

# College of Information Sciences and Technology

Outcomes from the  
UN OCHA 2002 Symposium & HIN Workshops  
on

Best Practices in Humanitarian Information  
Management and Exchange

By  
Carleen Maitland, Ph.D.  
Andrea Tapia, Ph.D.

College of Information Sciences and Technology  
The Pennsylvania State University

October 13<sup>th</sup> 2007

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Background .....	4
Outcomes of the Symposium and Workshops .....	4
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	11
Looking Forward .....	13
Appendix A: Method .....	15
Appendix B: Surveys (in a separate pdf file).....	16

## **Executive Summary**

The following report outlines the outcomes of the 2002 Symposium on Best Practice in Humanitarian Information Management and Exchange, as well as those of the subsequent Humanitarian Information Network workshops held in Bangkok (2003), Panama City (2005) and Nairobi (2006). Together the outcomes reflect the level of success achieved by OCHA in a wide range of humanitarian information management domains, as well as areas for improvement. Further, this report provides conclusions and recommendations for the Global +5 Symposium to be held in Geneva in October 2007.

**FINDING #1: The 2002 Symposium Developed Relationships and Professionalization of Information Management in the Humanitarian Relief Sector**

**RECOMMENDATION #1: Create Mechanisms for Post-Symposium Interaction Across Organizations**

**FINDING #2: Language used in the Organizational Principles and Best Practices were Well and Diversely Used**

**RECOMMENDATION #2: Disseminate Principles and Practices to a Wider Audience**

**FINDING #3: Follow-up Actions as listed in the Symposium Final Report were Unclear and Unfinished**

**RECOMMENDATION #3: Incorporate Follow-Up actions into Dissemination, Communication and Post-Symposium Activities**

**FINDING #4: Communication and Frequent Employment Changes in the Information Management in Humanitarian Relief Sector**

**RECOMMENDATION #4: Organizational and Individual Level Contact Management**

## **Background**

In 2002 UN OCHA held the first ever worldwide symposium dedicated to the topic of humanitarian information management. The Symposium brought together information management professionals from organizations throughout the sector including UN agencies, NGOs, and governmental agencies, as well as representatives from donors, the private sector and academia. The Symposium was followed by three regional workshops, held in Bangkok, Panama City and Nairobi.

This report is an analysis of the outcomes of the Symposium and the workshops. In the following sections we report findings generated from data gathered through surveys and interviews in the fall of 2007. This analysis is meant to provide direct to the Global +5 Steering Group, responsible for planning the follow on meeting to be held in Geneva in October, 2007.

The report begins with a topic by topic discussion of themes that emerged from an analysis of the combined survey and interview data. Following, this we distill the discussion into specific findings and offer recommendations. Further, detailed information about the method by which data for the study were gathered can be found in Appendix A, with the survey appearing in Appendix B.

## **Outcomes of the Symposium and Workshops**

This analysis of the Symposium and Workshops seeks to identify the ways in which they were a success as well as areas for improvements. The goal is primarily to assess the extent to which these meetings realized their own self-stated goals. In particular, the analysis focuses on those outcomes that can help OCHA and the information management profession succeed in the long term, as opposed to a focus on more short-term or logistical concerns related to meeting management. The key points discussed below are derived from data collected through six interviews and roughly 50 survey responses from Symposium and Workshop participants. It should be noted that the response rate for the survey was quite low and thus the results may be biased.

### **1. The 2002 Symposium was a success and had wide-ranging impacts.**

Overall, the interviewees felt that the 2002 Symposium was a strong success. They each defined success differently, but they all agreed that it was a groundbreaking effort to gather so many Information Management Professionals from the Humanitarian Relief Sector in one place. For example, one respondent said,

“I still have that folder from the [2002] Symposium and I decided to move [deleted for confidentiality] with that folder, which is kind of surprising. When I threw everything else away ... I selected to take this with me, because it somehow had an impact on me. I am definitely one of your candidates for success. These types of coming together, not only do they establish contacts and create relationships between people and therefore organizations, they also change your mindset in terms of how you can approach the work that you are trying to achieve.”

Another sub-theme appearing in this area was the concept of professionalization of Information Managers in the Humanitarian Relief Sector. Several subjects mentioned the role the 2002 Symposium may have played in raising the standards for Information Professionals in the Sector. One participant stated, "I think our main goal was to really sort of recognize that we were in the community, trying to increase the professionalism of that community, to get better practices with respect to information management, and the exchange, particularly around the need of standards."

