



**22nd Meeting of the Steering
Committee**

Sunbird Mt. Soche Hotel
Blantyre, Malawi
13 February 2026

CREWS/SC.22/workdoc.6

Draft Meeting Report

Final Meeting Report

Summary

The Meeting Report contains the summary of proceedings, the Decisions approved at the meeting, and the list of participants.

Summary of Proceedings and Decisions

1. The 22nd Meeting of the Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS) Steering Committee was convened on 13 February 2026 in Blantyre, Malawi, chaired by Canada.
2. Representatives from the CREWS Contributing Members participated in-person at the meeting: Canada (Chair), France, Finland, Monaco, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Austria, Germany and Luxembourg joined online. Invited Observers from China Meteorological Administration (CMA) and Czech Republic participated remotely. The Secretariat, Trustee, the World Bank, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), the International Federation of the Red Cross Red Crescent (IFRC), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Risk-informed Early Action Partnership (REAP), the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Systematic Observations Financing Facility (SOFF) joined the meeting in-person. The World Food Programme (WFP) joined online. Representatives from the host country, Malawi, were also present, including from the Water Resources Department, Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services, Environmental Affairs and Disaster Management. See Annex 1 -List of Participants.
3. The Summary of Key Decisions is below:
 - The Secretariat was invited to finalize a draft CREWS Operational Plan 2026-2030.
 - The CREWS Pipeline list of countries/regions and the proposed priority list of projects to initiate project preparation in 2026 was approved, depending on the availability of funds in the FIF.
 - The Implementing Partners were invited to initiate preparation of the projects entitled: Malawi Phase 2: Scaling Up Risk-Informed Planning, Hydro-Meteorological and Early Warning Services (USD 5 million) and Africa Continental: Strengthening of regional collaboration and institutional capacities for early warning and early action in Africa (USD 6 million), ensuring maximization of alignment opportunities.
 - Amendments made to the GCF-CREWS Scaling Up Framework on Early Warning and the related joint pipeline list of priority projects for scale up were approved.
 - Financing of the IFRC proposal for REAP, subject to IFRC's accreditation to CREWS was approved.
 - The Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, was invited to develop and deploy a Resource Mobilization Strategy and Plan aimed at encapsulating CREWS' ambition to deliver on its 2030 Strategy.
 - The incoming CREWS Director is invited to identify measures to strengthen the Secretariat in line with the key considerations highlighted and seek an increase to the administration budget.

Agenda Item 1 – Opening and Adoption of the Agenda

Welcome by the Chair and Introductory remarks by the Government of Malawi, host of the 22nd CREWS Steering Committee meeting

4. The Chair welcomed participants and thanked the Government of Malawi for hosting the 22nd CREWS Steering Committee and site visits.

5. The meeting opened with a welcome from the Malawi Commissioner for Disaster Management Affairs (DMA), highlighting Malawi's transition from reactive disaster response to proactive, risk-informed anticipatory action with CREWS support. Achievements of the current CREWS Malawi project were highlighted including the finalization and launch of the National Framework for Water and Climate Services (NFCWS) and the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) strategic plan for 2025 – 2029. Malawi also announced that it is joining the EW4ALL initiative. Malawi outlined its future priorities for CREWS Malawi phase 2, which includes full operationalization of the Malawi Disaster Risk Management Act 2023, expansion of impact-based forecasting across agriculture, health, aviation, energy and the integration of artificial intelligence into workflows. The Commissioner also stressed the need for strengthening anticipatory action by linking early warning triggers to pre-arranged financing and mainstreaming gender equality and disability inclusion.

Remarks by incoming representatives of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS)

6. The AOSIS Chair accepted the invitation to become a member of the CREWS Steering Committee. The Chair read the message from the Ambassador of AOSIS: "AOSIS is extremely grateful for the invitation to join this timely and important initiative. Well-resourced and sustainable early warning systems are a key component in SIDS responses to the climate crisis. We look forward to constructively engaging with the rest of the Steering Committee and advocating on behalf of all 39 UN-recognized SIDS to ensure that they can all benefit from the CREWS initiative. This in turn will get the world closer to achieving its aim of Early Warning Systems for all by 2027."
7. Further, the Chair mentioned that the LDC representative recently rotated from Malawi to Timor-Leste, and confirmation of their participation is expected shortly.

