The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

**Information Management Gaps and Challenges**

- **Data and Info. need**: Agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes.
- **Coordination**: Data and info. are not timely and granular enough.
- **Component**: Collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources.
- **Location**: Identified province & regional level coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns.
- **Timing**: Finds the coordination and received data relevant to their operations.

**Assessments**

- **Gender-based restrictions**: 33% of respondents are involved in two or more regions.
- **Coordination Level Gaps**: Regional (cluster level) is the predominant level of respondents.
- **Assessment Gaps and Challenges**: Programmes & Coordination are mostly dependent on data and IM.

**Capacity Building**

- **Female**: 27% of respondents are involved in two or more regions.
- **Male**: 73% of respondents are involved in two or more regions.
- **Skills**: 61% of respondents are involved in two or more regions.
- **Tools**: 67% of respondents are involved in two or more regions.

This mixed in mode analysis is supported by the research of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of iMMAP and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government. The data are the responsibility of the data providers; it does not give an endorsement or acceptance by iMMAP who is only responsible for the visualization.
The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

### Respondents Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>UN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

- 33%: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
- 32%: Kabul/HQ (agency)
- 11%: Province (agency)
- 17%: Regional (agency)

### Information Management

- **Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year**
  - Gender-based restrictions: 34%
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities: 25%
  - Insecurity & access constraints: 15%

- **Coordination Level Gaps**
  - Provincial: 26%
  - Cluster: 21%
  - Kabuli/HQ: 20%

- **Preferred Data Collection Methods**
  - Structured surveys: 30%
  - Focus group discussions: 25%
  - Key-informed interviews: 26%
  - Observation: 18%

### Assessments

- **Assessment Gaps and Challenges**
  - Lack of coordination (organization level): 20%

### Capacity Building

- **Capacity Building Setbacks**
  - Limited access of staff in the field: 61%
  - Gender concerns: 56%
  - No funding: 76%
  - No technical expertise: 49%
  - Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data: 61%

### Respondents by Region Coverage

- 33% of the respondents are involved at Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA) level in terms of program coordination or support

---

**This mixed is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of iMMAP and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government. The data are the responsibility of the data providers; it does not give an endorsement or acceptance by iMMAP who is only responsible for its visualization.**
AFGHANISTAN: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, ASSESSMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING GAPS SURVEY

The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

**Respondents Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents by Agency Type</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>LNGOs</th>
<th>INGOs</th>
<th>CSDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabul/HO (agency)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul/HO (cluster/OCHA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (cluster/OCHA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents by Region Coverage**

- 26% North Eastern
- 33% Northern
- 29% Eastern
- 37% Southern
- 19% Western

Of the respondents are involved at Kabul/HO (agency) level in terms of program coordination or support.

**Information Management**

- 91% agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes
- 64% Data and information are not timely
- 68% 60% participate in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms
- 29% collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources
- 79% 79% finds the coordination and received data relevant to their operations

**Assessments**

- 25% Coordination Level Gaps
  - 25% Provincial (organization level)
  - 23% Regional (organization level)
  - 12% Kabul (cluster level)
  - 14% Kabul (cluster level)

- 22% identified province (organization level) coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns
- 15% Identified province (organization level) coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns

**Assessment Gaps and Challenges**

- 15% Data and information are not timely
- 34% Gender-based restrictions
- 18% Insecurity and access concerns
- 25% Lack of cooperation from authorities
- 25% Preferred Data Collection Methods
  - 28% Structured surveys
  - 25% Focus group discussions
  - 25% Key-informant interviews
  - 19% Observation

**Capacity Building**

- 71% presence of an IM/Assessment team/focal person
- 24% Female
- 76% Male
- 57% prefer face-to-face capacity building modality
- 65% prefer practical hands-on capacity building approach
- 6% No funding
- 50% Gender concerns
- 25% No technical expertise
- 11% No existing modality
- 4% Limited access of parties to the field

**Lowest Data Analysis/IM Capacity at Coordination Level**

- 31% Provinces (organization level)
- 25% Regional (cluster level)
- 15% Kabul (organization level)
- 14% Regional (organization level)
- 11% Did not answer
- 4% Kabul (cluster level)
The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

Respondents Overview

Respondents by Agency Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INGOs</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>Cluster (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LNGOs</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Province (agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Kabul/HC (cluster/OCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Regional (agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Kabul/HC (agency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by Region Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information Management Gaps and Challenges

- **73%** are highly dependent on primary/secondary humanitarian data.
- **58%** collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources.
- **87%** finds the coordination and received data relevant to their operations.
- **67%** participate in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms.