Another subject echoed this statement and said,

"After having these regional meetings, on a nearly annual basis, we have brought together partners to come to these conferences and develop the concept of community of practice... What I found in the early days was the challenge of getting the person with the right combination of humanitarian skills and information management skills, the big challenge that we had in the early days is we could find information management people, we could find IT people, we could find GIS people, but they did not necessarily have that humanitarian background. We also found a lot of humanitarians who were interested in GIS, and IM, and IT, and all of those things, also communications technologies and saw the value of potential so they adopted and learned a lot of these skills. Some of them have kind of pulled over their professional focus into information management. Somehow in this process we have had everything from information enter training, as well as these conferences, where we have actually increased our capacity, in terms of staff, who have those skills, as well as I think we have also increased, the visibility of the need of people with those kinds of skills. I have also seen a growth of people that have the combination of both the IM and the humanitarian skills over the last five years. It is much more commonly discussed and referred to if there is a further understanding of what information management means. In the past a lot of people thought of it as just an IT thing, they are starting to understand it in a broader sense as a process."

The impact of the Symposium can also be measured in part by the actions taken by those who attended to disseminate its outcomes. The most popular mechanism of dissemination of knowledge gained at the Symposium, taken by just over 50% of the survey respondents, was to share the Symposium materials with other organizations not present. Other popular modes of dissemination included asking coworkers/employees to read Symposium materials, sending a memo or letter to coworkers/employees about the materials, and holding a meeting at their home organization to discuss the materials. One respondent added that the Operational Principles and Best Practices were frequently the subject of conversation.

Never the less, survey respondents from the 2002 Symposium did not uniformly indicate the highest level of impact on the six intended Symposium outcomes. Those areas in which three fourths (9/12) of the respondents felt at least a moderate impact had been achieved are "building partnerships" and "information management."

However, the survey respondents did indicate high levels of both personal and organizational advantages in attending the conference. In terms of personal advantages respondents felt most strongly that the symposium had added to their professional network and finding that other agencies faced similar challenges. For their organizations the advantages were perceived to be those of building greater levels of trust between the

agencies, fostering better collaboration on projects, and allowing agencies or members to combine their expertise.

## **2. The 10 Principles and Best Practices from the 2002 Symposium have been well-used and are valued by participants.**

Most of the subjects suggested that the 10 Principles and the List of Best Practices, the textual products of the 2002 Symposium, were useful to them in some way. Four out of the six subjects stated that they had used the final report, the principles or the best practices in some way during the past 5 years. One subject stated, [In reference to the Final Report] “Well apart from reading it, I use it regularly all the time, I took language from it... Everything from writing proposals to designing information systems.”

Another participant made similar claims stating, “It [the 2002 Final Report] is referred to all the time, and the statement and the operating principles, are actually referred to all the time, when describing a best practice with respect to information and information management and exchange. The document is plagiarized widely, which completely thrilled me.”

Another interviewee stated, “Where I have seen them [the principles and best practices] be used is certainly in [redacted] information management training. In all of the training and management information stuff, at some stage in the training the principles will be brought up on the screen and explained to the people as the principles that should guide our work.”

One of the subjects stated that she had shared the document with other people in the sector. She said, “I gave her the document and told her to use it as an example, what is the theme of today, what is information like, issues about how has information developed, who are the users, it is sort of a script and a little bit of structure.”

The same subject later said about her own use of the document,

“It helped us, and I am not hiding, we took chapters, like little paragraphs and we just threw them into our projects. It just was a good fit. Fair enough. Then we wrote a little bit about our own organization or whatever. We were trying to get something for information management. That on its own is slightly challenging, sometimes however there are these few donors that are quite interested in it [the text from the Final Report], and the EU has been one, and in our case the State Department of the US has been a great supporter... These are some of the issues that I used it for.

Another participant continued this sub-theme by stressing the connection with donors and with training. This subject said,

“I know of Echo, and I think an Australian, and some other donors, that have used it [the text from the Final Report] in some of their own training. We definitely [redacted], use it consistently in our training. I often hear partners referring to the symposium. We have had a series of regional workshops since and in each of those we used the operating principles as kind of a criteria for good information...I think it has really guided our strategy for the last five years in terms of where we thought. If you were to look at the [redacted] annual fundraising document... you will see that that consistency in terms of what our strategy has been with respect to information management,

and partnership. You will see a lot of the same kind of consistent language to come out of that. I feel that we have strong endorsement from the community. My feeling is that it is kind of an accepted thing, it is used for guidance really.”

