



People-Centered Early Warnings

CREWS Sixth Steering Committee Meeting
WMO, Geneva, 14 June 2018

What are people-centered early warnings according to CREWS?

CREWS principle c:

People-centered early warnings

“CREWS prioritizes investments that support early warning systems **developed with the participation of the people and communities that most require warnings, as well as vulnerable groups** to disasters and to the impacts of climate change”

(CREWS Operational Procedures Note No 1)

For CREWS: Who “most requires warnings” and who is “most vulnerable”?

- At global level:

LDCs and SIDS—*CREWS mandate*

- At national level:

Policy makers and authorities, sectors in **LDCs & SIDS**

- At community level:

Individuals and groups marginalized because of age, gender, ability, access to resources (inc. those previously displaced by disaster)

People at the center of early warning



Key points: Operationalizing the CREWS people-centered principle

- ✓ Broadening or strengthening CREWS partnerships (e.g., through climate outlook forum and DRR platforms)
- ✓ Integrating users from project design and throughout project life
- ✓ Integrating local and indigenous knowledge to complement technical knowledge
- ✓ Eliciting “ownership” by at-risk communities
- ✓ Broadening the “gender-sensitive principle” to include **all** people (of all ages and abilities) at risk through 2-way communication

“Participation”: How and when should CREWS engage?

- In the project design phase
- In the implementation phase: inception and throughout life-span of project
- In monitoring, reporting and evaluation



Photo: CREWS
consultation
with farmers,
Solobo,
Burkina Faso

People at center of CREWS projects:

1. In project design

- Project proposals identify people's early warning needs & access AND use this info to shape EWS
 - Who has access (e.g., women, children, youth, elderly, marginalized city residents, people with disabilities...)?
 - What info do they receive (e.g., hindcasts for agriculture, flood alerts...)?
 - How do they access the info (e.g., radio, mobile, TV, social media...)?
 - Who do they trust to convey info (e.g., sports celebrities)?
 - How is community info integrated in EWS (e.g., in risk assessment and warning dissemination)?



1. In project design (Cont.)

- Proposals identify national partners' community reach
 - Does NMHS consult with civil society groups, provide services targeted to various communities? Which groups does Civil Defence engage with?
 - Who is **not** engaged in consultations and outreach?
 - Do agencies reach out throughout the EWS chain: For risk assessment? Warning dissemination? Emergency preparedness? To get feedback after warnings?
- Project proposals identify who was engaged in the design of the CREWS project
- Project proposals identify outputs and indicators for engaging users



2. In Project Implementation

2a. Inception Phase

- Civil society, community-based, indigenous and marginalized groups and representatives of various ages and abilities are **invited to project planning meetings and represented at official launch**
- Gaps and opportunities analysis undertaken (**e.g. by broadening the gender analysis**)
 - **Opportunities to engage civil society** inc. at-risk and underserved groups, elderly, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities-- **throughout** project:
 - In risk mapping, data rescue, design and test of messages, development of warning dissemination strategy, media trainings, preparedness strategy and emergency drills...



2. In Project Implementation (*cont.*)

2b. Development of project

- National partners **develop list of groups and invite representatives** to project activities (or to relevant segments)
- **Views/information shared by users at meetings are documented and addressed in next project phase**
- Specific activities implemented to engage users throughout project life-span—inc. social media and new techs

Through climate outlook forums and DRR platforms:

- E.g., Consultations and feedback meetings, public presentations, trainings, media engagements for technical staff to interact with users
- Special arrangements/incentives provided to encourage public participation (e.g., accessible venues and opportune times for different groups, separate group consultations if appropriate)

3. In monitoring, reporting & evaluation

- **Project status reports** identify project outreach efforts:
 - numbers consulted (disaggregated by stakeholder group)
 - outcome of discussions
 - how views addressed/information incorporated
 - lessons learned
- **Annual reports** summarize achievements in ensuring public participation and engagement in early warning
- **Project evaluations** assess whether engagement was substantive and sustained; did it lead to improvements in early warning? (Users included in the evaluation process)

CREWS good practice examples

- **Burkina Faso**: consultations held with groups of women and men farmers to understand how they use radio weather reports for agriculture
- **Pacific SIDS**: NMHS assess their capabilities to ensure gender equality of early warning benefits in their broader capacity assessment
- **DRC, Mali and Niger**: developing indicators to monitor number of people with improved access to hydromet services, disaggregated by gender
- **Papua New Guinea**: to carry out gender analysis to identify interventions for women's benefit of early warning
- **Caribbean Lessons Learnt**: gender aspects specifically examined

Possible next steps

- Develop an operational note on implementing the principle
- Revise Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, adding indicators
- Revise Project Presentation Template
- Revise Project Status Report Template



Thank you!

CREWS Secretariat
www.crews-initiative.org
sllosa@wmo.int

CREWS Members



Australia



France (Chair)



Germany



Luxembourg



Netherlands

CREWS Observers



Canada



Japan



New Zealand



Norway



Switzerland



USAID



ACP

CREWS Implementing Partners



International guidance on people-centered early warnings

The Third International Early Warning Conference, 2006:

“**People-centred early warning systems** have to support and empower people in protecting themselves. In order to ‘go the last mile’, an integrated approach to early warning has to be ***based on the needs, priorities, capacities, and cultures of those at risk. People at risk must be partners in the system***, not controlled by it.”

Multi-Hazard Early Warning Conference, 2017:

engage users in the design, implementation, testing and validation of early warning system development to ensure messages are actionable and reach everyone