23rd Meeting of the Steering Committee

CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.6

Final Meeting Report

Summary of Proceedings

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

Summary

1. The 23rd Meeting of the CREWS Steering Committee was held on 30 June 2026, in Geneva, Switzerland. The Chair of the Least Developed Countries (LDC) group for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC), His Excellency Ambassador Barbosa from Timor Leste provided a welcome statement for his first participation. The meeting also noted the formal confirmation of John Harding as the Director of the CREWS Secretariat.

2. A primary objective of the session was to define the operational pathway toward the 2030 Strategy, particularly through the finalization of the Operational Plan and the Resource Mobilization Strategy. Ambassador Barbosa in his remarks emphasized that early warning systems remain a life-saving priority for LDCs and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), who contribute the least to emissions but suffer the most from climate impacts.

3. Significant operational progress was reported, notably the signing of the Financial Procedure Agreement with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the near completion of a similar agreement with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), expanding the networks and technical expertise available for CREWS operations. The Secretariat also showcased its transition toward a digitized Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) platform, moving away from manual reporting to provide real-time portfolio analytics by late 2026. Switzerland announced a new commitment of 9 million Swiss francs for the 2026–2030 period (USD 11 million equivalent) complementing recent announcement of contributions by Monaco and, in the margins of the G7, by France and the UK.

4. Decisions included the ring-fencing of additional USD 2 million for future Accelerated Support Window (ASW) financing, and the approval of the CREWS Administrative Budget for fiscal year 2027 (FY27).

5. The Committee requested a comprehensive review of the current CREWS project pipeline to ensure alignment with the new 2030 Strategy. The Steering Committee unanimously approved the continuation for an additional year of Canada, represented by Francis Pigeon, as Chair of the Steering Committee. Finally, the meeting concluded with a tribute to Gerard Howe (UK) for his years of contributions to early warning/early action as he concludes his service with FCDO.

Agenda Item 1 – Opening and Adoption of the Agenda

Welcome by the Chair

6. The Chair opened the 23rd meeting, welcoming participants, including representatives from Australia, Austria, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Monaco, Norway, Spain Switzerland, UK. He also welcomed representatives of international partners joining as Observers (see Participants List). He further welcomed Ambassador Barbosa, the LDC Chair to the UNFCCC, reiterating the importance of the inclusion of LDCs and AOSIS in the Steering Committee.

7. The Chair highlighted progress made since the 22nd meeting, citing the finalization of the strategic alliance with REAP. He also credited the French Government for its G7 Presidency and for elevating resilience, early warnings, early action and CREWS to the top of the international political agenda through at a high-level ministerial event in Paris.

8. The Chair noted the formal confirmation of John Harding as the Director of the CREWS Secretariat.

***Remarks from the Chair of the LDC Group (UNFCCC), Ambassador Adão Soares* Barbosa**

9. Ambassador Barbosa delivered introductory remarks on behalf of the LDC group. He stressed that for LDCs, early warning systems are not merely technical tools but are essential for saving lives, protecting livelihoods, and reducing loss and damage. He underscored that LDCs are disproportionately exposed to climate impacts despite their minimal emissions, and he welcomed the CREWS Operational Plan 2026–2030 for its focus on at-risk populations.

10. The Ambassador specifically called for people-centered, gender-responsive, and locally appropriate systems that ensure warnings are understood and acted upon by women, youth, and persons with disabilities. He concluded by encouraging the Committee to continue expanding support through the Accelerated Support Window and country and regional projects.

Review of progress on Decisions taken at the 22nd Meeting

11. The Secretariat provided a brief update on the status of Decisions taken at the 22nd meeting (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.1). It was confirmed that the operational modalities for the REAP strategic alliance had been finalized and approved with no objections (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.6). It was also explained that the recruitment process for the Director position had delayed the presentation of a revised budget and staffing proposal, which would be discussed at the current meeting.

12. The Chair then reviewed the day's agenda that was adopted (*CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.1*).

SC23/Item1/Decision 1.1: The Agenda is adopted.

Agenda Item 2 – CREWS Operations

Update by the Secretariat on activities and status of accreditation of IFRC and ITU

13. This session focused on the administrative and financial status of the CREWS initiative. The accreditation of the IFRC and ITU was welcomed. The Trustee confirmed that the Financial Procedure Agreement with ITU has been signed, and the agreement with IFRC is in its final stages, with signature expected within the week. The expansion brings new networks of national institutions and specialized expertise into the CREWS portfolio. The ITU representative expressed gratitude in the achievement and looked forward to proactive engagement in the upcoming programming phase.