The survey respondents support this finding with 60% having made use of the language from the report. The ways in which the language was used varied, while the most popular were “to defend an action or choice”, “for writing a document for the home organization”, “creating a new project”, and to move for organizational or technical change, or a collaborative partnership. Respondents also added that the report language was used for evaluating existing information systems. Generally, the least popular uses were in “applying for funding” and in press releases.

Further, in regards to use of particular Principles and Best Practices the survey found the following. Of the 10 Operational Principles, those used regularly by respondents include accessibility and timeliness. Other important principles include humanity, verifiability and relevance. Of the 7 Best Practices, all but two—‘engaging the private sector and academia’ and ‘resource mobilization’—were used at least occasionally. Among the more popular best practices were those for Developing Data and Information Products and for Maintaining Data and Information Quality.

### **3. Participants are unsure if the stated Follow-Up Actions from the 2002 Symposium were completed and are generally dissatisfied with post-symposium communication mechanisms.**

Five out of the six interviewees stressed that that they were unsure if the three stated follow-up actions as written in the 2002 Symposium final document were ever initiated, or completed. One subject said,

“I think it has not been coordinated. There is has definitely been documentation on humanitarian information management and exchange, just not coordinated. It is just generated independently. I think that is where the drafting specific guidelines for information management exchange makes it sound like there was going to be a coordinated thing, which I don’t think really occurred”

Also, of the 10 respondents assessing the status of Symposium follow-ups most found the status of the five follow-up actions to be ongoing and advancing slowly.

The comments concerning follow-up actions by interviewees typically dovetailed into a discussion of a lack of a mechanism to maintain communication between 2002 symposium attendees. One interviewee said,

“...there were some discussions of kind of how we at least needed a listserv, but that never really came about. It did not go how I wanted. There were some people that were deployed to different countries like from Kosovo going to support humanitarian effort for Iraq, or someone from Kosovo helping in Sierra Leone. There was sort of a [people] exchange going on. That was, we were involved in all of that, but it was not organized. I am sure there was some informal relationship for more ideas exchange, but nothing too formal.”

In reference to organized maintenance of relationships, networks and connections after the 2002 symposium, a subject stated, “I guess what I mean is it did not quite become as high a priority. For example there was a listserv developed, but it was people exchanging

emails, rather than kind of more formal ways they could talk. It is hard because it is actually very transient group anyway in most cases. Except for some of the national staff, it is kind of challenging no matter what you do.”

All of the subjects commented on the problem of high fluidity in the Humanitarian Information Management Sector. All six of our subjects had changed jobs within the last five years. Five out of six had changed employers as well as jobs. This reflects what we found when attempting to locate survey respondents and potential interview subjects.

One participant suggested that a mechanism for maintaining these relationships over time might be project teams in which small groups of diverse individuals were given something to do or create together. This participant stated,

“You have to have a purpose again. If it is to keep people talking to each other, they need a reason. We all meet people at conferences and we have these amazing conversations and may never talk to them again. That was the right time for that conversation, maybe there is just no reason to talk again. There has to be a reason, you could say, maybe we just have this kind of conference more often.”

In thinking about the coming 2007 Symposium as solving the problems from the 2002 Symposium, one participants said, “It would be maybe interesting, and I do think if we thought more carefully of the idea of a stronger communication strategy might come out of this [2007] symposium.”

However, despite the formal mechanisms for fostering post-Symposium and Workshop interactions the survey respondents indicated that levels of subsequent interactions was high, with over half of the Symposium respondents having frequent interaction with several attendees, while for those having attended the Nairobi meeting it was somewhat less.

Further, the reasons for these interactions were most often to undertake projects. Other reasons include workshops and conferences. However, from the Nairobi meeting the most popular form of interaction was to offer or receive specific information. This was not the case with Symposium respondents.

#### **4. Participants suggested that the diversity of participants in the 2002 Symposium was lacking.**

When asked what could have been done better at the 2002 Symposium most subjects believed that the type of participant was limited and emphasized the need for more diversity. One subject stated, “I think although we were sort of trying to make it sort of be more diverse, and more inclusive, non UN and non-Western participants, I think we were not as successful.” Another subject said, “I think the idea of these workshops was sort of addressing the issue of getting more regional and non-western participation. I think those were you know a group of the symposium to bring information to the regions.”

