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

#### Respondents by Region Coverage

- **33%** of the respondents are involved at Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA) level
- **16%** are from Northern provinces
- **15%** from Capital
- **12%** in Eastern provinces
- **11%** in Southern provinces

#### Respondents by Agency Type

- **32** NGOs
- **31** UN
- **2** clusters

#### Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved

- **33%**: Kabul/HQ (cluster/OCHA)
- **32%**: Kabul/HQ (agency)
- **11%**: Province (agency)
- **7%**: Regional (agency)
- **17%**: Regional (cluster/OCHA)

### Information Management

- **91%** of respondents are aware of the need for data to support programmes
- **69%** are highly dependent on primary-secondary humanitarian data
- **63%** are able to collect their own data, but also depend on other data sources
- **83%** find the coordination and received data relevant to their operations
- **27%** of respondents identify province (organization level) coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns

### Assessments

- **26%** Preferred Data Collection Methods
  - Structured surveys
  - Focus group discussions
  - Key-informed interviews
- **20%** Coordination Level Gaps
  - Field level
  - District level
  - Regional level

### Capacity Building

- **76%** presence of an IM/assessment team/focal person
- **73%** Male
- **27%** Female
- **49%** Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data
- **56%** prefer face-to-face capacity building modality
- **61%** prefer practical and hands-on capacity building approach

### Summary Findings

- **85% Male**
- **15% Female**

### Key Findings

- **Gender-based restrictions**
- **Lack of cooperation from authorities**
- **Insecurity & access constraints**

### Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year

- **34%** Gender-based restrictions
- **25%** Lack of cooperation from authorities
- **15%** Insecurity & access constraints

### Coordination Gaps

- **26%** Percentage

### Preferred Data Collection Methods

- **30%** Structured surveys
- **25%** Focus group discussions
- **26%** Key-informed interviews
- **18%** Observation

### Assessment Gaps and Challenges

- **69%** of respondents participate in data exchange and different active coordination mechanisms
- **54%** cannot share information or data due to its sensitivity
- **83%** of respondents are mostly sources of data and info.
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