Assessments

- **32%** of the respondents are involved in 2 or more regions.
- **23%** are not timely.

Capacity Building Setbacks

- **29%** funding.
- **76%** prefer face-to-face capacity building.
- **71%** Male.
- **56%** Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data.

Lowest Data Analysis/IM Capacity at Coordination Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Provinces (organization level)</th>
<th>44%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabul (organization level)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (cluster level)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (organization level)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul (cluster level)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Management

### Information Management Gaps and Challenges

- **Data field:** agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes
- **Field:** 96% of respondents use field data and information are not timely
- **Accuracy:** 27% of respondents identified province data and most of their own data, but also depends on other data sources
- **Need:** 56% of respondents collect data and received data relevant to their operations
- **Monitoring:** 67% of respondents find in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms
- **Collection:** Data and information are highly dependent on primary-secondary humanitarian data
- **Sharing:** 67% of respondents cannot share information with field staff

### Information Management Gaps

- **Software shortages:** 25% of respondents lack of software
- **Field shortages:** 16% of respondents lack of field
- **Update:** 15% of respondents lack of update
- **Access:** 38% of respondents lack of access
- **Insecurity & access constraints:** 22% of respondents lack of insecurity & access constraints

### Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year

- **Gender-based restrictions:** 31% of respondents
- **Lack of cooperation from authorities:** 25% of respondents
- **Insecurity & access constraints:** 16% of respondents

### Coordination Level Gaps

- **Limited data analysis:** 20% of respondents
- **Limited data exchange:** 20% of respondents
- **Limited data access:** 15% of respondents
- **Limited data sharing:** 15% of respondents

### Preferred Data Collection Methods

- **Structured surveys:** 30% of respondents
- **Focus group discussions:** 23% of respondents
- **Key-informed interviews:** 25% of respondents
- **Observation:** 19% of respondents

### Assessment Gaps and Challenges

- **Knowledge:** 70% of respondents
- **Budget:** 67% of respondents
- **Gender-based:** 66% of respondents
- **Coordination:** 66% of respondents

### Least Coordination/Analysis

- **Kabul/HQ (agency) level:** 85% of respondents
- **Regional (organization level):** 71% of respondents

### Capacity Building

- **Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data:** 56% of respondents
- **Prefer face-to-face capacity building:** 71% of respondents
- **Preferred funding:** 58% of respondents

### Capacity Building Setbacks

- **No funding:** 29% of respondents
- **No technical expertise:** 71% of respondents
- **Limited access of staff in the field:** 58% of respondents

### Respondents Overview

- **Total Number of Respondents:** 48
- **Male:** 39
- **Female:** 9

### Respondents by Agency Type

- **LNGOs:** 20
- **UN:** 3

### Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

- **Kabul/HQ (agency):** 46%
- **Regional (cluster/OCHA):** 21%
- **Regional (agency):** 17%

### Respondents by Region Coverage

- **Northern:** 20
- **North Eastern:** 16
- **Eastern:** 15
- **South Eastern:** 27
- **Southern:** 17
- **Kabul/HQ (agency):** 20
- **Regional (organization level):** 16
AFGHANISTAN: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, ASSESSMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING GAPS SURVEY

SUMMARY FINDINGS - CHILD PROTECTION - AREA of RESPONSIBILITY (CP-Aor) SUB-CLUSTER

The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

Respondents Overview

Respondents by Agency Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNGOs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGOs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

- 37%: Kabul/HQ (agency)
- 26%: Regional (agency)
- 18%: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
- 9%: Provincial (agency)

Respondents by Region Coverage

- 37% of the respondents are involved in Kabul/HQ (agency) level in terms of program coordination or support
- Other regions are involved in two or more regions