One participant felt that the problem was in who was invited to the 2002 Symposium. This subject said,

[how were people chosen and invited?] “Mostly it was sort of recommendations and there was, I would say, this sort of informal community of interest, like I said, this group of friends who made sure that all their friends got invited. There was like this time sort of an interest in sort of broadness beyond the UN and the western community, and try to get more international participation, and more non-UN participation from NGO’s and from governments and populations. They were affected by the emergencies. I think that they tried last time, they funded some people to come to it from sort of the developing world, I hope we will be a little more successful this time.”

Another respondent echoed this concern about inviting the same UN-based people, “ We tried to figure out so it’s not just the usual suspects that are everywhere, although we have to have them also.”

These feelings are supported by survey findings concerning the level of prior acquaintance among Symposium and Workshop participants, which was relatively high. For example, at both the 2002 Symposium and the Nairobi workshop for example, roughly half of the survey respondents knew at least half, if not all, of the attendees, while only one respondent for each of these two meetings knew no one.

However, some of the interview respondents felt the Symposium was already very diverse, “It was very broad, everything from representatives from the diplomatic missions in Geneva to private sectors from islands there, you had NGO, heads off office. There was quite a cross cutting, not cross cutting, but was a very broad involvement across the community but with an emphasis on information management, IT people there.” Another subject stated, “We have had really strong participation. We were up in the point where we have to close our doors because we have so many people who want to come to these conferences.”

## **5. Inaccessible Presentations and Documents**

When asked what happened to the materials that were produced at the Symposium five years ago (i.e. Presentations and documents) all respondents said they believed the materials were housed somewhere, but did not know exactly where or how to locate them. One informant stated,

“I don’t know if we had a symposium website... after the event and after we published the proceedings, I think the PowerPoint’s were put on the website, as .pdf files or something. You would have to ask, probably Relief-web had responsibility for it. I know in the proceedings, there are sort of summaries of the presentations, and I think the PowerPoint’s might have been sort of linked on the website... If they were taken off for some reason, probably Relief-web has them somewhere.”

## **6. The Role of the Post-Symposium Workshops: Bangkok, Nairobi and Panama**

The respondents were split as to the success of these three post-Symposium workshops. Some of the informants suggested that the three workshops served to carry the message of the symposium to the field during the past five years. Some suggested that they served

to bring field-level staff into the “best practices” fold. Some suggested that since the number of people who attended both the 2002 Symposium and any of these workshops was very low, the time between the first and the upcoming symposium (5 years) was far too long. One subject stated,

“The humanitarian information network sort of came out of the symposium and this idea of doing this sort of regional work-shops was something that came out of the symposium. I think that was a way of addressing that lack of success. Bringing information to panama, and to Nairobi and to Bangkok. Bringing this sort of regional focus to the regions where you can get more regional local participation than getting people flying to Geneva.”

Another participant said,

“I understood that the Bangkok meeting was a direct follow-up to the symposium. For me it was a disappointing meeting. It was basically sharing of information, what’s happening in the region, it did not break any new ground, it was just show and tell, a couple presentations on information management, presentations from different groups. Interesting things, but in it of itself it was not that valuable... Nairobi one was much better. It was very well structured, significant networking from the [redacted] side, and a good chance to learn a lot of initiatives in Africa. ... On the whole it was a much better meeting. [however]I don’t think the outputs of that meeting can be followed through.”

Another subject said that the three post-symposium regional meetings were not very useful, but in combination with the regular humanitarian information network workshops held in Geneva for half-day sessions, they managed to bring more people into the community. This respondent said,

“In Geneva what we tried to have mini humanitarian information network workshops in, like half a day. There were in 2004 at least 2 or 3, and in 2005, at least 3. 2006 at least 2 times that I knew of, on the overall, every 3months I think. We called them mini because there were 25 people, invited from different organizations.”

This inconsistency in assessments of the success of the workshops may arise from a lack of consistent and coherent goals for the workshops. It may be that the workshops were highly successful at bringing OCHA field staff together. However, it is unclear the extent to which this was a goal.

## **7. Through the 2002 Symposium UN OCHA has taken on a central role in the sector.**

Several subjects stated that the role of OCHA had changed because of the 2002 symposium. They felt that OCHA had taken a more central role across the entire Humanitarian Relief Sector for Information Management. They also stated that this furthered OCHA’s mission of coordination. One subject stated,

“What I also feel it [the 2002 Symposium] did was really strengthen OCHA’s mandate as kind of the center of the information exchange process, and then sort of overarching mechanism for information exchange among all of the community which of course is another component of our coordination role. By having the statement agreed by partners at that level, it is something we can say, OK look at the partners that they have agreed to these principles, they do think OCAH has this sort of central role, and it is helpful for us when we are trying to convince people to share and exchange information.”

