum centres, access was uneven in remote areas because of severe weather and temporary road closures.

The DREF operation responded by providing MNT 660,000 in multi-purpose cash assistance to each of the 1,000 targeted households.

Transfers were completed between 20 March and 13 April 2026 through MRCS's Financial Service Provider arrangement.

By closure, the planned cash assistance had been fully delivered. However, the Lessons Learned Workshop indicated that financial vulnerability remained a broader concern for some rural households, particularly in relation to debt, unstable income, and access to active bank accounts.

These issues were beyond the scope of the one-off emergency cash transfer but highlighted the importance of maintaining accessible financial service arrangements and clear beneficiary communication in future responses.



Initially, the snowstorm created physical and psychosocial health risks through exposure to extreme cold, injuries, isolation, and difficulties accessing health services. Poor road conditions and transport disruption particularly affected households in remote areas.

The operation addressed these needs by providing first aid kits to 1,000 targeted households, training 50 volunteers in MHPSS and first aid, and providing fuel support to local health facilities in nine affected provinces to help maintain outreach and emergency services in remote communities.

By closure, the planned health interventions were complete, and local first aid and psychosocial support capacity had been strengthened. Nevertheless, access to health services remained a broader challenge in some remote communities. The Lessons Learned Workshop noted that poor roads continued to make travel to health facilities difficult and that some isolated households could not regularly access services or assistance.

The operation also identified a monitoring gap in systematically recording people reached through Psychological First Aid and other informal MHPSS support, which will inform future response monitoring approaches.



Community Engagement And Accountability

At the start of the operation, affected households urgently needed timely, accessible information, especially on assistance, eligibility criteria, distribution arrangements, and safety information. Geographic isolation, poor connectivity, and changing access conditions increased the risk that households in remote areas would receive information late or inconsistently.

The operation responded through multiple communication and feedback channels, including branch staff and volunteers, hotline and telephone communication, social media and chatbox platforms, complaint boxes, and direct community engagement. Information and preparedness materials were also developed and distributed to herder households.

By the end of the operation, these mechanisms had enabled information sharing and feedback throughout implementation. However, the Lessons Learned Workshop confirmed that information gaps remained a challenge for some remote households due to limited radio, television, and internet coverage and inconsistencies between communication channels and intended recipients. Participants highlighted the importance of stronger multi-channel communication, continued engagement with bagh and soum authorities, community groups and local media, and adapted approaches for households unable to participate in regular community meetings.

Operational Strategy

Overall objective of the operation

The IFRC-DREF operation aimed to reduce the immediate humanitarian impact of the severe snowstorm on 1,000 of the most vulnerable herder households, representing an estimated 3,700 people. The target population was calculated using an average household size of 3.7 persons, a planning figure commonly used by humanitarian organizations in Mongolia. The operation provided targeted multi-purpose cash assistance, livelihood support, mental health and psychosocial support, and strengthened basic health and first aid capacity.

Overall, the operation reached 4,559 people across 1,000 households, exceeding the initial population target while fully achieving the



planned household coverage. These interventions enabled affected families to meet their urgent basic needs and helped reduce further humanitarian and livelihood risks during the four-month implementation period.

Operation strategy rationale

The operation was designed to address the immediate humanitarian and livelihood impacts of the February 2026 snowstorm, which sharply worsened existing dzud conditions. The most urgent needs identified were immediate purchasing power for affected herder households, protection of remaining livestock, access to basic health and first aid support, psychosocial support, and timely information and feedback mechanisms. These priorities reflected the high dependence of affected households on livestock, depleted household and fodder reserves, temporary isolation caused by blocked roads, and increased health and protection risks associated with extreme cold and difficult access conditions.

Based on these needs, the operation adopted an integrated approach combining multi-purpose cash assistance, livelihood protection, health and psychosocial support, and community engagement and accountability. Multi-purpose cash assistance was selected because markets remained functional in most soum centres and allowed households to prioritize different needs according to their circumstances, including food, fuel, transportation, medicines, hay and fodder. Each targeted household received MNT 660,000 through MRCS's existing Financial Service Provider arrangement.

Cash assistance was complemented by animal care kits because livestock represented the primary livelihood asset of affected herder households, and preventing further deterioration of livestock health was important for reducing longer-term livelihood losses. Centralized procurement was used because some livestock care items were not consistently available in remote local markets, and standardized procurement helped ensure quality and availability.

The operation also prioritized basic health, first aid, and mental health and psychosocial support in response to exposure-related injuries, extreme cold, isolation, and stress experienced by affected households. First aid kits were provided to targeted households, while volunteers received first aid and MHPSS refresher training to strengthen community-level support. Limited fuel assistance was also provided to health facilities in affected provinces to help maintain outreach and emergency health services where transportation and access remained difficult.

