



CREWS/SC.1/infdoc.1

Compilation of Comments on CREWS documents – 12 September Steering Committee

Notes: “T” denotes comments from the World Bank as Trustee

| Governance document | | |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Comment: | Provided by: | Proposed action: |
| The setup includes a double role for the donors: financing and program responsibility through participation in the Steering Committee. Netherlands suggests these roles be separated. | Netherlands | T- The roles are separate and clarified in the Contribution Agreements/Arrangements and Governance Documents respectively. |
| Reps and observers – whilst the governance document defines observers as non-decision-making members, Australia recommends further clarity around observers such as how they are agreed and by whom and who can apply for observer status. | Australia | T- The Governance Documents to clarify who are “Observers” and could also include: “The Chair of the Steering Committee (SC) may, in his/her discretion and taking into account Members’ views where feasible, invite other participants, including prospective Contributors, to SC meetings as deemed appropriate, who may participate in a non-decision making capacity to the extent indicated by the Co-Chairs. |
| Steering committee is operating on consensus. Para 12 refers to voting members rather than decision making members – suggest making this language consistent. | Australia | T- Agree. The term ‘decision-making’ to be used throughout. |
| Need to clarify what constitutes a quorum. | Australia | T - Specifying a quorum could impede SC flexibility and have practical drawbacks. Decisions are taken by consensus, or by no-objection in a virtual process (by e-mail), so it may not be necessary to specify quorum requirements, as any member can block a SC decision if not satisfied with level of representation at the meeting. Suggest to remain silent on quorum. |
| Can we articulate the option to have alternate representatives for the decision making members. | Australia | Para. 10 of the Governance document now reads: <i>“The Decision-making Members comprise a representative and an alternate from each of the Contributors to the CREWS Trust Fund. A designated representative and an alternate of each Decision-making Member is notified at all times to the Secretariat.</i> |
| <u>Partnerships:</u> Australia recommends considering including NGOs / civil society in programming where it makes sense. NGO / civil society play a crucial role in EWS development / use (for example national Red Cross / Red Crescent societies) and CREWS should consider partnerships to ensure messages reach communities and are understood. | Australia | T – This would be done by the Implementing Partners through their responsibility for implementing projects and programs (e.g. not at the SC level). The Investment Plan has been modified to reflect the role of NGOs / civil society in CREWS project implementation. |

| | | |
|---|------------------|---|
| <p>The governance structure of CREWS consists of a steering committee, a secretariat, a trustee and implementing partners. What role will partners be playing? GEF funded activity often differentiates implementing partners and executing partners. In certain instances the implementing partner (e.g. UNDP) might outsource or sub-contract an activity to a regional organisation or a developed country partner like a bureau of meteorology. We think this may be an important modality in the Pacific where depending on the project World Bank, WMO and UNISDR may have less experience or capacity than others.</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>Partners, such as regional organization and other organizations operating in CREWS countries will be invited to contribute to the implementation of projects through the lead Implementing Partner. The documents have been modified to reflect this.</p> |
| <p>Information is provided about the role of implementing partners, however the role of <i>partners</i> is not detailed. Australia recommends elaborating on clear roles and responsibilities of the implementing partners and partners for CREWS. Important to distinguish roles to reduce duplication and ensure successful outcomes of projects. For example, what role will the partners play in the design process? How will project plans be implemented and monitored and by who?</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>T- Contributing Partners engage through representation and decision-making on the SC. For implementation of projects, it is important to preserve accountability of Implementing Partners for project implementation.</p> <p>The Investment Plan has been modified to reflect the role of other partners both in the design process for projects and their implementation. Projects are implemented by a lead Implementing Partner who will engage other partners, through grant agreements and consultancies. The lead Implementing Partner is accountable for monitoring results.</p> |
| <p>Recommend elaborating on whether or not partners can become <i>implementing partners</i> and have more say about project implementation. For example, Australia may be able to provide the expertise of the Australian Bureau of Meteorology to assist with implementing the two Pacific projects. Interested to know if this is possible and if it needs to be reflected in the governance document.</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>T – The IPs are to be limited to those specified in the Governing Documents. If Trustee is to sign FPA and transfer funds to entities that are also Contributing Partners (and decision makers on the SC), there is a potential for conflict of interest and opening CREWs to criticism of ‘round-tripping’ ODA funds.</p> <p>The current wording of the Governance document allows other organizations to become Implementing Partners upon approval of the Steering Committee and with the no-objection of the Trustee, in accordance with an accreditation scheme that may be established by the Steering Committee (in consultation with the Trustee).</p> |