## Conclusions and Recommendations

### **FINDING #1: The 2002 Symposium Developed Relationships and Professionalization of Information Management in the Humanitarian Relief Sector**

The participants in the 2002 symposium and the 3 subsequent workshops did not believe that these meetings had a significant impact on developing and designing humanitarian information systems, using humanitarian information systems, improving the quality of information or improving preparedness. However, the participants felt that the strongest impact of the symposium and workshops were in creating relationships and collaboration between participants. In addition, the participants felt that the symposium helped establish the field of Information Management in the Humanitarian Relief Sector as a profession<sup>1</sup>. This professionalization of Information Management is believed to lead to better practices across organizations and a more centralized and formalized role for Information Managers within their home organizations.

### **RECOMMENDATION #1: Create Mechanisms for Post-Symposium Interaction Across Organizations**

The relationships that were created and maintained by the Symposium and Workshops are of high value to the participants. These relationships should be nurtured and facilitated by the hosting organization through post-symposium support. Post symposium support mechanisms might encompass online communication tools such as list-servs and bulletin boards, virtual meeting spaces and post symposium events, which encourage subsequent participation. It was also mentioned that the hosting organization might encourage further networking and relationships by offering both small projects and seed funding to inter-agency collaborative groups, providing these growing networks something to do together that would further strengthen ties.

As for professionalization, many central organizations in this space (OCHA) are already offering training that include the principles and best practices in the curriculum. These trainings should be made available in some form across the sector. Linkages should be made with other centers of education and training with the intention of elevating and standardizing some of the training of new Information Management Professionals in the sector.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sociologists have defined a profession as a field that required extensive study and a mastery of specialized knowledge, such as medical, religious, legal and engineering fields. The term profession is often contrasted with occupation, which refers generally to the nature of a person's employment. While both profession and occupation can refer to the method by which an individual earns an income, unlike occupation, profession ordinarily implies a commitment to a field of work, which usually involves years of planning, preparation and study. Modern definitions of profession have grown to include concepts of autonomy. Membership in the profession is usually self-restricted and self-regulated. Professions are also generally exclusive. Professions also usually require rigorous training and schooling beyond a basic college degree. A profession includes institutions for preserving the knowledge and the practices, enforcing the standards, and educating professionals.

**FINDING #2: Language used in the Organizational Principles and Best Practices were Well and Diversely Used**

The text in the Final Report for the 2002 Symposium was seen as useful and valuable. Most respondents found they had used the materials from the Final Report in some way after the symposium or workshop. Several mentioned that the materials were used in formalized and official instances like trainings or workshops. Others mentioned that they had used the materials in writing their own internal documents or to apply for external funding.

**RECOMMENDATION #2: Disseminate Principles and Practices to a Wider Audience**

The Organizational Principles and Best Practices have significant value in their own right, beyond that of the symposium and its attendees. We recommend that these find a wider audience perhaps through a more formal UN statement, through publication in other venues and through liberal sharing with other entities in the sector above and beyond the traditional stakeholders.

**FINDING #3: Follow-up Actions as listed in the Symposium Final Report were Unclear and Unfinished**

Unlike the Principles and the Best Practices, the respondents were unable to clearly identify the follow-up actions listed in the Final Report without reading them from the report. Even after reading them, they were unsure as to what they meant. All respondents were unsure as to what had been done on each of the follow-up actions. Most believed they were uncompleted.

**RECOMMENDATION #3: Incorporate Follow-Up actions into Dissemination, Communication and Post-Symposium Activities**

Identify clear and measurable follow-up actions and limit their number such that the likelihood of achieving them is high. Alternatively, Symposium organizers may want to keep the list private and simply engage the community on follow-up actions as they are undertaken.

In either case, organizers should engage symposium participants in each of the follow-up actions through post-symposium discussions and small group, inter-organizational projects. Create a monitoring and evaluation mechanism that reports back to the participants as a whole as to the progress being made on each of the follow-up mechanisms.

**FINDING #4: Communication and Frequent Employment Changes in the Information Management in Humanitarian Relief Sector**

Given that within the Humanitarian Relief Sector employees change jobs and organizations often, as well as flow in and out of the sector, this may be exacerbated within the Information Management divisions of these organizations as employees move in and out of industry or government IT employment, or in and out of programmatic or country level humanitarian work. And while individuals are able to manage their own

networks of sector contacts, inter-agency coordination and efforts by a central organizing entity may be hampered by this phenomenon, particularly with regard to post-Symposium management and communication.