Review of progress on decisions taken at the 21st Meeting, as well as the 9th and 10th Intersessional Meetings

8. The Secretariat reported on the decisions taken at the 21st Meeting, as well as the 9th and 10th Intersessional Meetings (CREWS/SC.22/infdoc.1). The following decisions had pending actions: (i) CREWS Operational Procedures on Programming in Fragile, Conflict and Violence-Affected contexts were finalized, (ii) circulation of the first batch of Accelerated Support Window (ASW) action notes for review and approval, (iii) noted on the ongoing outreach to the European Commission with regard to co-financing of the CREWS Eastern Caribbean proposal on cell-broadcast.

Decision 1.1/Item 1/22nd Meeting: The Agenda is approved.

Agenda Item 2 – Activating the CREWS Strategy 2030 – Elements of an Operational Plan 2026 - 2030

9. The Secretariat presented the elements of the CREWS Operational Plan (CREWS/SC.22/workdoc.2) as the "how" for delivering the Strategy 2030. The Plan focuses on: (i) strengthening joint programming among partners, (ii) hardwiring current monitoring and evaluation to climate adaptation outcomes, (iii) leveraging investments, and (iv) promoting emerging technologies. It also identified CREWS strengths to maintain such as the principled approach to its country

programming, emphasizing country-driven, people-centered and gender-responsive principles anchored on its 3 financing pathways.

10. The representative from Switzerland requested clarity on the “Met Service to Met Service” operational approach and how this would be integrated with the WMO’s Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP). A question was raised regarding coordination with SOFF to avoid duplication and asked for details on how Implementing Partners will ensure synergy. The importance of sustainability of investments was emphasized and the need to also ensure against overloading beneficiary countries with systems they cannot afford to maintain.
11. The representative from Norway expressed the need to demonstrate impact on the ground as a justification for further ODA finance and welcomed the focus on M&E indicators with baselines and targets for 2028 and 2030. It was asked how the new operational plan relates to the existing M&E framework and how Implementing Partners will report to CREWS. A clear definition of resource mobilization to distinguish between complementary finance and direct contributions was also requested.
12. The representative from the United Kingdom noted that it requires more granularity and choices regarding on where to focus resources. It was questioned on how to provide incentives to increase joint programming and requested more details on how the Secretariat interacts with large institutions like the GCF. A comment was made on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) indicators that it is a menu and might not be the most useful management framework and argued that sections on gender and people-centered approaches are good enough but not yet transformative.
13. The representative from France noted the gap between negotiated adaptation concepts at UNFCCC and the actual needs of populations seen during the field visits. It was asked whether the emerging technologies should have specific projects or be mainstreamed into all initiatives – stressing France’s preferences for mainstreaming.
14. The representative from Canada expressed interest in expanding partnerships beyond early warnings to sectors like agriculture, health and infrastructure. An inquiry on plans to expand the GCF-CREWS scale-up framework to other climate funds like the Adaptation Fund or Global Environment Fund (GEF) was raised.
15. The representative from the IFRC argued that anticipatory action should focus on three tracks: strengthening community ability to act on warnings, supporting the most vulnerable who lack capacity to act, and building the institutional capacity of responders. It was proposed specifically to reference anticipatory action in legal and policy framework targets. Further, IFRC explained that early action protocols (EAPs) approved via CREWS can be leveraged for automatic funding release from the IFRC’s Disaster Response Emergency Fund (DREF). It was also clarified that early warning is already a critical part of EAPs, but the goal is to build warnings that meet the specific requirements of anticipatory action.
16. The representative from WMO noted that it has a new engagement framework for peer-to-peer support, including South-South cooperation.
17. The Secretariat acknowledged the need for better definitions of sustainability and cost recovery for

Met Services. It also expressed excitement about AI and technologies like cell broadcast, noting the recently approved initiated project in the Caribbean. It was also noted that 5 of the 7 GGA target G indicators match current CREWS indicators.