Several contextual factors influenced how the strategy was implemented. The wide geographic distribution of affected households, long travel distances, changing weather and road conditions, and varying access to communications required flexible and decentralized implementation through MRCS mid-level branches and volunteers. Beneficiary verification and delivery arrangements were coordinated with local authorities, while distribution schedules and field movements were adjusted according to weather and access conditions.

Logistics and procurement supported the timely delivery of assistance. MRCS used existing supplier framework arrangements where possible, centrally procured animal care kits and coordinated the technical review and procurement of first aid kits with IFRC technical teams. Procurement and beneficiary verification were conducted in parallel where feasible to reduce delays, while branch-level distribution arrangements supported last-mile delivery to remote households.

Communication and community engagement were integrated throughout the response to ensure that households understood the available assistance, eligibility criteria and delivery arrangements and had opportunities to provide feedback. MRCS used direct telephone communication, branch staff and volunteers, social media, hotline services, complaint boxes and other community feedback channels. These mechanisms were particularly important given the geographic isolation and uneven connectivity of some affected communities.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting (PMER) supported beneficiary verification, implementation monitoring, accountability and operational learning. Post-distribution monitoring assessed the receipt, accessibility, relevance and usefulness of the assistance. A joint IFRC-MRCS monitoring mission was conducted in June, and the Lessons Learned Workshop brought together representatives from affected branches to review implementation experience, identify challenges, and capture recommendations for future responses.

At the end of the operation on 30 June 2026, the acute snowstorm response had transitioned toward recovery and seasonal preparedness. Planned cash and in-kind assistance had been completed, while closure activities focused on post-distribution monitoring, documenting lessons and strengthening preparedness for future winter emergencies. The operation also left strengthened capacity among MRCS branches and volunteers through training, field implementation experience, and lessons learned, which could be applied in subsequent dzud and severe-weather preparedness and response.



Targeting Strategy

Who was targeted by this operation?

This operation targeted 1,000 of the most vulnerable pastoral herder households affected by the snowstorm, representing approximately 3,700 people. This accounted for around 10 percent of the more than 10,000 households identified as being in need through preliminary assessments, taking into consideration the resources available to the operation. The intervention prioritized households experiencing severe wintering conditions, livestock losses or displacement, isolation caused by blocked roads, and reduced coping capacity. The primary geographic focus was limited, and dependence on livestock as the main source of livelihood was highest.

The targeting approach was based on the scale and severity of snowstorm-related impacts. Households that experienced confirmed damage to housing or other assets, livestock mortality, or significant livestock displacement were considered to be at heightened risk of income loss and food insecurity. As livestock represented the primary livelihood asset for pastoral families, even moderate losses could significantly reduce or eliminate the annual income of small-scale herders. Geographically isolated households faced additional risks because of limited access to markets, fuel, health services, and emergency assistance.

Priority was given to vulnerable households within affected communities that met the established needs and vulnerability criteria, including:

- Households that suffered significant damage to housing or other assets, livestock losses, or livestock displacement or disappearance as a result of the storm;
- Single-headed households;
- Households with older members;
- Households including persons with disabilities or people with chronic illnesses;
- Households including pregnant and lactating women;
- Households with multiple young children; and
- Families undertaking motor movement in remote areas with limited access to essential services.

The household selection and verification process was conducted in coordination with local authorities and community leaders. Snowstorm-related impacts and vulnerability criteria were verified to promote transparency and accountability and to minimize exclusion and inclusion errors. MRCS volunteers and staff from local branches supported household-level verification, community engagement, and post-distribution monitoring to help ensure assistance reached those most at risk.

Initial geographic prioritization, based on reports from MRCS local branches and preliminary impact assessments, included severely affected areas in Dornod and Sukhbaatar provinces in the eastern region; Darkhan-Uul, Orkhon, and Khuvsgul provinces in the northern region; and Khovd, Tuv, Uvs, and Zavkhan provinces in the western region.

Although the affected areas did not host large populations of refugees or internally displaced persons, the operation ensured that migrants, seasonal workers, and unregistered households residing in affected soums were not excluded where they met the established vulnerability criteria. Selection was needs-based and non-discriminatory, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The targeting approach aimed to stabilize the households most at risk, prevent further deterioration of livelihoods, and reduce the likelihood of distress migration and long-term socioeconomic decline following the snowstorm.