#### **RECOMMENDATION #4: Organizational and Individual Level Contact Management**

We suggest that mechanisms be created that maintain accurate and up-to-date contact information for all Symposium and Workshop participants and the organizations they serve. This contact data should include data that follows the individual from job to job as she travels, and establishes contact with those new individuals filling old posts in key organizations. We recommend that this data be kept, monitored and updated by the participants and organizations themselves, but housed in a central access point.

## **Looking Forward**

Whereas the above conclusions and recommendations are targeted at the near future, the following comments are suggestions for the longer term.

The analysis in this report suggests that the 2002 Symposium and the Workshops were highly successful in disseminating Operational Principles and Best Practices for Humanitarian Information Management. Yet, attendees did not perceive the level of impact to be so high. Thus, it may be that the mechanisms by which the operational objectives of professionalization can be met, the appropriate target for the beginning phase, have been identified and should continue. However, identifying the mechanisms by which more strategic and tactical level goals can be achieved, potentially those that will demonstrate greater impact, may be an area for further development.

One mechanism for achieving the tactical goal of professionalization may be to launch a Humanitarian Information Management Association. A professional association, with its various committees, can help with the ongoing dissemination of Operating Principles and Best Practices, it will help facilitate communication between those who stay within the sector move from agency to agency, and it can help through its committee structure to undertake some of the Symposium follow-up actions. Naturally, UN OCHA will need to think carefully about what role it would like to play in such an association. In other professions, association tackle some of the broader issues faced by the sector such as plurality in participation, standardization, training, more frequent meetings, and ongoing development of the profession.

The maintenance of relationships of individuals underlies agency-level coordination and when those relationships do not exist because of job changes, it is difficult to build the trust necessary for complex coordination activities. This is one of the main challenges that coordination in this sector is likely to face.

While government representatives and donors have participated in the Symposium, it appears that their role has been as those involved in Humanitarian Information Management, rather than representing their donor role in the sector. In their donor role

these agencies create a level of commonality in the sector, as all Humanitarian Relief agencies receive donor funds. They also serve as regulators and in some cases as conveners. Further, donors play a dual role of resource supply provided to the sector, as well as consumers of relief services. In these roles donors generate the demand for Humanitarian Information and therefore they should play a greater role in the Symposium.

## Appendix A: Method

This analysis was undertaken in the period of September 2007 through October 2007. Data were gathered through telephone interviews as well as online surveys.

Subjects for the surveys and interviews were identified as follows. For the survey, names and contact information were gathered from official 2002 symposium and workshop reports (Bangkok, Nairobi and Panama), under the assumption that while not all people listed in the reports may have actually attended, the number of people left off these official reports was likely minimal. The lists were compared to determine how many attendees were present at more than one meeting. From these lists it was concluded that very little overlap existed (one person attended two meetings). With this low level of overlap, separate surveys were developed for each workshop and the symposium.

Survey recruitment was done via email with the link to the survey included in the email. The email addresses gathered from the reports generated a significant number of 'bounces' indicating they were no longer valid. The response rates from these emails are indicated in Table 1 below.

	Geneva	Bangkok	Panama	Nairobi	Total
Sent	178	47	55	93	<b>373</b>
Bounced	55	0	11	19	<b>85</b>
Good	123	47	44	74	<b>288</b>
Completed	17	11	8	16	<b>52</b>
% C/Sent	9.55%	23.40%	14.55%	17.20%	<b>13.94%</b>
% C/Good	13.82%	23.40%	18.18%	21.62%	<b>18.06%</b>

Table 1: Response rate generated from Workshop email lists

Further, to provide insight into the origin of the bounced emails a domain analysis was made. The results of this repartition of bounced emails by domain (.org and other) are shown in Table 2.

	.org	other	Total	% / Sent
Nairobi	12	7	<b>19</b>	20.43%
Geneva	28	27	<b>55</b>	30.90%
Panama	7	4	<b>11</b>	20.00%
Total	47	38	<b>85</b>	
%	<b>55.29%</b>	<b>44.71%</b>		

Table 2: Distribution of domains of bounced emails

Subjects for interviews were identified as follows. A snowball method was used with contact information first provided by Steering Group members, which in turn generated additional contacts. A total of 16 emails requesting interviews were sent, resulting in 6 interviews.

## **Appendix B: Surveys (in a separate pdf file)**