Information Management Gaps and Challenges

- 98% of agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes
- 72% of data and information are not timely
- 41% identified province (organization level) coordination in IM gaps and access concerns
- 74% collects some of their own data, but also depends on various data sources

Assessment Gaps and Challenges

- 74% of programmes and coordination are mostly dependent on data and IM
- 72% of data and information are highly dependent on primary-secondary humanitarian data

Capacity Building

- 74% presence of an IM/assessment team/focal person
- 72% intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data
- 25% prefer face-to-face capacity building approach
- 63% prefer practical hands-on capacity building approach
- 75% of the respondents are involved in Kabul/HQ (agency) level in terms of program coordination or support

Cooperation Level Gaps

- 33%: National (organization level)
- 23%: Regional (cluster level)
- 18%: Provincial (organization level)
- 18%: Regional (organizational level)
- 10%: MFV level

Cooperation Level by Region Coverage

- 63% of the respondents are involved in Kabul/HQ (agency) level in terms of program coordination or support
- Other regions are involved in two or more regions
Respondents by Region Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Proportion of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

Information Management Challenges

- Agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes: 97%
- Data and info are not timely and granular enough: 24%
- Identified province (organization level) coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns: 78%
- Collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources: 76%
- Finds the coordination and received data relevant to their operations: 76%
- Participate in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms: 67%
- Are highly dependent on primary-secondary humanitarian data: 68%
- Cannot share information or data due to its sensitivity: 56%

Assessments

- Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year:
  - Gender-based restrictions: 33%
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities: 24%
  - Reduced presence of partners: 15%

- Preferred Data Collection Methods:
  - Structured surveys: 32%
  - Focus group discussions: 26%
  - Key-informant interviews: 24%

- Coordinate Level Gaps:
  - Data and Information: 32%
  - Funding: 21%
  - Technical Skills: 18%
  - Capacity Building: 15%
  - Programme Coordination & Support: 15%

- Capacity Building Setbacks:
  - Gender concerns: 29%
  - Lack of funding: 29%
  - Limited access to the field: 65%

- Lowest Data Analysis/IM Capacity at Coordination Level:
  - Provinces (organization level): 28%
  - Regional (organization level): 23%
  - Regional (cluster level): 15%
The following paragraphs provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

Respondents by Agency Type

- **17** LNGOs
- **15** INGOS
- **3** CSOs
- **3** UN

**Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved**

- 38%: Kabul/HQ (agency)
- 25%: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
- 10%: Regional (cluster/OCHA)
- 20%: Regional (agency)
- 1%: Provincial (agency)

Information Management Challenges

- Information Management Gaps and Challenges
  - 95% of agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes
  - 24% of respondents cannot perform analysis or data due to its sensitivity
  - 72% are highly dependent on primary-secondary humanitarian data
  - 40% requires structuring and analysis in terms of IM gaps and access concerns
  - 78% collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources

Assessments

- **Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year**
  - Gender-based restrictions: 32%
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities: 24%
  - Reduced presence of partners: 17%

- **Coordination Level Gaps**
  - Provincial (organization level): 25%
  - Regional (cluster level): 24%
  - Regional (organization level): 13%
  - Kabul (cluster level): 13%

- **Preferred Data Collection Methods**
  - Structured surveys: 29%
  - Key-informant interviews: 24%
  - Focus group discussions: 28%
  - Observation: 17%

Capacity Building

- **Gender-based restrictions**
  - Female: 71%
  - Male: 30%
  - No funding: 70%
  - No technical expertise: 68%
  - No existing modality: 60%

**Respondents by Region Coverage**

- 17 in North Eastern
- 15 in North
- 25 in South Eastern
- 14 in Western
- 11 in Southern

**Summary Findings - Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Sub-Cluster**

- The summary findings cover the information management, assessment, and capacity building gaps in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

**Assessment Gaps and Challenges**

- 60% preference for hands-on capacity building approach
- 68% prefer face-to-face capacity building modality
- 71% presence of an IM/Assessment team/focal person
- 30% female participation
- 70% male participation
- 38% of the respondents are involved at Kabul/HQ (agency) level in terms of program coordination or support