| <p>We are very concerned about the limitations outlined in paragraph 16. We understand the capacity constraints of the Secretariat however it should be clear that there will still be monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance with respect to operations of CREWS and that donors can be provided with reporting results and progress. Who will this information be provided by? Can these documents still be made available by other means (and state these means e.g. World Bank as Trustee).</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>T – Important to clarify that the Trustee will report on financial information and Secretariat will report operational information provided by the IPs. Para 16 does not limit IPs’ provision of such information to the Secretariat.</p> <p>The Governance document has been strengthened in this regard and now reads “<i>The roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat includes: developing and regularly updating a monitoring and evaluation framework and appropriate reporting guidelines and</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|------------|---|
| | | <i>internal procedures for CREWS for review by the Steering Committee, receiving and consolidating progress and other reports from the Implementing Partners for submission and review by the Steering Committee”</i> |
| Suggest defining what an adverse condition is, including advice about conflict of interests. | Australia | T – Suggest not to try to define the potentially vast range of possible “adverse conditions”, but rather leave to the IPs, who will each will have their own policies and procedures for dealing with issues like COI, which they must follow. |
| Useful to include contact details for secretariat (email address if available). | Australia | T – This is not usually included in the founding documents, as can change from time to time. |
| Will partners be involved in the governance of the projects? | Australia | T – Contributors will be involved at the SC level, approving funding and receiving reports. Partners can be involved in the governance of projects on a case-by-case basis. |
| The WMO, UNISDR and the World Bank are initial Implementing Partners: How does the Bank execute and implement the FPA in the constellation that it is both Trustee and Implementing Partner | Luxembourg | T- The Bank’s trustee role and IP role are separate, governed by separate agreements specifying roles and responsibilities, and the functions are discharged by separate Vice-Presidencies within the World Bank. World Bank as Trustee and World Bank as Implementing Partner (i.e. two different Vice Presidencies) will therefore enter into an FPA (it will be called Financial Procedures Memorandum (FPM) as it will not be an agreement where two separate legal entities enter into but the FPM will have the same content as the FPA and will carry the same weight). The World Bank as trustee acts in accordance with terms of the CA and FPA/FPM and decisions of the Steering Committee. |
| The Governance Document needs some legal editing. There are some rogue capitalisations (“Implementing Entity”, when it should be “Implementing Partner”, or “Voting Members”, when it should be “Decision-making Members”) and odd definitions (“members... comprise a representative...”). | Luxembourg | The Governance document has undergone an initial editing. A final edit will be carried out once it is approved by the Steering Committee. |
| The Secretariat prepares the meetings of the Steering Committee and makes completeness checks for proposed projects. Who evaluates these projects and who follows proper implementation? See, in this context, clauses 16 and 19, which explicitly exempt the Secretariat and the Trustee from the task (Trustee: no role at all, the Secretariat: not to prepare “customised” reports for donor countries). The conceptual approach seems to be that the Implementing Partners alone are responsible for proper follow up (the Secretariat may commission independent external evaluations though, see the Manual, para 26). Yet, looking at the Financial Procedures Agreement with Implementing Partners (FPA), the reporting guidelines are rather sterile and do not seem to include information on e.g. Project milestone achievements, problems and risks, planning | Luxembourg | T – Implementing Partners carry out the project monitoring and evaluation in accordance with their policies and procedures. IPs are then responsible to the Steering Committee for reporting project progress and results etc. to the SC through the Secretariat. Secretariat's role is limited to an administrative one, and the governance structure the Initiative currently does not envision the Secretariat to undertake "assessment". The Trustee will be responsible for financial reporting on the CREWs Trust Fund. |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| <p>changes, etc. (see the reporting formats provided as annexes to the FPA). Perhaps, the Trustee can include an additional Progress Report Template.</p> | | <p>The CREWS Secretariat will be responsible for consolidating progress reports received from the Implementing Partners for the projects which they lead. The Trustee will collect periodic financial reports from the Implementing Partners and provide regular report on the financial status of CREWS Trust Fund to the Steering Committee.</p> <p>A results framework will guide the development of projects to be funded through the Trust Fund and against which results will be regularly measured and reported.</p> |
