Purpose of the survey: The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Force 4 on Humanitarian-Development Collaboration is working to support the humanitarian system to better understand and to strengthen the implementation of that collaboration in consistency with humanitarian principles. The work aims at reducing and ending needs, reducing vulnerabilities and increasing resilience of crisis affected people – by strategically aligning humanitarian programming and development programming with a focus on peace and conflict. The Task Force is updating its mapping of good approaches and practices to linking humanitarian programming with peace or development initiatives. The aim of the mapping is to provide a global overview of where and how humanitarian-development-peace approaches are being implemented, what success looks like/what is being achieved, and gather good examples of success and lessons learnt. To do so, a survey to gather evidence on those efforts at the country level is being conducted through the UN Humanitarian Country Teams (HCT) and relevant partners.

<u>This survey is for local and national actors</u> so you can share your approaches to conducting work on the humanitarian development peace (HDP) nexus. I.e., programmes that focus on both people's short and longer-term needs, creating an intersection between humanitarian, development and peace/conflict programming. This will be used to complement the view from the country coordination level to help us understand how local actors are thinking about and working on these challenges. Information provided in this survey will be used in the IASC mapping and for learning products produced by the <u>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</u> (ALNAP) focused on locally-led humanitarian action.

For complementarity with the HCT survey, we are particularly seeking responses from organizations working in the following countries: *Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, DR Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Somalia, South Sudan, Ukraine, Uganda, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen.*

Completing the survey: There are 15 questions on the survey. Many of them are multiple choice with tick boxes. The amount of additional information you wish to provide in the additional text boxes is up to you, but we would appreciate additional information to help us understand your responses better. Individuals and their organizations will not be named in the public report.

<u>Please return your completed survey to Mae Albiento</u> at m.albiento@alnap.org by 6 November 2023. You can also contact Mae for any questions related to this survey and the mapping.

Deadline for returning surveys: 6 November 2023

YOUR DETAILS

Please note that your information will be kept confidential and we will not name you or your organization in the published report.

Name o	of organization:	
Type o	f organization:	
□ Non	-Government Organization (NGO)	☐ NGO Network
☐ Civil	society organization	☐ Government actor
□ Wor	men's rights organization	☐ Other. Please provide:
□ Wor	men-led organization	
Countr	y and location (e.g., province or district) of operatio	ns in that country:
Email c	contact (we will use this to send a copy of the final m	apping report for your information):
Please respons ☐ Yes		m contacting you to understand more about your
_	OUR ORGANISATION'S EXPERIENCE 1. Do any of your programmes link humanitarian issues (i.e., short-term basic needs and life saving for crisis affected communities) with a consideration of longer-term needs, vulnerabilities and resilience? For example, linking with development or peace/conflict programming. □ Yes □ No	
	If yes, then please elaborate on one example of how	v you do this:
2.	What financing mechanisms have you accessed to actions with development or peace concerns?	fund programmes that actively link humanitarian
	Please list the most important sources of funds for	this work:
3.	Which organizations do you partner with on progr development or peace concerns?	ammes that actively link humanitarian actions with
	Please list the most important partners for this wor	k:
4.	What monitoring approaches are you using to trac work across humanitarian, development and peac approaches or inter-agency monitoring initiatives]	
	Please briefly explain the monitoring approaches:	

	Are community perceptions included in your monitoring? Yes No
	If yes, please briefly explain:
L	if yes, please briefly explain.
	Has your organization conducted any of <u>your own</u> analyses of risks, vulnerabilities and underlying drivers/ root causes of fragility and humanitarian needs? [e.g., political, risk, conflict, security, climate, human rights, gender, migration, leave no one behind, etc.]
<u></u> _ '	Yes □ No
	If yes, please briefly explain:
	Has your organization <u>participated in joint</u> analyses (or contributed to the analysis conducted by another organization) of risks, vulnerabilities and underlying drivers/ root causes of fragility and <u>humanitarian needs?</u> [e.g., political, risk, conflict, security, climate, human rights, gender, migration, leave no one behind, etc.]
' L	Yes No
	If yes, which types of analyses? Please briefly explain:
8.	What are the greatest challenges you have encountered in your organization to implementing a more joint humanitarian-development-peace approach? (Tick all that apply)
	Funding
	Staffing
	Lack of guidance/ technical know-how
	Resistance / lack of commitment by participating actors
	Competing priorities
	Lack of development assistance
	Risk to principled humanitarian action
	Competition for limited resources
	Lack of coordination (including around joint analyses and joined-up programming)
	Lack of a common understanding of what a humanitarian-development-peace nexus approach means
	Other. Please specify:
	Additional remarks and other challenges:
9.	What factors have been most important to helping you to implement a more joint humanitarian-development-peace approach?
	Please briefly name the key enabling factors:

	Have you experienced that linking peace/conflict programming with humanitarian work causes
	challenges to principled humanitarian action – e.g., being neutral and independent? If so, please
	provide examples of how this was successfully handled.
□ <u>Y</u> €	es 🗆 No
1	f yes, please briefly describe the challenges and successes:
OORDII	NATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL
11. /	Are you aware of any efforts to coordinate humanitarian-development-peace approaches nationally?
F	For example, led by the government or UN actors.
□ Ye	es 🗆 No
I	f yes, then who/which organization is in charge of coordinating it? Please briefly explain the approach:
	f there is a national level approach, has your organization been consulted or engaged in those processes?
□ Y€	es 🗆 No
I	f yes, please explain your involvement:
<u> </u>	
e	n your perspective, how much progress has been made <i>nationally</i> to strategically align short-term emergency response with longer-term risks, vulnerabilities and priorities, and conflict mitigation? (Please consider the last 5 years)
☐ Si	gnificant progress
□ Sc	ome progress
\square N	o progress
	ome decline
□ Sc	
	gnificant decline

- 14. Please share any positive examples of programming, key challenges (and unintended consequences) or lessons learned from your work on linking humanitarian programming with longer-term needs and considerations of peace and conflict. Please note if they include a focus on gender. [Please provide links if you have any documentation/reports on this subject that you would like to share]
- 15. Please share any examples of where working on peace/social cohesion alongside humanitarian and development enabled sustained impact. Please note if they include a focus on gender. Please explain how this happened.