18. UNDRR noted that 36 countries where CREWS operates are not yet reporting on Sendai Framework Target G and suggested CREWS to help improve this official reporting.
19. The representative from the UK reiterated the need to place a premium on collaboration and asked for incentives that reward true integrated programming rather than just speaking to each other. It also proposed a small working group to support the Secretariat in refining the Operational Plan.

Decision 2.1/Item 2/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee invites the Secretariat:

- **To finalize a draft CREWS Operational Plan 2026-2030, and to circulate a draft for review of the Steering Committee within two months of the meeting drawing on discussions of the 22nd meeting of the Steering Committee supported by a working group composed of Members, partners and beneficiaries;**
- **To further define funding pathways, the principle of leveraging additional funds based on practice (scaling-up, co-financing and programmatic alignment and bridge financing) and the metrics for measuring;**
- **To develop a concept note on the application of new technologies and innovations to enhance early warning systems, as part of the draft operational plan, including through consultations with targeted stakeholders;**
- **To review the CREWS Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning framework and indicators, considering the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) indicators and to make recommendations to ensure that CREWS reporting is aligned with the GGA.**

Agenda Item 3 – CREWS Operations

Update by the Trustee on activities and the status of the CREWS Financial Intermediary Fund (FIF) (CREWS/SC.22/infdoc.2)

20. The Trustee reported USD 142 million in contributions and pledges with USD 141 million received. It noted funding decisions total of USD 103.9 million for projects. It confirmed funds available for allocation as of the meeting date amount to USD 15.4 million.
21. The representative from France requested that the Steering Committee be informed of amounts available in the FIF for commitments before decisions are taken in meetings. This was supported by the representative from Norway.
22. The representative from the UK observed that the trust fund is slowly reducing and suggested CREWS to act more as a financing network than a primary financier. The representative from France further argued that the initiative should be led by results rather than just financial KPIs.

Status (performance assessments, project highlights and risk status) of CREWS Portfolio January – December 2025 (CREWS/SC.22/infdoc.3)

23. The Secretariat provided a snapshot of the interim status of the CREWS portfolio, highlighting the following:
- 15 ongoing multi-year country and regional projects, 12 ASW actions across Africa, Asia Pacific and the Caribbean.
 - USD 17.5 million in new multi-year investments approved, particularly in strengthening engagement in Asia and the Pacific.
 - While delivery rates are strong in several mature projects, newly launched projects show naturally lower expenditure rates, which are expected to accelerate in 2026.
 - CREWS has helped leverage approximately USD 900 million including support to 3 countries accessing GCF resources.
 - Most projects fall within medium to medium-high risk categories, typical for complex multi-country operations.
 - Overall, delivery performance remains solid with stronger results in established projects and expected acceleration in new ones.
 - Announced the development of an online results tracking tool and the initiation of the preparation process of the 2025 CREWS Annual Report.
24. In summary, 2025 demonstrates continued scaling of CREWS investments, strong technical outputs and growing leveraging of climate finance. The focus in 2026 will be on accelerating delivery of new projects, strengthening results tracking and deepening people-centered and gender-responsive approaches.

CREWS Pipeline List and proposed priorities for full proposal development (CEW/SC.22/workdoc.3)

25. The Secretariat presented the CREWS Pipeline List and proposed priorities for full proposal development. The Pipeline List serves as a structured tool to guide CREWS financing decisions, ensuring that countries and regions included demonstrate eligibility, ownership, and readiness. The process assesses needs (risk exposure and institutional capacity for early warning), demand (national and regional prioritization of early warning with evidence), and leveraging potential (opportunities for additional resources and synergies). It also monitors fragile, conflict, and violence (FCV) contexts and Least Developed Country (LDC) status to support strategic and targeted investments.
26. The current pipeline includes 29 projects (with 11 additional projects), covering 49 countries and totaling USD 124.25 million. Fourteen countries are classified as operating in fragile contexts, including conflict-affected states such as Afghanistan, Haiti, Myanmar, and Yemen, as well as institutionally or socially fragile small island states. Several countries are also approaching LDC graduation, which has implications for future eligibility and support strategies. Overall, the proposals show strong alignment with the CREWS 2030 Strategy, emphasizing pillar-based structuring, integrated partnerships, institutionalization, anticipatory action, impact-based forecasting, and leveraging regional mechanisms, with clear priorities identified for full proposal preparation.
27. Two pipeline proposals were suggested to immediately proceed to full proposal development: (i) CREWS Malawi phase 2, and (ii) Africa continental. CREWS Malawi phase 2 builds on substantively scaling up pilot initiatives and technological innovations. It will focus on institutional strengthening and legal advancement, expanding anticipatory action, enhancing risk financing and mainstreaming gender equality and disability inclusion. CREWS funding would bridge support