14. In the next 6 months, the Secretariat will focus its efforts on resource mobilization and outreach (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.2). Programmatically, a number of new projects and ASW actions are being rolled out. The Secretariat provided an update on its digital transformation efforts, specifically the development of a new digitized M&E and reporting platform. The Secretariat explained that the

system is moving away from manual Excel-based tracking to a digital environment where data is collected, validated, and aggregated online through project-specific workspaces. This platform will provide real-time portfolio dashboards and analytics, enhancing transparency and accountability for all stakeholders. The system is expected to be operational by the last quarter of 2026. Additionally, the Secretariat announced the launch of Dgroups, a new mailing list and knowledge hub platform designed to improve document sharing and event coordination.

Update by the Trustee on activities and the status of the CREWS Trust Fund

15. The financial status of the initiative was presented by the Trustee and the Secretariat (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.3). As of late June 2026, the CREWS Trust Fund held USD12.5 million in available funds. However, a significant funding shortfall of USD98.2 million was noted when compared against the current approved project pipeline of USD124 million. The United Kingdom (UK) and Norway suggested approving new funding decisions once projected pledges were confirmed. Switzerland announced a 9 million Swiss francs (USD 11 million equivalent) commitment for 2026–2030, representing an increase in their year-on-year support.

Status of CREWS Portfolio

CREWS Annual Report 2025 – A Decade of Delivery

16. Rebecca Venton, editor, provided a snapshot of the CREWS 2025 Annual Report (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.4). The report highlights a decade of progress in strengthening early warning and climate resilience in LDCs and SIDs. Centred on the theme “A decade of delivery”, the report celebrates key achievements through 5 featured projects – Chad, Malawi, Togo, Southeast Asia and the Caribbean – alongside a regionally structured portfolio review. It also examines CREWS’ growing visibility and its role in transforming the climate finance landscape by providing multiple financing pathways, supporting investment readiness and expanding partnerships.

17. Looking ahead, the report emphasizes CREWS’ strategic focus on scaling impact by enabling larger investments in early warning systems, strengthening de-risking mechanisms and formalizing new partnerships to broaden technical expertise. The report that these achievements provide a strong foundation for continued growth and acknowledges the support of CREWS’ partners and Members in making the progress possible.

Accelerated Support Window Status

18. The Secretariat reported on the continued growth and high demand for technical assistance through the ASW since its launch in 2022 (*CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.5*). A total of 29 ASW Actions have been approved, with USD 6.7 million committed from the USD 7 million ringfenced budget, leaving a balance of USD 300,000. Africa accounts for most approved Actions, followed by Asia-Pacific and the Caribbean, receiving technical assistance through WMO, UNDRR and the World Bank. The ASW has 76% of Actions not requiring extensions, distinguishing it from project support, and contributes to innovation, institutional capacity building and leveraging larger investments. The ASW Actions have delivered several tangible results, including the development of loss and damage databases, investment plans, feasibility studies, digital weather applications and strengthened national capacities, while also supporting the preparation of larger-scale investments.

19. It was noted that demand for ASW support continues to exceed available resources, with 16 additional requests valued at approximately USD 3.9 million pending.

GCF-CREWS Scaling Up Framework on Early Warning

20. Freddy Soto, Climate Investment Specialist from the GCF Secretariat presented on the status of the scaling up framework (CREWS/SC.23/infdoc.5). Several countries are advancing, with Cambodia and Fiji closest to GCF Board consideration. Gambia, Mauritania, Lao PDR, Djibouti, Malawi, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands are at various stages of proposal development. Additional countries, including Haiti, Senegal, Barbados, Kiribati and Rwanda, are in early discussions. An external evaluation recognizes GCF as the leading global financier of climate information and early warning systems, emphasizing the success of the GCF-CREWS partnership in scaling proven solutions. However, it also identifies persistent challenges in last-mile delivery, long-term sustainability, institutional capacity, and regional coordination, recommending stronger collaboration, knowledge sharing and alignment with national systems.

21. The presentation also outlines the GCF-3 Strategic Planning Process (2028-2031), which will shape the Fund's priorities during its 3rd replenishment period and support delivery of the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG). Building on previous strategic plans, the new process emphasizes an open and inclusive consultation involving GCF Board Members, national designated authorities, accredited entities, observer organizations, UNFCCC parties, indigenous peoples, and other stakeholders. A detailed roadmap schedules consultations, survey, regional events and Board discussions in 2026, leading to successive draft version of the Third Updated Strategic Plan (USP-3) before its expected approval at Board meetings B.47/B.48. The planning process is designed to strengthen country ownership, improve performance and maximize the catalytic impact of GCF investments in climate resilience.