Explain the selection criteria for the targeted population

Beneficiary selection was based on the severity of storm-related impacts and households' reduced coping capacity. Priority was given to pastoral herder households that had experienced livestock mortality or displacement, damage to housing or other assets, depleted fodder reserves, or isolation caused by blocked roads. As livestock represented the primary source of household income and food security, such losses directly threatened household well-being and survival, particularly among small-scale herders with limited livestock holdings and no alternative source of income.

The vulnerability criteria further prioritized single-headed households, older persons living alone, households including persons with disabilities or people with chronic illnesses, pregnant or lactating women, households with multiple young children, and families undertaking motor movements in remote areas with limited access to essential services. The overall aim was to direct limited resources towards households facing the greatest livelihood risks and having the lowest capacity to recover independently following the storm.



Total Assisted Population

Assisted Women	1,231	Rural	100%
Assisted Girls (under 18)	1,034	Urban	0%
Assisted Men	1,198	People with disabilities (estimated)	8%
Assisted Boys (under 18)	1,096		
Total Assisted Population	4,559		
Total Targeted Population	3,700		

Risk and Security Considerations (including "management")

Does your National Society have anti-fraud and corruption policy?	Yes
Does your National Society have prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse policy?	Yes
Does your National Society have child protection/child safeguarding policy?	Yes
Does your National Society have whistleblower protection policy?	Yes
Does your National Society have anti-sexual harassment policy?	Yes

Please analyse and indicate potential risks for this operation, its root causes and mitigation actions.

Risk	Mitigation action
Delays in renewal of the Financial Service Provider (FSP) framework agreement or delays in procurement of animal care kits and first aid kits may postpone cash transfers and in-kind distributions, affecting timely assistance to targeted households.	- The MRCS FSP framework agreement was renewed on 19 March 2026. MRCS initiated and closely monitored the renewal of the FSP framework agreement through clear internal timelines and coordination with IFRC. Regular communication was maintained with the FSP to track progress and promptly address documentation and administrative requirements. - Existing supplier framework agreement was used to reduce procurement lead times for the animal care kits. - Procurement planning for First Aid kits was initiated early, and tender documentation was prepared in advance following approval. Close coordination was maintained with the IFRC Country



	Cluster Delegation and the Asia Pacific Regional Office on procurement requirements and compliance standards to facilitate timely review and technical support. Where feasible, procurement processes and beneficiary verification were conducted in parallel to minimize delays and support the timely delivery of cash and in-kind assistance.
Ongoing snowstorms and forecasts of further severe weather may constrain access to remote soums, delay distributions, and exacerbate losses. As seasons shift and temperatures rise during the thaw period, additional seasonal hazards may emerge, disrupting transport routes and increasing public health risks.	- MRCS applied flexible distribution schedules based on real-time weather monitoring and changing access conditions. Close coordination was maintained with local emergency Commissions to obtain updated information on road conditions, accessible routes, and emerging hazards. - Early warning and preparedness messages were integrated into community engagement activities to reduce risks associated with secondary and seasonal hazards. Access constraints were continuously reassessed, and contingency plans were updated to support the timely adaptation of distribution routes, schedules, and delivery arrangements.
Stretched human resources and difficult access to isolated herder settlements (snowdrifts, road pass closures, long distances) may delay assistance delivery and create uneven coverage across multiple target areas and interventions.	MRCS applied a decentralized hub-and-spoke delivery model led by its provincial and soum-level branches, with support from surge volunteers mobilized from neighboring branches and community focal points at the bagh level. Assistance was sequenced by soum or bagh, with the most remote settlements prioritized during the first safe access windows. Relief items were pre-positioned at provincial and soum hubs to shorten last-mile transportation and facilitate timely delivery. Where roads remained closed, MRCS applied flexible assistance modalities, including cash-first and hybrid approaches, to maintain timeliness of assistance while in-kind kits were delivered in phases as access improved. Delivery progress was monitored daily using a remote-settlement coverage checklist, supported by telephone-based communication once access was restored to reach households that had initially been inaccessible.



Please indicate any security and safety concerns for this operation:

The primary safety risks relate to extreme cold temperatures (reaching -48°C), snowstorms, drifting snow, reduced visibility, and icy road conditions. These hazards increase the risk of vehicle accidents, frostbite, hypothermia, and delayed emergency evacuation. Remote soums and herder settlements are often located in isolated areas with limited communication coverage, which may complicate coordination and rapid response in case of an incident.

In addition, ongoing livestock displacement has led some herders to undertake high-risk searches during blizzard conditions. While this behavior primarily affects community members, it also increases exposure risks for volunteers conducting field visits in remote grazing areas. Potential spring thaw and “yellow flood” conditions may further create unstable terrain, contaminated water sources, and sanitation-related public health risks.