| <p>Financial Procedures Agreement (FPA)</p> | | |
| <p>Comment:</p> | <p>Provided by:</p> | <p>Proposed action:</p> |
| <p>Include language that includes decisions applicable prior to effectiveness of agreement (5.2)</p> | <p>WMO</p> | <p>T - The Steering Committee will approve project proposals and any other decisions relevant to the implementation of the Initiative until the Initiative ceases to operate and those approvals and approved decisions will also be applicable. Therefore, it would not appropriate to include the suggested edits that limit to the applicable decisions taken prior to the effectiveness of the Agreement.</p> |
| <p>Article 7.1 refers to the recording and return of Interests earned on contributions - This could be an issue for us as our administrative system (called Umoja) transfers all UNISDR interests on income to one single account so we cannot track each trust fund interests. This Article may not be applicable to the UN Secretariat</p> | <p>UNISDR</p> | <p>T - This is a standard requirement for FIFs based on the fact that investment income earned on contributed amounts be used for overall purposes of the FIF. Other UN implementing entities have agreed to this under other FIFs (e.g. GEF). Amounts transferred for fees or admin expenses are generally excluded, so this may not apply to amounts transferred in respect of Secretariat expenses. For Implementing Partners, calculation relies on systems and procedures of the Implementing Partner, so a notional approach to calculation of the interest attributable to amounts transferred by the trustee may be used if no other system is in place in the Implementing Partner.</p> |
| <p>We understand that the World Bank will accept the format of Umoja financial statements</p> | <p>UNISDR</p> | <p>T - In general CRERWs should rely on existing procedures of the IPs and not require new reporting formats.</p> |
| <p>The UN does not allow external auditors to review its financial books & receipts.</p> | <p>UNISDR</p> | <p>T - It is not suggested that external auditors review UN financial books. The purpose of this clause is to state that any audits of the Implementing Partner 's financial statements shall be carried out by the IP's external auditors (and not any other external auditors).</p> |
| <p>"Nothing in this Agreement shall operate as or be construed to constitute a waiver, renunciation or any other modification of any privilege, exemption or immunity</p> | <p>UNISDR</p> | <p>T – The provision ensures any privilege, exemption or immunity accorded to the institution or the Trustee pursuant</p> |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---|
| accorded to either of the Implementing Partner or the Trustee pursuant to its respective constituent document, international convention or any applicable law". We trust this ensure the application of UN Rules & Regulations and privileges will be applied. | | to their founding document is respected. With regard to rules and regulations, para 5.2 (a)(i) ensures that implementation follows policies and procedures of the Implementing Partner. |
| Please confirm that indirect costs (PSC) referred to as Administrative Costs in the agreement, can be 13%, which is the PSC for the UN Secretariat | UNISDR | T – Pursuant to Paragraph 13 (i) of the Governance Document, the responsibility to approve the fee structure rests with the Steering Committee. A flexible option would be for CREWs to adopt a case-by-case approach whereby proposed costs/fees are included with Implementing Partner funding proposals. |
| Perhaps one can consider to subject the liability obligations in 2.1 to the same fiduciary principles as in 5.4, e.g. by stating, "... willful misconduct...", and provided that the Implementing Partner acted in a prudent manner as a fiduciary in accordance with the Implementing Partner's policies and procedures..." | Luxembourg | T – This would not be necessary as Section 5 covers use of funds; e.g. 5.2 refers to use of funds transferred by the Trustee to the Implementing Partner would follow their policies and procedures. |
| In re governance: The Secretariat prepares the meetings of the Steering Committee and makes completeness checks for proposed projects. Who evaluates these projects and who follows proper implementation? See, in this context, clauses 16 and 19, which explicitly exempt the Secretariat and the Trustee from the task (Trustee: no role at all, the Secretariat: not to prepare "customised" reports for donor countries). The conceptual approach seems to be that the Implementing Partners alone are responsible for proper follow up (the Secretariat may commission independent external evaluations though, see the Manual, para 26). Yet, looking at the Financial Procedures Agreement with Implementing Partners (FPA), the reporting guidelines are rather sterile and do not seem to include information on e.g. Project milestone achievements, problems and risks, planning changes, etc. (see the reporting formats provided as annexes to the FPA). Perhaps, the Trustee can include an additional Progress Report Template? | Luxembourg | T - Implementing Partners are responsible to the Steering Committee and would report on project progress, etc. to the SC, through the Secretariat. |