22. Finland noted that while the evaluation covered the overall GCF portfolio, it was important to consider its implications for the GCF-CREWS Scaling Up framework. Finland sought clarification on how closely GCF-accredited entities are involved with the CREWS Implementing Partners, emphasizing the importance of maintaining strong partnerships to preserve project quality. Questions were also raised regarding the identification of accredited entities for countries still in the pipeline, and how countries initiate requests for scale up support.

23. The United Kingdom highlighted the significance of the GCF becoming the largest financier of early warning systems. The intervention stressed the importance of maintaining collaboration between GCF, CREWS, REAP, Friends of Early Warning and other partners to ensure that lessons learned are shared and reflected in future strategic planning and replenishment processes. The UK also noted the evaluation's observations regarding the speed of project delivery, emphasizing that maintaining responsiveness of the CREWS Secretariat would be essential to meeting GCF requirements and supporting continued investment in evidence-based, full spectrum early warning systems.

24. WMO confirmed that close collaboration already exists between CREWS Implementing Partners and GCF-accredited entities in several scaling up projects. Project concepts are developed through existing CREWS partnerships rather than emerging independently. While welcoming the independent evaluation, WMO informed the Committee that it had questioned some conclusions, particular regarding the maturity of projects emerging from the scaling up framework and arguing that these initiatives had already been tested, refined and de-risked. WMO also appreciated the

GCF's openness in organizing follow-up discussions to exchange perspectives on the evaluation findings.

25. The Secretariat thanked the Steering Committee for recognizing the strategic value and the financing, through the Secretariat administrative budget, of the roll-out of the Scaling Up Framework, which has enabled the recruitment of consultants, organization of validation workshops, and provision of technical assistance to countries developing GCF proposals. The Secretariat reminded that the process is country-driven and only proceeds following endorsement from the National Designated Authority. It also noted that several accredited entities, including WFP, FAO and SPREP have already been actively involved in CREWS implementation, providing continuity and strengthening collaboration throughout the project development process.

26. The GCF reaffirmed that all project development begins with engagement with National Designated Authorities to ensure national ownership and the prospect of receiving the required no-objection letter. It was noted that recent improvements to the framework include earlier involvement of GCF regional teams, allowing projects to better reflect country priorities and regional pipelines. Looking ahead, the GCF indicated that it is exploring opportunities to expand the framework to include larger programmes, enabling greater scale and impact while continuing close collaboration with the CREWS Secretariat.

27. The Secretariat acknowledged that the Scaling Up Framework is still evolving and emphasized the importance of continuous learning as the growing portfolio of country requests is implemented. It was noted that the framework helps ensure quality and consistency across projects by systematically identifying scalable, de-risked components developed through earlier CREWS investments. Beyond individual projects, the Secretariat highlighted the broader value of the partnership in strengthening strategic coherence between CREWS and the GCF by aligning country priorities, financing pipelines, and institutional planning. In response to comments on delivery speed and Secretariat capacity, it was noted that the framework has achieved comparatively efficient project preparation timelines while recognizing that increasing demand will require adequate resources and continued support from implementing partners.

28. The Chair noted the importance of equipping Steering Committee Members with timely information to support engagement with their respective constituencies and GCF Board representatives on CREWS priorities. He proposed that the Secretariat provide regular briefing materials to facilitate these discussions.

Funds to be ringfenced in the FIF for Accelerated Support Window financing decisions

29. France reiterated its support for the ASW financing pathway. While recognizing the value of the ASW, France observed an apparent imbalance in the distribution of ASW actions among implementing partners and sought clarification on the underlying reasons. It suggested that this issue should be considered in future programming, particularly as new implementing partners join CREWS, and emphasized the importance of incorporating the perspectives of beneficiary countries to better understand how ASW actions are initiated and allocated.

30. The United Kingdom welcomed the progress achieved under the ASW and emphasized the importance of drawing lessons from the completed actions to inform its future direction. It also noted disparities in the distribution of actions across implementing partners and thematic areas and encouraged the Secretariat and Steering Committee to adopt a more strategic approach to portfolio management. The United Kingdom stressed that future programming should seek an

appropriate balance across implementing partners, sectors, and geographic regions while maintaining the Secretariat's delegated authority to screen proposals and ensuring that findings from the planned evaluation inform future Steering Committee decisions.

