Survey on the Inter-Agency Contingency Planning Guidelines for Humanitarian Assistance

Survey Results

View Individual Responses

1. Type of organisation you work for (select one)

International NGO		3	8%
National NGO		0	0%
Red Cross Red Crescent		2	5%
United Nations/UN agency		28	74%
IOM or other International Organisation		1	3%
Government/National authority		1	3%
Donor		0	0%
Academic Institution		0	0%
Independent consultant/trainer		2	5%
Other, please specify View Responses		1	3%
	Total	38	100%

2. Country where you currently work (select from list)

Afghanistan		1	3%
Albania		0	0%
Algeria		0	0%
American Samoa		0	0%
Andorra		0	0%
Angola		0	0%
Anguilla		0	0%
Antigua and Barbuda		0	0%
Argentina		0	0%
Armenia		0	0%
Aruba (The Netherlands)		0	0%
Australia		0	0%
Austria		0	0%
Azerbaijan		0	0%

Bahamas (the)		0	0%
Bahrain		0	0%
Bangladesh		0	0%
Barbados		0	0%
Belarus		0	0%
Belgium		0	0%
Belize		0	0%
Benin		0	0%
Bermuda		0	0%
Bhutan		0	0%
Bolivia		0	0%
Bosnia and Herzegovina		0	0%
Botswana		0	0%
Brazil		0	0%
Bulgaria		0	0%
Burkina Faso		0	0%
Burundi		0	0%
Cambodia		0	0%
Cameroon		0	0%
Canada		1	3%
Cape Verde		0	0%
Cayman Islands		0	0%
Central African Republic (the)		0	0%
Chad		0	0%
Channel Islands		0	0%
Chile		0	0%
China		0	0%
China - Hong Kong (Special Administrative Region)		0	0%
China - Macau (Special Administrative Region)		0	0%
China - Taiwan Province		0	0%
Colombia		1	3%
Comoros (the)		0	0%
Congo (the)		0	0%
Cook Islands		0	0%
Costa Rica		0	0%
Côte d'Ivoire		3	8%
Croatia		0	0%
Cuba		0	0%

Cyprus		0	0%
Czech Republic (the)		0	0%
Democratic People's Republic of Korea (the)		0	0%
Democratic Republic of the Congo (the)		0	0%
Denmark		0	0%
Djibouti		0	0%
Dominica		0	0%
Dominican Republic (the)	▬	1	3%
Ecuador		0	0%
Egypt		0	0%
El Salvador		0	0%
Equatorial Guinea		0	0%
Eritrea		0	0%
Estonia		0	0%
Ethiopia		0	0%
Fiji		0	0%
Finland		0	0%
France		0	0%
Gabon		0	0%
Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)		0	0%
Gambia (the)		0	0%
General		0	0%
Georgia		0	0%
Germany		0	0%
Ghana		0	0%
Gibraltar		0	0%
Greece		0	0%
Greenland (Denmark)		0	0%
Grenada		0	0%
Guadeloupe (France)		0	0%
Guam		0	0%
Guatemala	▬	2	5%
Guinea		0	0%
Guinea-Bissau		0	0%
Guya		0	0%
Haiti		0	0%
Holy See (the)		0	0%
Honduras	▬	2	5%
Hungary		0	0%

Iceland		0	0%
India		0	0%
Indonesia		0	0%
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		0	0%
Iraq		0	0%
Ireland		0	0%
Israel		0	0%
Italy		1	3%
Jamaica		0	0%
Japan		0	0%
Jordan		0	0%
Kazakhstan		0	0%
Kenya		1	3%
Kiribati		0	0%
Kuwait		0	0%
Kyrgyzstan		0	0%
Lao People's Democratic Republic (the)		0	0%
Latvia		0	0%
Lebanon		0	0%
Lesotho		0	0%
Liberia		0	0%
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (the)		0	0%
Liechtenstein		0	0%
Lithuania		0	0%
Luxembourg		0	0%
Madagascar		0	0%
Malawi		0	0%
Malaysia		1	3%
Maldives		0	0%
Mali		0	0%
Malta		0	0%
Marshall Islands (the)		0	0%
Martinique (France)		0	0%
Mauritania		1	3%
Mauritius		0	0%
Mayotte (France)		0	0%
Mexico		0	0%
Micronesia (Federated States of)		0	0%
Moldova		0	0%