| Contribution Agreement/Arrangement | | |
| Comment: | Provided by: | Proposed action: |
| insert: "The Trustee shall submit the payment request by 31 January 2017 at the latest." | Luxembourg | T – The Trustee can accommodate with slight adjustment: "The Contributor will deposit the Contribution in cash into such account with such bank designated in a payment request by the Trustee by [January 31, 2017 or other appropriate date] upon submission of a payment request by the Trustee." |
| insert: The Contributor does not assume any responsibility or liability to the Trust Fund, the Trustee, an Implementing Partner or any third party for any claims, demands, damage or loss as a result of the implementation of the activities of the Trust Fund | Luxembourg | T - This is an issue that still needs to be vetted internally by the Trustee. The Trustee will get back to Luxembourg separately. |
| insert: The following officials shall be copied on all electronic notifications from the Trustee to the Contributor: | Luxembourg | T - This can be handled as an administrative matter as the purpose of the provision is to identify a contact point. |
| We noticed that the proposal is that the Trustee is be reimbursed based on actual costs. I understood that the World bank usually is reimbursed based on a fixed | Netherlands | T - The Trustee is establishing a special type of trust fund called a Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF), under which |

| | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| percentage of the total trust fund amount. Why is this different for this trust fund? | | trustee costs are recovered on an actual recovery basis. The alternative fee structure used for Trust Funds is based on contributed amounts (e.g. 5% on first \$50mn, 4 % on next \$450mn) and would likely result in much higher trustee costs for CREWs. |
| Arrangement vs Agreement language | Netherlands | <p>T - This is fine. It has already been addressed on the first page of the CA template where the Trustee commented as follows: For those contributors that the Trustee has agreed to sign an "arrangement", following terms will be used in the first two pages:</p> <p>Agreement – Arrangement Shall – Will Party – Participant Terms – Provisions</p> <p>Also, the following paragraph will be included in the second page: "All references made in the Annex to "shall", "Contribution Agreement" and "Parties" will have the same meaning as the term "will", "Contribution Arrangement" and "Participants" herein. In addition, references in the Annex to tenses of the verb "to agree" will be deemed to constitute references to tenses of the verb "to decide"."</p> |
| This Arrangement does not create any rights or obligations under international law. | Netherlands | T – We can include the following language for those who enter into an Arrangement: "It is understood that this Contribution Arrangement is not an international treaty. It is an administrative arrangement between the Contributor and the Trustee." |
| Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Arrangement will be settled by negotiation between the Participants or mutually accepted mode of settlement. | Netherlands | T - The Initiative should reflect the spirit of mutual trust and it is expected that issues if any will be resolved amicably in any event. If Contributors require, we can include the following: "The Contributors and the Trustee shall use their best efforts to amicably settle any dispute, controversy, or claim arising out of or relating to the Contribution Agreements." |
| reference to be included in the FPAs to IEs' framework to prevent and combat fraud and corruption, | Netherlands | T - The reference here is kept general to the Implementing Partner's policies and procedures as each Implementing Partner may not have a "framework to prevent and combat fraud and corruption" per se. The issue of fraud and corruption will be addressed as the IE complies with its own policies and procedures. |
| What does 3.1 mean that "The Contribution funds in the Trust Fund shall be accounted for as a single trust fund and shall be kept separate and apart from the funds of the IBRD. The Contribution funds shall be held in the United States | Germany | T – Contribution funds for the CREWS funds may be commingled with contribution funds for other trust funds. These funds may be |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---|
| Dollars. The Contribution funds may be commingled with other trust fund assets maintained by the IBRD.” | | commingled for the Trustee to invest and reinvest pending disbursement. The Trustee maintains separate records and ledger accounts with respect of the funds in the CREWS Trust Fund and transfers made therefrom (See para. 8) so this would not pose any issue to account for the funds contributed and transferred. |
| 4.1 – Which versions of the Governance Document and Contribution Agreement apply? | Germany | T – This refers to the latest version of the Governance Document approved by the SC, and the Contribution Agreement signed by the Contributor. |