while a GCF scale up proposal is being developed and increases probability of GCF approval. On the other hand, the African continental pipeline addresses a gap at the continental level in terms of digitalization of early warning and climate information, human resource development and quality management.

28. The representative from the UK requested to explicitly include in the pipeline process flowchart on how the Secretariat filters the pipeline. It supported the CREWS Malawi phase 2. Regarding the Africa Continental proposal UK requested its approval subject to evidence of alignment with UK WISER Africa and the EU Space for Early Warning SEWA programme.
29. The representative from Norway supported Malawi project and supported the Bangladesh project as it is a time-critical case given it is facing graduation from LDC status.

Decision 3.1/Item 3/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee:

- Approves the CREWS Pipeline list of countries/regions as presented at the meeting
- Approves the proposed priority list of projects to initiate project preparation in 2026, depending on the availability of funds in the FIF.

Decision 3.2/Item 3/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee Invites the Implementing Partners to initiate preparation of the projects entitled: Malawi Phase 2: Scaling Up Risk-Informed Planning, Hydro-Meteorological and Early Warning Services (USD 5 million) and Africa Continental: Strengthening of regional collaboration and institutional capacities for early warning and early action in Africa (USD 6 million), ensuring maximization of alignment opportunities.

Amendments to the GCF-CREWS Scaling Up Framework on Early Warning, joint pipeline list of countries for scale up (CREWS/SC.22/infdoc.5)

30. The representative from the GCF Secretariat reported that projects in Togo and Caribbean covering Belize and Trinidad & Tobago have been approved by the GCF board under the scaling up framework. It was proposed to expand the framework beyond the USD 25 million Simplified Approval Process (SAP) funding allocation cap to allow for larger standard Proposal Approval Process (PAP) projects. It was emphasized that the need to have Nationally-Designated Authorities (NDAs) engage with regional teams as early as possible is imperative to expedite the review process.
31. The representative from the UK raised concerns about the trade-off between the scale of PAP projects and the speed of the SAP modality. The GCF confirmed that both SAP and PAP modalities would remain available on a case-by-case basis.

Decision 3.3/Item 3/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee approves amendments made to the GCF-CREWS Scaling-up Framework on Early Warning and the related joint pipeline list of priority projects for scale-up and invites the Secretariat to regularly inform the Steering Committee on progress, at a minimum prior to every GCF Board meeting, as well as keeping the Steering Committee abreast of financial implications of the roll-out of the Scaling-up Framework on the CREWS Secretariat administrative budget.

Status of accreditation of Implementing Partners (CREWS/SC.22/workdoc.4) and engagement by IFRC and ITU in CREWS operations

32. The Secretariat noted with appreciation that, following the Steering Committee's stage 2 Fit-for-Purpose approvals, both IFRC and ITU have progressed substantially through stage 3 fiduciary and safeguards review process. The Accreditation Panel's visit in mid-December and near completion of the technical assessment reflect commendable efficiency and cooperation on all sides. Draft reports are to be shared for fact-checking and these would then be submitted to the Trustee for no-objection and then to the Steering Committee for approval.

Partnership with REAP and financing modalities (CREWS/SC.22/workdoc.4)

33. The Chair introduced the proposal to strengthen collaboration between CREWS and REAP, including financial support through the CREWS Trust Fund to the REAP Secretariat via IFRC. It was recalled that the UK had introduced the proposal at the 9th Intersessional Meeting.