31. Finland supported the comments made and highlighted the need to assess whether the Secretariat possesses sufficient resources to manage the growing number of ASW applications while maintaining the mechanism's strategic focus. It emphasized the importance of the planned external evaluation in examining operational effectiveness, learning opportunities, and resource implications before decisions are taken on the future direction of the ASW. Finland also encouraged consideration of the overall financial implications of decisions taken during the meeting and suggested that evaluation findings should help inform future project approvals.

32. REAP welcomed the discussion and enquired whether the Secretariat envisaged a structured pathway through which innovative activities supported under the ASW could be progressively scaled up into larger interventions. REAP highlighted the importance of ensuring that innovation projects are linked to longer-term investment opportunities and encouraged continued development of a clear scalability pathway within the ASW framework.

33. The Secretariat clarified that ASW proposals are assessed on the basis of demonstrated country demand and national ownership rather than the identity of the implementing partner. It explained that beneficiary countries determine which implementing partner is best placed to provide the requested technical assistance and emphasized that the ASW offers an important opportunity for new implementing partners, including ITU and IFRC, to demonstrate their expertise and establish their engagement within the CREWS partnership.

34. The Secretariat further explained that national meteorological and hydrological services have historically been the most active users of the mechanism. It recalled that the ASW was established to provide a rapid and flexible response to country requests and has since evolved into a strategic instrument supporting innovation, immediate operational needs, and project preparation. The Secretariat also confirmed that a robust screening process is now in place to ensure that only proposals aligned with CREWS priorities are submitted to the Steering Committee and assured Members that the Secretariat currently has the capacity to manage this process.

35. The UK reiterated that the Steering Committee should adopt a more proactive approach to shaping the ASW portfolio rather than relying solely on demand-driven submissions. It argued that current trends reflected existing institutional relationships rather than strategic choices and suggested that future programming should deliberately promote greater balance across implementing partners and the different components of the early warning value chain while preserving the country-driven nature of the mechanism.

36. Switzerland supported the UK's proposal for a more strategic portfolio approach, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that CREWS investments address the entire early warning value chain rather than concentrating primarily on hydrometeorological observation and monitoring. It encouraged the Steering Committee to use the evaluation to strengthen balance across the different components of early warning systems.

37. France supported a more strategic approach to ASW programming and observed that the mechanism should place greater emphasis on strengthening last-mile delivery. It suggested that future ASW proposals could be considered collectively rather than individually to facilitate more strategic decision-making and to manage expectations in light of increasingly constrained financial

resources. France also emphasized the importance of commissioning a meaningful evaluation capable of informing future improvements and expressed support for ensuring that new implementing partners are represented in future ASW proposals.

38. Norway agreed that portfolio balance was important but noted that this would likely improve naturally as IFRC and ITU become fully operational as implementing partners. It commended WMO for its active engagement to date and supported ring-fencing resources while allowing sufficient time for new partners to develop proposals. Norway also endorsed the planned evaluation as an opportunity to assess the mechanism's future direction.

39. The Chair clarified that the proposed decisions concerned the ring-fencing of funding and the commissioning of an evaluation rather than the approval of individual ASW projects. He emphasized that the Steering Committee's discussion on strategic direction should be reflected in the scope of the evaluation while ensuring that adequate funding remained available to support future ASW activities, including those involving new implementing partners.

40. The Secretariat explained that ASW financing supports a diverse range of technical assistance activities, including innovation, assessments, responses to urgent operational needs, and project preparation. It cautioned against using the distribution of implementing partners as a primary performance indicator, arguing that the mechanism is intended to respond to country demand rather than finance specific institutions. The Secretariat further reassured Members that proposals are already subject to rigorous strategic screening before reaching the Steering Committee and that the requested ring-fenced funding reflects current priorities rather than the full volume of demand.

41. Switzerland supported both proposed decisions but questioned why the evaluation criteria excluded assessment of impact. It recommended broadening the scope of the evaluation to include impact alongside relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability to ensure that the overall contribution of the ASW can be adequately assessed.

42. Finland requested that financial decisions be considered in the context of the overall resource situation facing CREWS, including Secretariat resource requirements, rather than individually. It also suggested that the evaluation could precede future project approvals so that its findings can inform subsequent funding decisions.

43. The UK proposed that the Steering Committee explicitly recognize in its decision that the ASW evaluation should inform future portfolio-level management and strategic decision-making. It emphasized that while funding should not be delayed pending the evaluation, the evaluation should provide evidence to guide the future evolution of the mechanism.