To mitigate these risks, MRCS implemented the following measures:

- Coordination with Provincial/local Emergency Commissions to obtain real-time weather, road, and access information before field deployments;
- Enforced travel safety protocols, including the suspension or postponement of travel during active blizzard warnings;
- Used appropriate winter vehicles and equipment and required field teams to travel in pairs or groups;
- Provided adequate winter protective clothing to staff and volunteers;
- Conducted pre-deployment safety briefings covering the prevention of cold-related illness and injury, safe driving practices, and emergency communication procedures;
- Maintained regular communication and safety check-ins between field teams and MRCS mid-level branch offices;
- Ensured compliance with IFRC and MRCS safeguarding and duty-of-care policies; and
- Provided insurance coverage for volunteers while they were carrying out operational duties.

The MRCS security framework applied to National Society staff and volunteers. Where IFRC personnel were deployed, the IFRC security framework applied. Comprehensive measures were implemented to protect the safety and security of all RCRC personnel involved in the operation. These measures included continuous monitoring of the operational context, timely dissemination of security updates, tracking of staff and volunteer movements through telephone or social media communication, security assessments in operational areas, and pre-deployment security briefings.

Contingency plans were also maintained and updated as operational conditions changed. Relevant personnel were required to complete applicable IFRC e-learning courses, including Basic Knowledge and Prevention Measures for Responders, Personal Security, Security Management, and Volunteer Security.

Has the child safeguarding risk analysis assessment been completed?

Yes

Implementation



Livelihoods And Basic Needs

Budget: CHF 79,180

Targeted Persons: 3,700

Assisted Persons: 4,559

Targeted Male: 1,843

Targeted Female: 1,857

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
-------	--------	--------

# of households provided with animal care kits to protect their livestock	1,000	1,000
---	-------	-------

Narrative description of achievements

MRCS completed beneficiary registration and verification in coordination with relevant mid-level branches and local authorities. Following this process, the operation provided livelihood support to 1,000 targeted herder households through animal care kits. In addition, 3,000 bales of hay were distributed in three provinces where livestock feed reserves were unavailable, providing complementary support to help households protect their remaining livestock during the difficult winter and spring conditions.

The animal care kits were centrally procured by MRCS through its existing supplier framework agreement. The kits were dispatched from Ulaanbaatar to the affected provinces on 16 March 2026 and subsequently delivered to targeted households between 18 March and 13 April 2026.

Following completion of the assistance, MRCS conducted Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) to assess the receipt, timeliness, relevance and usefulness of the livelihood support. Approximately 100 assisted households across 80 soums participated in the survey, representing around 10 per cent of the 1,000 households assisted under the operation.

The PDM findings indicated a high level of satisfaction with the livelihood assistance. Surveyed households confirmed receipt of the animal care kits, and beneficiaries reported using the products to treat eye and hoof conditions, support livestock nutrition and improve the condition of weakened animals. Respondents also reported positive effects on livestock health and condition. Beneficiary feedback indicated that the 3,000 bales of hay, together with the animal care products, contributed to supporting livestock survival and reducing further livestock losses during the response period.

Overall, the findings demonstrated the relevance of combining livestock feed support with animal care products to protect the primary livelihood assets of affected herder households.

Lessons Learnt

- Early beneficiary registration and verification, combined with close coordination with mid-level branches and local authorities, supported timely delivery of assistance. The use of an existing supplier framework agreement also helped accelerate procurement and ensure standardized animal care kits. The experience reinforced the importance of early planning, decentralized delivery through branches, and PDM to assess the relevance of assistance and capture community feedback.

Challenges

- Remote locations, long travel distances, changing weather and road conditions, and limited branch capacity created challenges for last-mile delivery. Reaching geographically dispersed households required additional coordination and flexibility in delivery arrangements. Follow-up and post-distribution monitoring were adapted to local access and communication conditions to ensure adequate coverage of targeted households



Multi Purpose Cash

Budget: CHF 165,793
Targeted Persons: 3,700
Assisted Persons: 4,559
Targeted Male: 1,843
Targeted Female: 1,857

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
# of households provided with cash assistance to meet their basic	1,000	1,000



Narrative description of achievements

MRCS extended its existing Financial Service Provider (FSP) framework agreement for a further two years, with the extension effective from 19 March 2026. Following beneficiary registration and verification, cash assistance was successfully transferred to targeted households between 20 March and 13 April 2026 through the MRCS FSP arrangement. Targeted households were informed about the cash transfer and related arrangements by MRCS mid-level branch staff and volunteers through direct phone calls, social media group messaging, public information posts and physical certification of humanitarian assistance.