34. The representative from the UK explained that the proposal builds on long-standing discussions and aims to finance REAP functions through CREWS for an initial two-year period. It was stated that REAP's networking, lesson learning, analysis, and partnership of 110+ institutions would add value to CREWS' strategic objectives, particularly in scaling full value-chain early warning systems and anticipatory action. He emphasized that the draft decision has two parts: (1) approval of financing and (2) agreement on governance and reporting arrangements between the two Secretariats. He noted the importance of reviewing the partnership's effectiveness over time.

35. The representative from the REAP Secretariat highlighted the need to address fragmentation in the early warning and early action landscape. Referencing recent developments, including draft findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the urgency of strengthening early warning and anticipatory action was stressed, especially for fragile populations. The REAP's 2030 strategy priorities was outlined: (1) sense-making and analysis of investments and gaps, (2) policy influence and coalition-building, and (3) financing. The proposed alliance would reduce fragmentation, create operational value for CREWS, and send a strong global signal on coordinated action.

36. The Chair noted Canada's initial hesitation but expressed support based on demonstrated added value, particularly in resource mobilization and coordination.

37. The representative from Switzerland supported the proposal in principle, describing it as a pragmatic solution to reduce fragmentation and enhance coherence. However, it was noted that the concept note was too generic and requested more detail on governance, operational coordination, and reporting. A mid-term review within the first two years was suggested.

38. The representative from France strongly supported stronger coordination but requested clearer information on detailed actions and oversight arrangements. It was emphasized that the need for CREWS representation in REAP governance is needed and clarification on how REAP's broader mandate would align with CREWS' focus on Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

39. Representative from Finland supported the proposal, recognizing clear synergies and expressing confidence that the partnership would deliver impact at scale.

40. The representative from Norway echoed support for improved coordination and reduced fragmentation but reiterated concerns about the lack of operational detail. The need for clarity on

how CREWS would concretely benefit was requested.

41. The representative from Germany agreed that stronger alignment could enhance coherence and impact but questioned whether financing was necessary for all aspects of collaboration, suggesting some alignment might occur without funding. Clarification on REAP's benefits beyond general coordination was sought and raised questions about budget figures. It was also asked whether similar collaboration was foreseen with SOFF. Later, the efficiency of funding a separate Secretariat structure was questioned instead of fully integrating REAP into CREWS, though confirmed Germany would not block consensus.
42. In response, representative from the UK clarified that the budget covers core Secretariat functions and that REAP's existence depends on such funding. It proposed that the CREWS Chair sits on the REAP Governing Board to address oversight concerns. It confirmed that the UK intends to increase its contribution to CREWS (including REAP support), subject to planning assumptions, and emphasized that the allocation under discussion amounted to CHF 1.9 million. It was encouraged that the Committee proceed pragmatically and assess value over time.
43. The representative from REAP acknowledged the question of deeper structural integration as valid and worthy of future consideration but suggested it required broader reflection.
44. Members discussed governance modalities and timelines. Switzerland reiterated the importance of specifying governance, operational, and reporting arrangements. France preferred that detailed governance proposals come jointly from both Secretariats, with a clear deadline.

Decision 3.4/Item 3/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee approves the financing of the IFRC proposal for the Risk-informed Early Action Partnership (REAP), subject to IFRC's accreditation to CREWS, in the amount of CHF 1,942,957. The Steering Committee invites both Secretariats to propose governance, oversight, operational and reporting modalities to the Steering Committee for review and approval by May 1st 2026.

Agenda Item 4 – Outreach, Resource Mobilization and Secretariat Staffing

Updates to the CREWS outreach and resource mobilization strategy (CREWS/SC.22/workdoc.5)

45. The Secretariat provided a brief presentation on the CREWS resource mobilization strategy. It was emphasized that resource mobilization is both a core responsibility of the Secretariat and a collective responsibility of the Members. It was underscored that CREWS' progress to date has relied heavily on Members' outreach and peer engagement, citing examples including, the French diplomatic engagement in multilateral processes and Norway's engagement following introductions facilitated by a Member. The Secretariat developed a resource mobilization strategy in 2022 and maintains contact databases, engagement tracking systems and bilateral priorities mapping. The components of the resource mobilization strategy include emphasizing value for money, outreach to peers, capitals and leveraging multilateral meetings, private sector engagement and encouraging greater alignment and transparency.
46. The representative from Canada inquired on the following: (i) how the level of ambition is linked to the Operational Plan, (ii) whether the USD 124 million representing immediate needs refers only to pipeline projects, (iii) whether targets should be presented as a range with a minimum and ambitious ceiling and (iv) whether 100% contributor engagement implies maintaining current

contribution levels.