| 4.5 What is the defined mechanism to ensure that necessary adjustments (of activities, in order to achieve results) as suggested by the Steering Committee (based on these reports) will be incorporated in the Implementing Partner’s activities? Insert reference to Gov Doc. | Germany | T – The Steering Committee will receive reports from the IPs to enable it to monitor progress. In a worst case scenario, the SC could decide not to approve new projects submitted by the IP. Also, if funds are not used for the purposes intended, the IP is required to take certain actions as specified in para 5.6 of the FPA. Furthermore, if the IP cannot meet the obligation under para. 5.6 or any other obligation under the FPA, the issue is brought to the attention of the SC and the SC may instruct the Trustee to suspend any further commitment and/or cash transfer of the CREWS resources to the IP until such time as the IP has cured the non-compliance to the reasonable satisfaction of the Trustee in consultation with the Steering Committee. |
| 6.0 – Are end of year adjustments based on actual costs incurred subject to SC approval | Germany | T – Adjustments will be based on actual costs as the Trustee (and Secretariat) must be able to fully recover its costs. If these are expected to be significantly different from original estimates, the SC would be informed. |
| Operations Manual | | |
| Comment: | Provided by: | Proposed action: |
| Implementing partners: Is the number of implementing partners limited to the current three organizations? If not, how are new implementing partners selected? | Netherlands | The current wording of the Governance document allows other organizations to become Implementing Partners upon approval of the Steering Committee and with the no-objection of the Trustee, in accordance with an accreditation scheme that may be established by the Steering Committee (in consultation with the Trustee). |
| Australia is concerned the operations manual states that the design of the projects will base based on implementing partners ‘appropriate procedures’. Assuming that each implementing partner has different project design processes, Australia recommends clarification around how projects will be designed. Can partners provide input into this process? | Australia | T – This is the modus operandi of FIFs, under which each IP uses own policies and procedures. The programming procedures for CREWS projects have been further clarified in the revised documents. This includes aspects of quality control of respective Implementing Partners procedures for project design and the |

| | | |
|---|---------------------|--|
| | | role of partners in this process. |
| In terms of monitoring and evaluation, how much funding has been set aside for this? Will there be independent evaluations throughout the course of the projects, how many, etc. recommend providing further details on M&E. | Australia | T – Funding allocations would be proposed in annual Administrative Budgets and project proposals, not in the founding governing documents. Implementing Partners will include the financial resources required for the reporting in each project proposal. The Secretariat provisional budget in the Administrative Costs has US\$ 40'000 for reporting for the first year of operation, not including staff costs. |
| Amending projects: Suggest changing ‘The steering committee shall approve changes, on a no objection basis, before they take effect’ to ..shall approve changes by consensus... to ensure consistency with governance document. | Australia | T – Suggest to leave original text as the method for decision making by the SC is covered elsewhere. |
| Investment Plan | | |
| Comment: | Provided by: | Proposed action: |
| Dutch pledge. As I indicated in the June telcom: our intention is to spread the Dutch commitment over the coming years (2017 - 2020 and to set aside part of the commitment for projects by KNMI that contribute to CREWS objectives and which are coordinated with CREWS for maximum impact. | Netherlands | The change has been reflected to the “pledges” table in the draft Investment Plan. |
| Focus is on SIDS and LDCs. In many cases it will make sense to work in regional programs that could also include other type of countries (e.g. Philippines or Indonesia with lots of small islands). How ‘hard’ is the focus on SIDS and LDCs? | Netherlands | The geographic focus of the CREWS initiative is the responsibility of the Steering Committee. The current CREWS documents reflect the focus on SIDS and LDCs. |
| Dutch focus countries. The Netherlands has a development relation with the following countries: Afghanistan, Burundi, Mali, Jemen, Rwanda, South-Sudan, Palestine Territories, Bangladesh, Benin, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenia, Mozambique and Uganda. It is not a requirement for us that these countries are addressed through CREWS, but it would be of interest to us and we could provide extra assistance through our embassies if needed. | Netherlands | Following the suggestion made at the videocall on 27 June 2016, Mali has been included as a CREWS Project Country. |
| Netherlands seeks clarity on how will the CREWS secretariat be financed. | Netherlands | T – The Secretariat and Trustee costs will be funded from resources in the CREWs Trust Fund, based on annual Administrative Budgets to be submitted to the SC for approval. |
| On cooperation: It would probably be a good idea to reflect better ongoing initiatives in this field, e.g. (for Africa) the many activities orchestrated by UNECA/African Union/African Development Bank (“ClimDev Africa”). The UK / DFID has a big meteorological/disaster risk reduction agenda. One could probably recommend to reach out to regional initiatives. | Luxembourg | Aligning with existing programmes and looking to leverage existing resources are two of the programming principles of the CREWS. Contacts with both initiatives have been initiated through the development of the CREWS programme. UK/DFID has been invited to join the CREWS Steering Committee as an Observer. |