Following the completion of cash assistance, MRCS conducted Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM), covering approximately 100 households, representing around 10 per cent of the 1,000 assisted households. A systematic random sampling approach was applied using the beneficiary list, with a random starting point followed by the selection of approximately every 10th household. This resulted in survey coverage across 80 soums in the intervention areas.

The PDM findings showed that the cash assistance was highly relevant to household needs. Between 90 and 100 per cent of surveyed households assessed the cash support as highly useful and reported that it helped reduce immediate financial pressure and support household livelihoods. Households reported using the cash primarily for food, medicines and other essential household needs.

Overall, the findings confirmed that MPCA provided households with the flexibility to prioritize expenditures according to their individual needs during the emergency and complemented the livelihood assistance provided under the operation.

Lessons Learnt

- The operation demonstrated the value of maintaining an established FSP arrangement, which enabled cash assistance to be delivered promptly following the framework agreement extension. Early beneficiary verification and the use of multiple communication channels through mid-level branches and volunteers also helped ensure that targeted households were informed about the assistance and transfer arrangements.
- The experience also highlighted the importance of strengthening contingency arrangements for cash delivery. For future emergency operations, MRCS should consider establishing framework agreements with one or two additional FSPs as backup options to the primary provider. Having alternative FSP arrangements in place would help reduce operational risk and support continuity of cash transfers in the event of delays, service disruptions, limited geographic coverage, or other constraints affecting the primary FSP.

Challenges

- The timing of the FSP framework agreement extension required close coordination to maintain continuity of cash delivery. In remote areas, varying levels of phone and internet connectivity also required flexible communication and follow-up through branch staff and volunteers to ensure that beneficiary information was received.



Health

Budget: CHF 37,970
Targeted Persons: 3,700
Assisted Persons: 4,559
Targeted Male: 1,843
Targeted Female: 1,857

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
# of households provided with first aid kits to meet their medical needs	1,000	1,000

# of volunteers trained in MHPSS	45	50
# of volunteers received First Aid Refresher Training	45	50

Narrative description of achievements

MRCS completed the procurement of first aid kits following the required technical review with the IFRC medical logistics team. The approval and procurement process took approximately three months, after which the first aid kits were distributed to the targeted regions and delivered to households within the operational timeframe.

To complement the provision of first aid kits, MHPSS and first aid refresher training was organized from 10–13 March 2026, involving 50 volunteers (18 men and 32 women). The training strengthened volunteers' capacity to provide basic psychosocial support and first aid services to affected households during field-level response activities.

Following the training, volunteers integrated Psychological First Aid (PFA) and basic psychosocial support into their regular engagement with affected households. Support was provided during door-to-door visits, field interactions and telephone communication, depending on the needs identified by volunteers. This approach enabled volunteers to provide immediate psychosocial support to affected herder households, including those in remote areas where access was difficult. As PFA was often provided informally as part of wider household visits and operational activities, rather than through separately scheduled MHPSS sessions, individual recipients were not consistently recorded. Therefore, a reliable total number of people reached through MHPSS/PFA could not be reported.

In addition to distributing first aid kits, trained MRCS volunteers provided basic guidance to beneficiary households on the contents and appropriate use of the kits, including basic first aid measures relevant to common injuries and cold-related emergencies. This helped strengthen household-level preparedness and the ability of families in remote areas to provide immediate assistance while awaiting access to formal health services.

To support continued access to essential and life-saving health services in remote and severely affected areas, MRCS also provided fuel support to nine local health facilities in Dornod, Darkhan-Uul, Sukhbaatar, Orkhon, Khuvsgul, Khovd, Zavkhan, Tuv and Uvs provinces. This support helped local health services maintain outreach and emergency service delivery to communities facing difficult access conditions.

Lessons Learnt

- The operation highlighted the importance of initiating technical review and procurement processes for health-related items as early as possible, particularly where specialized IFRC review or approval is required. Close coordination with IFRC technical teams helped ensure that first aid kits met required standards while still being delivered within the operational timeframe. The experience also demonstrated the value of combining material assistance with volunteer capacity strengthening and support to local health facilities. MHPSS and first aid refresher training strengthened volunteers' ability to provide community-level support, while targeted fuel assistance helped local clinics maintain outreach to remote and hard-to-reach communities.
- The operation highlighted the importance of including a beneficiary-level MHPSS indicator at the planning stage, such as the number of people receiving Psychological First Aid (PFA) or basic psychosocial support. Without a clearly defined indicator for actual reach, it was difficult to establish appropriate monitoring tools and systematically record the number of people supported. Future emergency operations should therefore integrate MHPSS reach indicators, simple data collection tools, and clear reporting responsibilities from the outset to enable more consistent monitoring of psychosocial support provided to affected communities.