47. The representative from Norway suggested exploring philanthropy and charitable foundations and proposed opening a window for charities to contribute without joining governance structures. Further, it was encouraged that there can be an outreach beyond traditional western donors to middle-income countries.
48. The representative from the UK emphasized the need for clarity on “why CREWS”. It noted potential in innovation and technology partnerships and highlighted the need to re-engage partners with a targeted campaign message such as: “Finish the job.”
49. UNDRR emphasized the alignment between CREWS and the broader EW4ALL initiative and suggested stronger coordination on resource mobilization. It is convening a global early warning conference in 2027 in Africa.
50. WMO read a statement from its Assistant Secretary-General confirming WMO’s support for CREWS’ continued resource mobilization efforts and recognizing CREWS as an important financing mechanism for the WMO.
51. France is using its G7 Presidency to promote CREWS. It has framed its narrative as: “We are close to success. We can close the gap.” It suggested focusing on a clear, time-bound financing target emphasizing CREWS’ credibility. It called for operational coordination through a small group involving the CREWS champions from the LDCs and SIDS and engage with private sector actors. It stressed the urgency due to the G7 ministerial timelines.
52. Switzerland indicated that it intends to maintain its annual USD 1 million contribution for four years, subject to approval.
53. Monaco stated its pride in being part of the CREWS initiative, emphasized that the week’s visit demonstrated the CREWS partnership spirit and thanked the Government of Malawi for hosting. Monaco confirmed its readiness to support the collective resource mobilization efforts, alongside France. It also announced that Monaco’s contribution will substantially increase over the next two years, reaching a tenfold increase by the end of 2027. While acknowledging it is modest compared to others, it represents a significant commitment at the level of the Principality.
54. UK suggested that resource mobilization be framed as a campaign and not just a financing exercise. It emphasized leading with results rather than financial targets with the visible leadership from LDCs and SIDS.

Decision 4.1/Item 4/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee invites the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, to develop a Resource Mobilization Strategy aimed at encapsulating CREWS’ ambition to deliver on its 2030 Strategy, that would be used as the main tool to communicate publicly. The Strategy shall:

- **include resource mobilization targets and associated expected projects and initiatives to be supported across CREWS’ various funding pathways; and,**
- **provide indication of various actions and opportunities at a high level to achieve its objective.**

Decision 4.2/Item 4/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee invites the Secretariat to develop and deploy a Resource Mobilization Plan with targeted actions to deliver on its Resource Mobilization Strategy in short order, in close consultation with CREWS members and partners.

Secretariat staff capacity, functions/skills assessment and gaps (CREWS/SC.22/infdoc.7)

55. The Chair recalled that during the previous intersessional meeting, the Steering Committee requested the CREWS Director to revert with an assessment of the Secretariat's staffing.
56. The Secretariat reminded that the Steering Committee approves the Secretariat's annual administrative budget and activity funds, and the Director is responsible for ensuring the Secretariat is fit-for-purpose and cost effective. The self-assessment showed that the Secretariat is adequately staffed but stretched. Any scale up in ambition would require additional capacity. There is increasing demand on programme support. Junior Professional Officer (JPO) modalities could help address short-term gaps.
57. The Chair noted that the discussion is not about performance but about capacity. The Secretariat is highly dedicated and overextended. It was cited in terms of reinforcement to consider additional support for resource mobilization and communications.
58. Canada would support an increase in the administrative budget to enable this.
59. Norway praised the Secretariat as lean and efficient. It was stated that resource mobilization is a high priority and that it is ready to support to carry this out.
60. France agreed with the assessment. It supported that this matter be addressed at an intersessional meeting.
61. Switzerland thanked the Secretariat for its commitment and responsiveness. A clarification was asked on what specific functions would be reinforced, estimated costs and percentage of administrative costs relative to total CREWS disbursement.
62. UK noted that the staffing needs should be linked to the Operational Plan. It stated that resources should align with delivery requirements and supported moving quickly if critical priority posts are identified.
63. The Chair clarified that the Steering Committee's role is to approve the administrative budget. The staffing structure is under the Director's authority. The intention is to provide flexibility to the Director to strengthen the Secretariat in line with the Steering Committee's strategic direction.