Monaco		0	0%
Mongolia		0	0%
Montenegro		0	0%
Montserrat		0	0%
Morocco		0	0%
Mozambique		0	0%
Myanmar		0	0%
Namibia		0	0%
Nauru		0	0%
Nepal		3	8%
Netherlands (the)		0	0%
New Caledonia (France)		0	0%
New Zealand		0	0%
Nicaragua		0	0%
Niger (the)		0	0%
Nigeria		0	0%
Norway		0	0%
occupied Palestinian territory		1	3%
Oman		0	0%
Pakistan		0	0%
Palau		0	0%
Panama		1	3%
Papua New Guinea		0	0%
Paraguay		0	0%
Peru		0	0%
Philippines (the)		0	0%
Pitcairn Island		0	0%
Poland		0	0%
Portugal		0	0%
Qatar		0	0%
Republic of Korea (the)		0	0%
Réunion (France)		0	0%
Romania		0	0%
Russian Federation (the)		0	0%
Rwanda		0	0%
Saint Helena		0	0%
Saint Kitts and Nevis		0	0%
Saint Lucia		0	0%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		0	0%

Country		Count	Percent
Samoa		0	0%
San Marino		0	0%
Sao Tome and Principe		0	0%
Saudi Arabia		0	0%
Senegal		0	0%
Serbia		0	0%
Seychelles		0	0%
Sierra Leone		0	0%
Singapore		0	0%
Slovakia		0	0%
Slovenia		0	0%
Solomon Islands		0	0%
Somalia	▬	1	3%
South Africa		0	0%
Spain		0	0%
Sri Lanka		0	0%
Sudan (the)		0	0%
Suriname		0	0%
Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands		0	0%
Swaziland		0	0%
Sweden		0	0%
Switzerland	▬▬▬▬▬▬	12	32%
Syrian Arab Republic (the)		0	0%
Tajikistan		0	0%
Thailand	▬	3	8%
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		0	0%
Timor-Leste		0	0%
Togo		0	0%
Tokelau		0	0%
Tonga		0	0%
Trinidad and Tobago		0	0%
Tunisia		0	0%
Turkey		0	0%
Turkmenistan		0	0%
Turks and Caicos Islands		0	0%
Tuvalu		0	0%
Uganda	▬	1	3%
Ukraine		0	0%
United Arab Emirates (the)		0	0%

United Kingdom		0	0%
United Republic of Tanzania (the)		0	0%
United States of America (the)		1	3%
United States Virgin Islands		0	0%
Uruguay		0	0%
Uzbekistan		0	0%
Vanuatu		0	0%
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		0	0%
Viet Nam		0	0%
Western Sahara		0	0%
Yemen		0	0%
Zambia		0	0%
Zimbabwe		0	0%
	Total	38	100%

3. In which type of office do you currently work?

Headquarters		13	34%
Regional Office		7	18%
Country Office		13	34%
Field/sub office		3	8%
Other, please specify View Responses		2	5%
	Total	38	100%

4. Which statement best describes your familiarity with and use of this IASC product?

I have never seen it		5	13%
I have seen but not used it		10	26%
I have used it occasionally		17	45%
I use it frequently		6	16%
	Total	38	100%

5. Do you have a copy of this product?

No		2	6%
Yes, in soft copy		14	42%
Yes, in hard copy		1	3%
Yes, both in soft and hard copy		16	48%
	Total	33	100%

6. If Yes, how did you find / receive the document?

From a colleague in my office		6	19%
From my headquarters		4	13%
From another agency		2	6%
From an interagency meeting		5	16%
I downloaded it from the IASC site		7	23%
Found through search engine		0	0%
From an e-mail list		1	3%
From a training course		1	3%
Directly from IASC / IASC subgroup		4	13%
Can't remember		0	0%
Other, please specify View Responses		1	3%
	Total	31	100%