Challenges

- The main challenge was accurately tracking and recording the number of people who received MHPSS services. Psychological First Aid (PFA), as the basic level of psychosocial support, was often provided directly during door-to-door visits, field interactions, or telephone communication, depending on immediate needs identified by volunteers. As support was frequently provided through practical, on-the-spot decision-making rather than scheduled sessions, consistently capturing individual reach figures was difficult. This highlighted the need for simple and practical recording tools that volunteers can use during field visits and remote follow-up without disrupting service delivery.
- The technical review and approval process for first aid kits required approximately three months, reducing the available implementation window for procurement and distribution. Reaching remote communities with health and MHPSS services also required continued coordination with local branches and health facilities. Limited transport capacity and long distances into the affected



communities further reinforced the need for flexible approaches, including support to local clinics and trained volunteers to bring essential services to affected households.



Community Engagement And Accountability

Budget: CHF 12,734
Targeted Persons: 3,700
Assisted Persons: 4,559
Targeted Male: 1,843
Targeted Female: 1,857

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
# of people reached with information on the operation, including assistance details, selection criteria, and relevant risk communication	3,700	4,559
% of feedback received is addressed	80	100

Narrative description of achievements

MRCS developed a handbook on traditional herding practices covering herders' health, livestock disease prevention, traditional knowledge and practices, and practical advice for young herders. MRCS also developed IEC materials on disaster preparedness exercises for herder communities. A total of 2,000 copies of these materials were produced for herder households to strengthen knowledge of resilience, multi-hazard preparedness and the continuation of positive traditional practices. Early warning and preparedness messages were also disseminated through MRCS mid-level branches, volunteers, social media and other communication channels.

Alongside the dissemination of information, the operation maintained multiple feedback mechanisms, including hotline services, direct communication with branch staff and volunteers, in-person feedback, complaint boxes, and social media and chatbox platforms. Approximately 5 per cent of targeted beneficiary households provided feedback through the hotline and phone calls, with most inquiries relating to the limited number of households that could be supported under the operation. These inquiries were addressed by trained personnel and CEA staff, who explained the beneficiary selection criteria. No major complaints were recorded across the affected regions.

To improve accessibility for vulnerable and remote households, MRCS used multiple communication and feedback channels rather than relying on a single method. Information was shared through direct phone calls, in-person communication by branch staff and volunteers, hotline services, social media and chatbox platforms, and community-level engagement. For households in remote areas with limited phone or internet connectivity, branch staff and volunteers provided direct follow-up and face-to-face communication where feasible. This approach helped ensure that older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant and lactating women, and other vulnerable households could access information on assistance, eligibility and feedback mechanisms through locally appropriate channels. The experience also reinforced the importance of maintaining flexible and inclusive communication approaches for households that may face mobility, connectivity or access barriers.

Following the provision of MPCA and livelihood assistance, MRCS conducted Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) to assess beneficiary satisfaction, accessibility and relevance of the assistance, as well as community feedback, while supporting transparency and accountability throughout the operation. The PDM provided additional evidence on accountability and communication, with surveyed households reporting high overall satisfaction with the assistance and confirming that support was received promptly.

Beneficiary feedback further highlighted the importance of reliable information, direct household engagement and continued follow-up, particularly for households living in remote and isolated areas. Respondents emphasized the value of having people visit affected households to provide information and psychosocial support during severe weather conditions. These findings reinforced the importance of maintaining multiple communication and feedback channels and ensuring that information on assistance, targeting criteria and available support is clear, timely and accessible to affected communities.



Lessons Learnt

• The operation demonstrated the value of using multiple communication and feedback channels to reach dispersed herder communities. Combining printed guidance materials, branch and volunteer communication, hotline services, and social media helped strengthen access to information and provided communities with different options to raise questions or provide feedback. Feedback received also showed the importance of clearly communicating targeting criteria and resource limitations from the outset.

Challenges

• A key challenge was managing community expectations where needs exceeded the number of households that the operation could support. Most feedback received related to questions about beneficiary coverage and targeting limitations. This highlighted the need for continued clear and consistent communication on selection criteria, available resources, and the scope of assistance, particularly in communities where many households faced similar levels of need.



Secretariat Services

Budget: CHF 23,015

Targeted Persons: 0

Assisted Persons: 0

Targeted Male: 0

Targeted Female: 0

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
# of monitoring visits conducted	3	1

Narrative description of achievements

The IFRC CCD Beijing and APRO conducted a joint field monitoring mission with MRCS from 8–12 June 2026 in Ulaanbaatar and Dornod Province, Mongolia, to review the MRCS DREF response. The target was one field monitoring visit involving three IFRC colleagues (two from APRO and one from CCD Beijing). Given the availability of IFRC teams, the field monitoring visit was conducted by one colleague from IFRC CCD Beijing and one from APRO.