| For the initial set of beneficiary countries: Is there the possibility to include Cape Verde in this list? | Luxembourg | Decisions on project countries and pipeline countries are made by the Steering Committee. The decision is based on ongoing mapping of EWS status, capacity and leveraging potential, as well as availability of funds. |
| Page 5 (output 1.2) Hazard and risk information of exposed | Australia | Reviews of early warning system |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| <p><i>populations and assets to guide early warning systems and climate and weather services. As written it is not clear what is being done with risk information. Is it being acquired or used to guide EWS and hydromet services?</i></p> | | <p>effectiveness have highlighted that risk information does not sufficiently drive the development of early warning operations. In some countries it is the lack of risk information, in others the risk information is available but either not formatted to address early warning needs (i.e. focus on financial exposure rather than loss of lives) or not sufficiently used by the hydromet community. The country projects will therefore assess whether additional risk data is required or if existing data can be used for early warning implementation.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 1.4) <i>Long-term development plans for NMHSs. Suggest explicit inclusion of the need to consider system interoperability at the national and regional levels.</i></p> | Australia | <p>The proposed wording has been included.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 1.6) <i>Preparedness and response plans with operational procedures for effective early warning dissemination, readiness to act with regular simulation exercises. This may require advocacy with NHMSs/NDMOs and Ministries of Finance to ensure sustainability. CREWS should consider high staff turnover in SIDS and make sure warning responsibilities are readily accessible</i></p> | Australia | <p>The result sought with Output 1.6 is for CREWS to link-up, in Project Countries, with initiatives by NDMOs supported by GFDRR and other partners to strengthen SOPs for preparedness and contingency planning, specifically to ensure that they integrate early warning components. Similar efforts will be made for simulation exercises.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 1.7) <i>Targeted education and public awareness programmes available for warning systems and related public action. CREWS should note the high linguistic diversity at subnational level across PICS and low literacy in planning targeted education and awareness programmes.</i></p> | Australia | <p>Good practices exist, and have been applied by the Implementing Partners for raising awareness in communities with low literacy rates and diverse languages.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 1.8) <i>Greater inter-operability between risk-related safety-nets and risk sharing initiatives and hydromet services and early warning systems. Can this be clarified?</i></p> | Australia | <p>One objective of CREWS, is to promote better collaboration between initiatives for risk sharing (ARC in Africa and regional catastrophic risk insurance pools in the Pacific) and the development and dissemination of climate predictions and early warnings. This will be achieved, at the country project level, through the identification and use, where appropriate, of relevant data and products developed for risk-sharing purposes.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 3.1) <i>Standards and systems in place to monitor early warning trends, needs, gaps and capacity to drive investments and measure progress... Clarify whether this involves an overlap with existing WMO mandate. This output is grouping significant work items together that are likely to need varying expertise to implement. Suggest clarification as to who will do this, and how information will be useful to target countries.</i></p> | Australia | <p>The suggested revision of the Output wording is “Apply, in SIDS and LDCs, standards and systems in place to monitor early warning trends, needs, gaps and capacity to drive investments and measure progress...” CREWS will support WMO and UNISDR in their efforts to support CREWS target countries measure Target G of the Sendai Framework.</p> |
| <p>Page 5 (Output 3.3) <i>Knowledge products are compiled and applied for technical guidance for early warning service delivery in countries and cities. Risk this will be supply driven. CREWS should ensure these products will be demand driven and ensure communication with NHMSs, NDMOs and communities to manage this risk.</i></p> | Australia | <p>The need for early warning service delivery to be demand driven and adapted to different audiences and vulnerable groups in particular is a driving principle of the CREWS. CREWS projects will seek to engage with early warning users (NDMOs and key sectors) from the early programming</p> |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| | | stage to ensure that services and products developed by the projects have ownership and are applicable to said audiences. |
| 6 2016 monitoring of EWS capacity. DFAT has undertaken a broad EWS stocktake which will go to the Pacific Island Forum Foreign Ministers Meeting in August – we will contribute the findings of this report. | Australia | The report will be considered both with regard to the methodology used and the findings for the 2016 monitoring of EWS capacity. It has also been uploaded to the CREWS workspace for other partners to consult. |