7. How has the product been used?

Project / programme design		10	30%
Training of partners		7	21%
Preparing country/ field level guidance		17	52%
Examples of good practice		12	36%
Advocacy		3	9%
I do not know		2	6%
Other, please specify View Responses		3	9%

8. For this IASC product, how true are the following statements?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not true	Slightly true	Quite true	Very true	Not sure
It is available in my preferred working language	3 9%	0 0%	4 12%	24 73%	2 6%
My HQ has instructed my office to use it	12 36%	3 9%	6 18%	7 21%	5 15%
My organisation is fully committed to its use	2 6%	10 30%	9 27%	8 24%	4 12%
It has been incorporated into my own organisation's	3 9%	6 18%	12 36%	8 24%	4 12%

policy					
In our inter-agency discussions, it is the common standard	4 12%	6 18%	12 36%	7 21%	4 12%
I know at least one organisation actively promoting the use of this product	3 9%	6 18%	7 21%	14 42%	3 9%

9. For this IASC product, how true are the following statements?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not True	Slightly True	Quite True	Very True	Not sure
It is easy to get access to	2 6%	7 21%	11 33%	10 30%	3 9%
It is easy to use	0 0%	7 21%	16 48%	8 24%	2 6%
I use it in my day to day work	13 39%	7 21%	10 30%	3 9%	0 0%
It provides helpful policy guidance	1 3%	7 21%	11 33%	13 39%	1 3%
It includes practical examples relevant to my situation	5 15%	9 27%	12 36%	4 12%	3 9%
It includes good practice based on experience of what works	4 12%	7 21%	10 30%	9 27%	3 9%
It sets realistic and attainable standards	1 3%	5 15%	12 36%	11 33%	4 12%
I have been trained in its use	20 61%	6 18%	3 9%	3 9%	1 3%
It has had a positive impact on our field operations	3 9%	9 27%	10 30%	4 12%	7 21%

10. For this IASC product, how true are the following statements?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not true	Slightly true	Quite true	Very true	Not sure
This product is just one of several sources of guidance on this subject	5 15%	12 36%	5 15%	9 27%	2 6%
I want to use it but don't know how to get a copy	31 94%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%	1 3%
This product is too complicated	22 67%	6 18%	4 12%	0 0%	1 3%
This product is too long	19 58%	8 24%	5 15%	0 0%	1 3%
I follow my own organisation's procedures, rather than IASC guidance	11 33%	8 24%	7 21%	4 12%	3 9%
The product is out of date	25 76%	7 21%	0 0%	0 0%	1 3%

I have a copy but do not have time to read or use it	21 64%	5 15%	5 15%	1 3%	1 3%
I can't keep track of all the sources of guidance on this topic	13 39%	16 48%	3 9%	0 0%	1 3%

11. How could this IASC product be improved?

View 17 Responses

12. How could this IASC product be more widely known and used?

View 19 Responses

13. How familiar are you with these other IASC products?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not seen it	Seen but not used	Occasionally Used	Often used	Not sure
Gender Handbook	12 32%	15 39%	8 21%	2 5%	1 3%
Civil Military Guidelines and Reference for Complex Emergencies	14 37%	10 26%	8 21%	5 13%	1 3%
Guidelines for HIV/AIDS interventions in Emergency Settings	16 42%	14 37%	3 8%	4 11%	1 3%
Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support	21 55%	10 26%	5 13%	0 0%	2 5%
Operational Guidelines on Human Rights and Natural Disasters	15 39%	8 21%	10 26%	3 8%	2 5%
Savings Lives Together	21 55%	11 29%	0 0%	4 11%	2 5%
IASC advocacy paper on Humanitarian Action and Older Persons	27 71%	5 13%	3 8%	1 3%	2 5%

14. How do you prefer to access guidance materials, in general? (select one)

Email attachment		10	26%
Hard copy		12	32%
CD-ROM / memory stick		3	8%
Download from the Internet and use later		11	29%
Read on the Internet		2	5%
Other, please specify		0	0%
	Total	38	100%

15. Any other comments which may assist the Review of IASC Products:

View 7 Responses

16. If you would like to see the results of this and other surveys in this Review when it is complete, please provide your email address here. [Your email address will not be passed on to others]