In addition to the monitoring mission, IFRC CCD Beijing, APRO and Geneva provided technical support to MRCS for the renewal of the Framework Agreement (FA) with the Financial Service Provider (FSP), as well as for the procurement of animal care kits and first aid kits.

IFRC also supported communications and visibility efforts for the operation through social media and other communication channels, highlighting the response and support provided to affected communities. Relevant communications and visibility materials are provided below:

- <https://x.com/IFRCAsiaPacific/status/2033764110077485096?s=20>
- <https://x.com/IFRCAsiaPacific/status/2029469823936368925?s=20>
- https://x.com/IFRC_DREF/status/2032041581956469233?s=20
- <https://x.com/Xcastel/status/2032102851590111548?s=20>
- <https://x.com/IFRCAsiaPacific/status/2098341582714069329?s=20>
- https://www.linkedin.com/posts/olga-dzhumaeva-53570358_drefinaction-localization-ugcPost-7433079898275192832-c5s4/
- <https://www.linkedin.com/posts/mongolia-red-cross-responds-to-snowstorm-ugcPost-7435234874334003200-ArF1/>

Lessons Learnt

• Through interviews with MRCS NHQ, MRCS branches, local governments and assisted herder households, the mission confirmed the aid's high relevance and effectiveness in protecting livestock and livelihoods amid disrupted grazing and transport, with strong early-warning systems, local coordination, and beneficiary appreciation, though cash-transfer notifications caused some access delays;



recommendations include better SMS alerts, digital monitoring tools, pre-positioned mineral licks, enhanced shelter preparedness, and greater attention to steppe-fire risks alongside dzud and winter hazards.

Challenges

• The technical review of first aid kit items by IFRC Geneva requests the NS to provide a thorough and detailed list of information on the items, which requires the NS to invest in considerable time and dedicated human resources. The limited human resources in IFRC Geneva to review the documents also poses challenges to ensure the review could be done within a short time frame. Together these factors hinder the timely procurement and delivery of the first aid items.

National Society Strengthening

Budget: CHF 30,698
Targeted Persons: 0
Assisted Persons: 0
Targeted Male: -
Targeted Female: -

Indicators

Title	Target	Actual
# of lessons learned workshops conducted	1	1
# of volunteers mobilised	300	300

Narrative description of achievements

MRCS mobilized 300 trained volunteers (133 men and 167 women) to support the implementation of the operation across the targeted areas. Before deployment, volunteers were briefed on the operational objectives, roles and responsibilities, distribution procedures, beneficiary verification, reporting requirements and coordination arrangements. To support their safe deployment, safety and security briefings covered extreme cold, severe weather, safe travel, emergency communication and movement restrictions during blizzards. Volunteers were also oriented on safeguarding, the MRCS Code of Conduct, confidentiality, non-discrimination, Community Engagement and Accountability, Protection, Gender and Inclusion, and appropriate feedback and referral mechanisms. Following these briefings, volunteers supported beneficiary verification, community outreach, cash and in-kind distributions, communication with remote households, feedback collection and post-distribution monitoring.

To review the implementation of the operation and capture learning from the response, MRCS organized a Lessons Learned Workshop (LLW) from 3–5 June 2026, bringing together 28 representatives (13 men and 15 women) from affected mid-level branches involved in the humanitarian response. The workshop provided a platform to discuss key achievements and challenges and share good practices and field experiences. Participants reflected on response coordination, assistance delivery, operational processes and branch-level experiences, and identified practical lessons and recommendations to strengthen future emergency preparedness and response.

Among the key findings, participants highlighted the need to better address the challenges faced by remote herder households, including financial constraints, difficult road conditions, high transportation costs and limited access to essential services. Participants also identified gaps in timely and consistent information sharing, particularly for isolated households, and emphasized the need to use multiple, locally appropriate communication channels to ensure that information reaches communities effectively.

Building on these findings, the workshop also highlighted the importance of stronger coordination with bagh and soum authorities, community groups, local media and other relevant stakeholders. Recommendations focused on expanding outreach to remote households, providing clearer guidance and information to beneficiaries, and strengthening local coordination to ensure that future assistance is timely, accessible, well-coordinated and responsive to the specific needs of affected communities.