| Page 7 <i>Integrated Programming</i> . Says ad-hoc Programming group aligning and prioritising a number of existing programmes and initiatives, reviewing budgets, as well as identifying lead implementing partners. Australia would appreciate seeing a more thought out and transparent detailing of this issue (at least for the Pacific Projects). We consider that in the Pacific there may be more experienced and more viable long term lead options from within the ‘other partners’ listings. There may be utility in naming a development or design lead and a process for establishing an implementation lead. | Australia | Two stages in the programming of CREWS country projects will assist in ensuring country ownership, inclusiveness of relevant partners and better alignment of country project with regional support. First, and this is a new proposal, CREWS will run programming workshops at the inception of each country project, engaging with the national and regional partners. These will also identify the lead implementing partner for the country projects. Second, the Implementing Partners have already a well-established network of institutions and partnerships through whom they will be implementing the CREWS projects. |
| Page 6-7 <i>Leveraging investments</i> . Would be good to consider opportunities to leverage actual addition investments – will WMO/WBG/UNISDR pursue other multilateral project funding? This is mentioned on page 6 (potential for leveraging) and upstream leveraging of policy improvements on page 7 but is not explored for each of the specific support projects. | Australia | The country projects for Mali, and DRC already include the leveraging of existing larger multilateral projects (respectively the GCF and the GEF). Opportunities will be sought in others. |
| Page 12 <i>The installation of the SmartMet Integrated Forecasting System as well as the SmartAlert installed in the PICs will be able to provide the necessary environment to host this regional warning platform in the region</i> . The regional plan seems to provide details on a particular technical solution (e.g. SmartMet). There are other options like Visualweather. Given Smartmet has been trialled by a number of countries; it seems a targeted consultations / user feedback would reveal suitability of the various options. Recommend that detailed in-country consultations are conducted for both projects, before the technical solutions are defined. Is the workplan relying on or suggesting channelling of CREWS funding to FINPAC’s SmartMet services? Choice of technical solution should be heavily influenced by workable, long-term support options/arrangements after completion of the project. | Australia | These question will be addressed in the regional consultation for the Pacific project. |
| Page 14 <i>PNG Program- Lead Partners</i> . While there is a clear need for improved forecasting ability for droughts, CREWS should ensure a focus on accessibility of warnings, and that any initiative includes consideration at the outset of what advice will be given to communities on actions to be taken along with alerts. DFAT would recommend working with a civil society / NGO partner to ensure effectiveness of an alert system. | Australia | These question will be addressed in the regional consultation for the Pacific project. T – This is possible, however CREWS funding will be channelled only through the IPs. The IPs may then work with CSOs in accordance with their policies and procedures. |

| | | |
|---|------------------|--|
| <p>15 <i>International Early Warning Conference</i>. Suggest support is provided for key decision makers from project nations to attend, and specifically that policy makers in Ministries of Finance are invited. CREWS to ensure focus is not solely on infrastructure/technology but last mile communications.</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>Both points (1. ensuring participation of representatives from SIDS and LDCs and CREWS project countries in particular; and 2. The need to focus on the last mile) have been taken-up by the Conference programme committee. Information on the Conference preparations will be provided at the Steering Committee meeting on 12 September.</p> |
| <p>Page 16 <i>Pacific Partners</i>. Considering the crucial role of NGOs in EWS, CREWS should consider including these stakeholders in its programming.</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>T – This is possible, however CREWs funding will be channelled only through the IPs. The IPs may then work with CSOs in accordance with their policies and procedures</p> <p>The CREWS documents have been modified to reflect this.</p> |
| <p>Page 18 <i>Partnerships and Frameworks</i> We strongly suggest partnerships with NGOs who are often critical in ensuring messages reach communities and are understood!</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>The language on the role of NGOs has been strengthened in the Work Plan and their role promoted through the programming process.</p> |
| <p>Page 19 <i>Scope</i>. The two Pacific projects seem to have scopes that are broader than what could be accomplished with the budgets indicated.</p> | <p>Australia</p> | <p>A prioritization of activities will be carried out through consultations with all relevant partners in the Pacific once the CREWS investment plan will be adopted by the Steering Committee.</p> |