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

- **LNGOs**: 13
- **INGOs**: 12
- **UN**: 2

Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

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

Respondents by Region Coverage

- Northern: 16
- Western: 16
- Central: 17
- South Eastern: 18
- Eastern: 18

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

Information Management

- Agencies use both quantitative and qualitative data to support programmes
- Data and information are not timely
- 90% of respondents participate in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms
- 65% of respondents highly depend on primary-secondary humanitarian data
- 61% of respondents collect some of their own data, but also depends on other data sources
- 74% of respondents prefer face-to-face modalities
- 87% of respondents find the coordination and received data relevant to their operations

Assessments

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%: Provinces (organization level)
- 24%: Regional (cluster level)
- 21%: Kabul (organization level)
- 20%: Kabul (cluster level)
- 10%: Remaining

Preferred Data Collection Methods

- 28%: Structured surveys
- 24%: Key-informant interviews
- 26%: Focus group discussions
- 18%: Observation

Assessment and Capacities Gaps

- **Lack of access concerns**: 27%
- **Limited access to staff in the field**: 27%
- **Gender-based restrictions**: 27%
- **Lack of cooperation from authorities**: 27%
- **Insecurity and access concerns**: 27%

Capacity Building

- **Presence of an IM/Assessment team/focal person**: 75%
- **Gender concerns**: 52%
- **Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data**: 55%
- **Provincial (organization level)**: 39%
- **Kabul (organization level)**: 26%
- **Regional (cluster level)**: 16%
- **Regional (organization level)**: 13%
- **Kabul (cluster level)**: 3%
- **Did not answer**: 3%

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. Click here to view the online dynamic dashboard for more detailed survey findings. See the succeeding page for sector-specific highlights.