Decision 4.3/Item 4/22nd Meeting: The Steering Committee invites the incoming CREWS Director to identify measures to strengthen the Secretariat in line with the key considerations highlighted at the 22nd meeting of the Steering Committee, and seek an increase to the administrative budget before the 23rd meeting of the Steering Committee.

Agenda Item 5 – Next steps and Any Other Business

64. The World Bank/GFDRR informed that an Understanding Risk Conference will take place this year in Abu Dhabi. It was noted that most CREWS Implementing Partners have previously contributed

to or participated in previous sessions. The conference will focus on emergency preparedness, artificial intelligence and related risk and resilience topics. CREWS Members and partners are invited to consider participating and contributing.

65. The Government of Malawi, represented by the Director of the Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services (DCCMS) appreciated the opportunity to observe the deliberations. It was noted that Malawi clearly has committed and earlier partners supporting climate resilience efforts. Strong appreciation was expressed for the scaling up opportunity provided noting that it is not only for the DCCMS but more for the communities. Malawi is ready to support efforts to sustain and expand CREWS work.

Decision 5.1/Item 5/22nd Meeting: The 23rd Meeting of the Steering Committee will take place in Geneva, Switzerland, in person, with the possibility to connect online, on June 30th, 2026. The 24th Meeting will take place in the fourth quarter of 2026, with the venue and format still to be confirmed.

66. The Chair thanks the host country, the Members and partners of CREWS and the Secretariat for an efficient and productive meeting.

END OF MEETING

Annex 1 – List of Participants

MEMBERS	NAMES	STATUS
Austria	Cornelia Jaeger, Federal Ministry Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management, Republic of Austria	Confirmed online
Canada (Chair)	Francis Pigeon, Environment and Climate Change Canada	Confirmed in person
	Linh Trinh, Environment and Climate Change Canada	Confirmed in person
Finland	Soili Kangaskorpi, Climate and Environment Ambassador Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland	Confirmed in person
France	Benoit Faraco, climate change negotiations, renewable energy and climate risk prevention Ambassador, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, Republic of France	Confirmed in person
	Lorelei Lankester, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs	Confirmed in person
Germany	Verena Ommer, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Germany	Confirmed online
	Leona Hollasch, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Germany	Confirmed online
Luxembourg	Benjamin Questier, Ministry de inistry Environment, Climate and Biodiversity Luxembourg	Confirmed online
Monaco	Carl Dudek, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of the Principality of Monaco	Confirmed in person
Norway	Lars Andres Lunde, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	Confirmed in person
	Lars Nettet Romundstad, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation	Confirmed in person

	Lene Østvand, Norwegian Meteorological Institute	Confirmed in person
	Vegard Bønes, Norwegian Meteorological Institute	Confirmed in person
	Elinah Kuya, Norwegian Meteorological Institute	Confirmed in person
Switzerland	Sergio Perez, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	Confirmed in person
UK	Gerard Howe, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, Government of the United Kingdom	Confirmed in person
	Reel Ahmed, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, Government of the United Kingdom	Confirmed in person
	Fionne Caitlan Marshall, Met Office	Confirmed in person
OBSERVERS	NAMES	STATUS
China Meteorological Administration	Na Xiaodan, China Meteorological Administration	Confirmed online
Czech Republic	Ladislav Zeman, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic	Confirmed online
Malawi (Host)	Hon Patricia Wiskes, Ministry of Natural Resources Malawi	Confirmed in person
	Richard Perekamoy, Ministry of Natural Resources Malawi	Confirmed in person
	Wilson Moleni, Disaster Management Affairs Malawi	Confirmed in person
	Lucy Mtilatila, Climate Change and Meteorological Services Malawi	Confirmed in person
	Eng James Chitete, Ministry of Water and Sanitation Malawi	Confirmed in person
	Taonga Mbale, Ministry of Natural Resources and Climate Change Malawi	Confirmed in person
Spain	Fernando Belda, State Meteorological Agency Spain	Confirmed online
PARTNERS	NAMES	STATUS
Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Freddy Sotto	Confirmed online

