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>LNGOs</th>
<th>INGOs</th>
<th>CSDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Respondents</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86% Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Program Coordination or Support Involved</th>
<th>31%: Kabul/HO (agency)</th>
<th>29%: Kabul/HO (cluster/OCHA)</th>
<th>11% Province (agency)</th>
<th>18%: Region (agency)</th>
<th>10% Regional (cluster/OCHA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Information Management**

- Agencies use both quantitative & qualitative data to support programmes: 91%
- Data and information are not timely: 68%
- The data and information are not fully reliable: 31%
- Collects their own data: 79%
- Identified province (organization level): coordination in terms of IM gaps and access concerns: 29%
- Relevant information is not shared: 27%
- Data and information are not timely: 68%

**Assessments**

- Top 3 Challenges in Conducting Assessments Last Year:
  - Gender-based restrictions: 34%
  - Lack of cooperation from authorities: 25%
  - Insecurity and access concerns: 18%

- Coordination Level Gaps:
  - 25%: Information (organization level)
  - 23%: Regional (organization level)
  - 22%: Kabul (cluster level)
  - 15%: Intermediate level
  - 14%: Kabul (cluster level)

- Preferred Data Collection Methods:
  - 28%: Structured surveys
  - 25%: Focus group discussions
  - 25%: Key-informant interviews
  - 28%: Observation

**Capacity Building**

- 71% presence of an IM/Assessment team/focal person
- 24% Female
- 76% Male
- 57% Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data
- 65% prefer practical hands-on capacity building approach
- 5% Intermediate knowledge level in handling protection-sensitive data

**Summary Findings - Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) Cluster**

- Of the respondents involved at Kabul/HO (agency) level:
  - 31% of the respondents are involved in two or more regions
  - 26% in Provinces
  - 29% in Kabul/HQ (agency)
  - 19% in Region (agency)
  - 31% in Region (cluster/OCHA)
  - 13% in Eastern provinces

- Respondents by Agency Type:
  - 46 LNGOs
  - 46 INGOs
  - 7 CSOs

**Respondents by Region Coverage**

- 33% Northern
- 29% Eastern
- 19% Southern
- 31% Western
- 26% North Eastern

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

- Provinces (organization level): 31%
- Regional (cluster level): 25%
- Kabul (organization level): 15%
- Regional (organization level): 14%
- Did not answer: 11%
- Kabul (cluster level): 4%