44. France requested greater clarity regarding the timeline for the evaluation and encouraged the Secretariat to provide the Steering Committee with greater visibility over the wider ASW pipeline to improve transparency and facilitate strategic oversight. It noted that better information would help manage expectations among implementing partners and beneficiary countries.

45. Speaking on behalf of Canada, the Chair requested that future ASW approval documents include a comprehensive overview of the entire ASW portfolio, including projects approved to date by geography and implementing partner, to enable the Steering Committee to make decisions based on a complete understanding of the portfolio.

46. The Secretariat confirmed sufficient resources were available to support the proposed financing decisions at the meeting. It indicated that a proposal for the ASW external evaluation could be prepared for discussion during the planned intersessional meeting and noted that information on the broader ASW pipeline is already available through the ASW dashboard in the CREWS website and could be summarized more systematically in future Steering Committee documentation. While welcoming the evaluation, the Secretariat advised against linking the ring-fencing decision to its completion, stressing that maintaining the flexibility to respond rapidly to urgent country requests remains essential.

47. The UK supported maintaining the flexibility of the ASW to respond rapidly to emerging priorities, including potential El Niño-related needs, while reiterating that the evaluation should inform future portfolio management rather than delay current funding decisions.

48. IFRC indicated that it was talking with its national societies to develop potential ASW proposals, including initiatives related to El Niño preparedness.

SC23/Item2/Decision 2.1: The Steering Committee invites the Secretariat to develop a costed concept note to initiate an independent evaluation of the Accelerated Support Window. The evaluation will provide evidence and inform future portfolio management of the ASW to meet the CREWS 2030 Strategy.

SC23/Item2/Decision 2.2: The Steering Committee approves the ringfencing of USD 2 million in the CREWS FIF for financing decisions for the Accelerated Support Window Action Notes during the period July 2026 to June 2027.

Updates on ongoing project preparation

49. The Secretariat updated the Steering Committee on the status of projects advancing to full proposals. Benin's World Bank-led proposal has been submitted for review, with a budget reduction to US$2 million while noting US$867,500 in EC/ACP co-financing. West Africa Phase III (USD 3.5 M), led by WMO, is undergoing internal peer review and is expected to be submitted in July. Malawi Phase II (USD 5 M), led by the World Bank with WMO, IFRC, UNDRR, and potentially ITU, is in preparation, with stakeholder consultations planned for July–August and submission targeted for September 2026. The Eastern Caribbean proposal (USD 5.5 M) has received Accelerated Support Window (ASW) funding for feasibility studies and inception work, while the Africa Continental Proposal (USD 6 M) has progressed following submission of a scoping paper, with ACMAD providing further updates.

50. The World Bank/GFDRR presented the Eastern Caribbean project, which aims to establish a resilient, regionally coordinated emergency alert system using cell broadcast technology across five Caribbean countries through ECTEL. It was highlighted that the innovation of cell broadcast over SMS-based alerts, emphasizing its greater reliability, scalability, and people-centered approach. The USD5.5 million project has secured approximately Euros 460,000 in European Union co-financing through the ACPU programme, while USD 250,000 from the ASW enabled extensive stakeholder engagement involving governments, regulators, mobile operators, regional organizations, and development partners. It was stressed that this broad consultation process ensured strong country ownership, technical feasibility, and regional coordination as the project moves toward submission.

51. Ousmane Ndiaye, Director General of ACMAD, explained that the Africa Continental Proposal focuses on coordination, knowledge sharing, and strengthening continental ownership of early warning investments. As CREWS expands across Africa, the project seeks to ensure lessons learned in one country benefit others, while aligning efforts with the African Union and complementary initiatives such as SIWA, ECMWF, and EUMETSAT. He emphasized that because CREWS cannot fund every country, a continental mechanism is essential to ensure no country is left behind by facilitating shared learning and capacity building among Regional Climate Centres and national meteorological services. The project aims to improve sustainability, align with African priorities, and strengthen anticipation and preparedness as Africa's most effective adaptation strategy.

52. France proposed a review of the existing CREWS project pipeline considering the 2030 Strategy, operational plan, and newly accredited implementing partners. It was suggested that countries should have the opportunity to revisit projects that have been in the pipeline for some time to ensure they remain aligned with evolving priorities, particularly regarding innovation, mobilization of additional investment, and strengthening the full early warning value chain. It was emphasized that although no funding decisions were being made at this meeting, reviewing the pipeline now would ensure future funding decisions are consistent with CREWS' updated strategic direction and allow new implementing partners to contribute where appropriate.