Lessons Learnt

- The operation demonstrated the importance of early volunteer mobilization and strong engagement of MRCS local branches in reaching remote and dispersed herder communities. Clear pre-deployment briefings, defined roles, and regular coordination helped volunteers support beneficiary verification, distributions, community engagement, and monitoring.
- As part of MRCS preparedness efforts, volunteers had previously received refresher training that included self-care and staff-care considerations for maintaining their physical and mental well-being during emergency response. Volunteers were also equipped with Red Cross disaster response team uniforms and appropriate protective clothing to support their safety and readiness for deployment.
- The operation further reinforced the value of integrating volunteer well-being into preparedness and response arrangements. Future operations can continue strengthening this approach through regular well-being check-ins, appropriate rest and rotation during prolonged deployments, peer support and post-deployment reflection or debriefing, particularly where volunteers are working for extended periods in remote and demanding conditions.

Challenges

- Key challenges included difficult access to remote communities, long travel distances, fluctuating weather conditions, and increased workloads for branch staff and volunteers. Differences in operational capacity and experience between locations also affected implementation. These experiences highlighted the need for continued investment in branch and volunteer preparedness, clearer operational guidance, stronger coordination and information-sharing, and systematic follow-up on lessons identified during the response.



Financial Report



DREF Operation

Final Report (CHF)

Date from: 1 Feb 2026 to 31 Aug 2026

MDRMN021 - Mongolia - Snowstorm 2026

Operating timeframe: *Start date: 27-Feb-2026 End date: 30-Jun-2026*

Appeal launch date: *04-Mar-2026*

I. Summary

	Actual (CHF)
Opening Balance	0
Funds & Other Income	349,389
DREF Response Pillar	349,389
DREF Anticipatory Pillar	
Expenditure	-349,390
Closing Balance	-1

II. Expenditure by planned operations / enabling approaches

Description	Budget	Expenditure	Variance
PO01 - Shelter and Basic Household Items			
PO02 - Livelihoods	74,349	79,180	-4,831
PO03 - Multi-purpose Cash	155,674	156,982	-1,308
PO04 - Health	40,391	51,854	-11,463
PO05 - Water, Sanitation & Hygiene			
PO06 - Protection, Gender and Inclusion			
PO07 - Education			
PO08 - Migration			
PO09 - Risk Reduction, Climate Adaptation and Recovery	21,324	11	21,313
PO10 - Community Engagement and Accountability	11,957	12,734	-777
PO11 - Environmental Sustainability			
Planned Operations Total	303,695	300,761	2,934
EA01 - Coordination and Partnerships			
EA02 - Secretariat Services	16,610	12,792	3,818
EA03 - National Society Strengthening	29,085	35,837	-6,752
Planned Operations Total	45,695	48,629	-2,934
Total	349,389	349,390	0

III. Expenditure by budget category & group

Prepared on 30-Sep-2026

Page 1 of 2

[Click here for the complete financial report](#)

Please explain variances (if any)

Overall, the operation recorded an expenditure of CHF 349,390 against a total approved budget of CHF 349,389, representing full budget utilization in accordance with DREF financial procedures.

Variance explanation:



Financial implementation remained broadly aligned with the approved budget, with variations across individual budget lines.

In the initially approved MDRMN021 budget, MRCS planned to utilize MNT 65,000,000 (CHF 14,130) for the procurement of first aid kits under PO04 Health. However, following the tendering process, the price offered by the selected supplier amounted to MNT 86,380,000, which was MNT 21,380,000 (approximately CHF 4,730) higher than the original budget. The supplier was selected considering both the complete set of documents provided and the price advantage.

Furthermore, the initially approved budget included CHF 9,000 for IFRC monitoring costs under EA02 Secretariat Services, with the intention of deploying a team of around three people to conduct field monitoring in Mongolia. Due to the limited availability of IFRC colleagues, two colleagues from APRO and CCD Beijing were able to conduct the field monitoring visit. Following discussions between IFRC and MRCS, and with approval from IFRC Geneva, CHF 5,000 was reallocated through a project agreement amendment from the IFRC monitoring budget to MRCS to cover the additional cost of the first aid kit procurement.



Contact Information

For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:

National Society contact:

Munguntuya Sharavnyambuu, Director of Climate change and Disaster management department, munguntuya.sh@redcross.mn, 97699311909

IFRC Appeal Manager: Olga Dzhumaeva, Head of Delegation, CCD for East Asia, olga.dzhumaeva@ifrc.org

IFRC Project Manager: ZHENG Xiao, Senior Officer, Disaster Risk Management, xiao.zheng@ifrc.org, +8618810143243

IFRC focal point for the emergency: Farah Nur Wahyuni Zainuddin, Operations Coordinator, opscoord.eastasia@ifrc.org, +60136503391

[Click here for reference](#)