View 19 Responses

» **Member login**   » **Send my own surveys**   » **Quick tour**

Survey on the Inter-Agency Contingency Planning Guidelines for Humanitarian Assistance

« Return to Survey Results

Open Ended Responses

Display [25] Per Page
Displaying 1-17 of 17 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last

11. How could this IASC product be improved?	
#	**Response**
1	By producing it on a CD together with the training module, to be dispatched to the field.
2	The relationships between cluster contingency planning and agency planing is very confusing at the country level and has created in my opinion just too many plans!
3	do not know
4	.
5	more case studies
6	it is pretty good, not so much up front bureaucratic discussion but needs a section on how to evaluate the plan, the process and what the impact of having the plan was in a response
7	Provide examples of contingency plans elaborated and successfully used. Table 1: provide illustration for each indicative elements, and a list of sources of information. Contingency planning would gain from integrating more reliable sources of data and information and more specifically satellite derived geo-information. This in fact would apply to few other IASC products.
8	Adding to it a training package/presentations that can be delivered to the field with more focus on cross-cutting issues including protection and human rights.
9	Could be made more practical. In website some good practices on IACP process and products should be displayed. Could better articulate the link to National Authorities in IACP and with clusters.
10	Despite valiant efforts, I still believe the product is too abstract and not sufficiently anchored in the realities of the field.
11	the tool must be adequate though its used will make the difference
12	Make the process more user friendly and field based
13	more case studies
14	Providing example of completed contingency plan Including practical sector level guidance on preparation activities and prepositioning examples
15	It is good and simple but needs to incorate more on Clusters, and because of clusters, need more on inter-cluster coordiantion...
16	more specific!
17	keep it simple

Display [25] Per Page
Displaying 1-17 of 17 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last

Survey on the Inter-Agency Contingency Planning Guidelines for Humanitarian Assistance

<< Return to Survey Results

Open Ended Responses

Display [25] Per Page

Displaying 1-19 of 19 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last

12. How could this IASC product be more widely known and used?	
#	**Response**
1	By maintaining updated IASC homepage. By disseminating it in a wider context instead of "known" humanitarian organizations.
2	Agencies need to own it, instead most agencies have their own guidelines on this subject.
3	Ensure that all OCHA and RC/HC receive it as part of their briefing notes
4	.
5	Workshops at national level
6	get it out of the IASC focus on contingency planning
7	promote it through member orgs and by the HC and OCHA
8	Using modern communication tools - smartphones
9	Sent to all HCTs + UNCTs. Organising systematic training on their use not only at the country level but also at the regional level.
10	The guideline and the tool box should be posted on multiple websites including those that are most visited preventionweb, provention. It is not even in the IASC website !
11	By actually conducting rollout trainings on its use
12	making its use mandatory
13	the current approach is top down and friend to big players. including communities and local institutions in the design could make the product widely known and used
14	wider distribution thru multiple information channels
15	Promotion through the relevant RC/HC structure who should provide lead to the HCT.
16	Think it is the standard within the humanitarian community, not sure how it could reach outside
17	OCHA should locally make a presentation and highlight its major elements
18	Not understood by many ocha staff
19	complement the booklet with trainings, especially for UN-staff (which tend to take it too serious and go into details)

Display [25] Per Page

Displaying 1-19 of 19 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last

» Member login   » Send my own surveys   » Quick tour

Survey on the Inter-Agency Contingency Planning Guidelines for Humanitarian Assistance

« Return to Survey Results

Open Ended Responses

Display [25] Per Page

Displaying 1-7 of 7 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last

15. Any other comments which may assist the Review of IASC Products:	
#	**Response**
1	In general hard copies are useful for practical day to day use in the field.
2	.
3	including examples from around the globe
4	no comments
5	Even though the IASC products are of good quality and covers wide range of issues, individual organizations prefer using their own tools and materials for assessments, design and implementation of their programmes. There has to be structure that ensures the implementation/utilization of this product by organizations.
6	Need to move toward online tools
7	If there are to many products they won't be used. Plus each orginization tends to create it's own thus making something from the IASC less important.

Display [25] Per Page

Displaying 1-7 of 7 Responses   Select Page: First | Previous | Next | Last