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)	Stephanie Julmy	Confirmed in person
	Jurg Wilbrink	Confirmed in person
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	Vannesa Gray	Confirmed in person
	Anna Perlin	Confirmed online
Risk-informed Early Action Partnership (REAP)	Catalina Jaime	Confirmed in person
Systematic Observations Financing Facility (SOFF)	Olga Miltcheva	Confirmed in person
World Food Programme (WFP)	Jesse Mason	Confirmed online
IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS	NAME	STATUS
United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)	Loretta Hieber-Girardet	Confirmed in person
	Marco Massabo	Confirmed in person
	Stephanie Dannenmam	Confirmed online
	Andrew Colin Spezowka	Confirmed online
	Huw Beynon	Confirmed online
World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)	Firas Raad	Confirmed in person
	Niels Holm-Nielsen	Confirmed in person
	Henriette Mampuya	Confirmed in person
	Hugo Wesley	Confirmed in person
	Abigail Baca	Confirmed in person
	Kondwanie Frank Chirembo	Confirmed in person
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)	Daniel Kull	Confirmed online
	Lina Sjaavik	Confirmed in person
	Joshua Ngaina	Confirmed in person

	Nakiete Msemo	Confirmed in person
WORLD BANK TRUSTEE	NAMES	STATUS
	Larissa Vovk	Confirmed in person
SECRETARIAT	NAMES	STATUS
	John Harding	Confirmed in person
	Maria Lourdes Macasil	Confirmed in person
	Catherine Thompson	Confirmed online
	Mathias Mulumba	Confirmed online
	Yi Wang	Confirmed online
	Hap Rothsopong	Confirmed in person
	Rhodaine Tetteh-Narh (intern)	Confirmed online
	Peter Maertens (consultant)	Confirmed online
	Graham Joscelyne (consultant)	Confirmed online
	Becky Venton (consultant)	Confirmed online

Annex 2 –Agenda

09.00 – 0945 Item 1 – Opening and Adoption of the Agenda

- 1.1 Welcome by the Chair
- 1.2 Introductory remarks by the Government of Malawi, host of the 22nd CREWS Steering Committee meeting
- 1.3 Remarks by incoming representatives of LDCs and SIDS
- 1.4 Review of progress on decisions taken at the 21st Meeting, as well as the 9th and 10th Intersessional Meetings
- 1.5 Adoption of the Agenda

09.45 – 11.30 Item 2 – Activating the CREWS Strategy 2030 – Elements of an Operational Plan

11.30 – 15.30 Item 3 – CREWS Operations

- 3.1 Update by the Trustee
- 3.2 Status of CREWS Portfolio January – December 2025
- 3.3 CREWS Pipeline List and proposed priorities for full proposal development
- 3.4 Amendments to the GCF – CREWS Scaling up Framework on Early Warning, joint pipeline list of countries
- 3.5 Status of accreditation of Implementing Partners and engagement by IFRC and ITU in CREWS operations
- 3.6 Partnership with REAP and financing modalities

15.30 – 16.30 Item 4 – Outreach, Resource Mobilization and Secretariat Staffing

- 4.1 Updates to the CREWS resource mobilization strategy
- 4.2 Engagement by Members and partners to outreach and resource mobilization efforts
- 4.3 Secretariat staff capacity, functions/skills assessment and gaps

16.30 – 17.00 Item 5 – Next steps and Any Other Business

The CREWS Initiative gratefully acknowledges the support of:

CREWS Members



CREWS Observers



Visit www.crews-initiative.org

Contact us: crews-secretariat@wmo.int

Follow us: <https://www.linkedin.com/company/crews-initiative>

Watch us: <https://www.youtube.com/@crewsinitiative6027>

Engage with us: <https://bsky.app/profile/crews-initiative.bsky.social>

<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61581593597102>

https://www.instagram.com/crews_initiative/