**AFGHANISTAN: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, ASSESSMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING GAPS SURVEY**

This mixed method approach was gathered through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The context here is the responsibility of INGOs and does not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United Nations Government. The data on the responsibility of the data providers is not given an endorsement or acceptance by INGOs who are only responsible for its visualization.
AFGHANISTAN: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, ASSESSMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING GAPS SURVEY

The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

Respondents Overview

- **Total Number of Respondents**: 31
- **Gender Distribution**:
  - Male: 90%
  - Female: 10%

Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

- 35%: Kabul/HQ (agency)
- 32%: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
- 10%: Province (agency)
- 13%: Region (agency)

Information Management

- **Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year**:
  - Gender-based restrictions (34%)
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities (27%)
  - Insecurity and access concerns (15%)

- **Coordination Level Gaps**:
  - 28%: Provincial (organization level)
  - 24%: Regional (cluster level)
  - 21%: Kabul (organization level)
  - 17%: Regional (organization level)
  - 10%: Kabul (cluster level)

Assessments

- **Preferred Data Collection Methods**:
  - Structured surveys: 28%
  - Key-informant interviews: 24%
  - Focus group discussions: 26%
  - Observations: 18%

Assessment Gaps and Challenges

- **Programmes & Coordination** are most dependent on data IM
- **Data and information** are highly dependent on primary/secondary humanitarian data
- **74%** of the respondents are involved at Kabul/HQ (agency) level

Respondents by Region Coverage

- 35% of the respondents are involved in two or more regions

Capacity Building

- **Capacity Building Successes**:
  - Female presence: 28%
  - Male presence: 72%

- **Gender Concerns**:
  - No funding: 52%
  - No technical expertise: 58%
  - Limited access of staff in the field: 48%

- **Lowest Data Analysis/IM Capacity** at Coordination Level
  - Provinces (organization level): 39%
  - Kabul (organization level): 26%
  - Regional (cluster level): 16%
  - Regional (organization level): 13%
  - Kabul (cluster level): 3%
  - Did not answer: 3%
The following highlights provide a summary of the survey conducted in February 2023, which aimed to identify gaps in Information Management (IM), Assessments, and Capacity-Building among humanitarian partners, clusters, sub-clusters, and working groups involved in the response efforts in Afghanistan. The feedback gathered during the survey was analyzed to generate crucial evidence that will support advocacy for optimizing humanitarian information management and assessment capacities in the country. This includes improving data exchange mechanisms, assessment priorities, and capacity strengthening efforts.

### Respondents Overview

- **Total Number of Respondents:** 30
- **Male:** 67%
- **Female:** 33%
- **Respondents by Agency Type:**
  - INGOs: 13
  - LNGOs: 11
  - UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA): 2
  - Provincial/Cluster: 3

- **Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved:**
  - 30%: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
  - 23%: Kabul/HQ (agency)
  - 22%: Regional (agency)
  - 13%: Provincial (agency)
  - 5%: Regional (cluster/OCHA)

### Information Management Gaps and Challenges

- Agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes.
- Data and information are not timely.
- 63% of the respondents are highly dependent on primary/secondary humanitarian data.
- Programs & Coordination are mostly dependent on data and IM.
- 80% finds the coordination and received data relevant to their operations.
- 63% protects information or data due to its sensitivity.
- 50% collects some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources.
- 50% cannot share information or data due to its sensitivity.
- 63% cannot share information or data due to its sensitivity.
- 66% cannot share information or data due to its sensitivity.

### Assessments

- **Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year:**
  - Gender-based restrictions: 34%
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities: 28%
  - Lack of interest in joining: 14%

- **Coordination Level Gaps:**

- **Assessment Gaps and Challenges:**

- **Capacity Building:**

- **Gender Concerns:**

- **Capacity Building Setbacks:**

### Lowest Data Analysis/IM Capacity at Coordination Level

- Provinces (organization level): 47%
- Regional (organization level): 20%
- Kabul (organization level): 17%
- Did not answer: 7%
- Regional (cluster level): 7%
- Kabul (cluster level): 3%