53. The Secretariat noted that the CREWS pipeline is reviewed annually by the Steering Committee. It was encouraging that ITU and IFRC are involved in some pipeline projects with potential for stronger engagement. Once accredited, they will have opportunities to take on project leadership roles going forward. It was agreed that a continuous review of the pipeline would be appropriate to reflect the evolving partnership landscape.

54. The Chair suggested that the proposed validation exercise of the current pipeline should confirm that existing projects remain aligned with the forthcoming 2030 Strategy, operational plan, and country priorities. This could be a review, potentially using a matrix format, to assess alignment and identify opportunities for newly accredited implementing partners to contribute before future funding decisions are made.

55. The Secretariat welcomed France's proposal, emphasizing that the accreditation of ITU and IFRC represents a significant strategic opportunity for CREWS but also introduces challenges in integrating new expertise into project design. It was noted that effective partnerships require time and deliberate effort. It is anticipated that while the list of priority countries might remain largely unchanged, the types of interventions within projects would likely evolve to better incorporate the strengths of the expanded partnership. It was agreed that reviewing the pipeline before the next round of funding decisions would be valuable.

56. The UK supported France's proposal, observing that many ambitions described in the resource mobilization strategy—such as greater programmatic focus, stronger partnerships, and increased emphasis on anticipation and impact—still need to be demonstrated in practice. It was argued that the sizeable pipeline justifies a structured review. It was advocated to assess how well the portfolio aligns with the new strategy, incorporates flexibility, integrates the newly accredited implementing partners, and balances projects at different stages of development before future financing decisions are taken. The importance of considering the timing of the review was stressed, acknowledging that some projects are more urgent due to graduation, extensions, or emerging needs. It was reiterated that the review should be completed before the next funding round to ensure future financing decisions reflect the updated strategic direction.

57. The Secretariat concluded by noting that although the current discussion was for information rather than immediate decision-making, it would provide valuable guidance for future financing decisions. It was added that current implementing partners are already discussing how to integrate the newly accredited technical partners into projects currently under preparation, meaning further adjustments to project designs may emerge as those discussions progress. The Steering Committee will be kept informed as these developments unfold.

SC23/Item2/Decision 2.3: The Steering Committee invites the Secretariat, in collaboration with implementing partners and potential beneficiaries, to undertake a comprehensive review of the CREWS pipeline against priorities of the CREWS 2030 Strategy and future operating context. The review with proposed recommendations will be submitted to the Steering Committee ahead of the 24th Meeting in order to inform future financing decisions.

58. WB/GFDRR asked the Steering Committee to reconsider the Secretariat's request to reduce the Benin project's budget from US$6.2 million to US$2 million. Reducing the budget would change the project's scope, weaken its expected outcomes, and undermine the country's confidence in the process. It was also highlighted that the proposal was designed to strengthen national ownership by allowing Meteo Benin to directly implement a significant share of activities. WMO reinforced the case for maintaining the Benin project's original budget by noting that the national meteorological service had recently transitioned into an autonomous agency with WMO support and is now well positioned to implement a substantial portion of the project directly.

59. The Secretariat informed that such financing decisions, by the Steering Committee, consider CREWS' broader strategic objectives and financing shortfalls. It was noted that the proposed budget reduction reflects a strategy of using CREWS funding to catalyze additional financing, particularly through the Green Climate Fund's SAP scaling-up framework, rather than attempting to meet all identified needs directly. It was also acknowledged that lower-than-expected European Commission co-financing had influenced the decision. The Secretariat emphasized that discussions with partners would continue, including a dedicated meeting following the Steering Committee meeting and the Committee would be informed of progress.

Presentation of the CREWS Administrative Budget FY 27

60. The Secretariat presented the administrative budget (*CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.2*), noting that actual Secretariat expenditures for FY2026 (July 2025–June 2026) were slightly under budget as of May and expected to align with the approved budget by the end of the fiscal year (June 2026). The staffing costs exceeded projections due to the exceptional depreciation of the US dollar against the Swiss franc, which increased Geneva-based personnel costs. Looking ahead, a proposed Secretariat strengthening, following recommendations from the 22nd Steering Committee, and a functional assessment, was presented. The proposal included shifting some previously temporary staffing costs from the activities budget into the staffing budget for greater transparency, adding capacity in programming, information management, communications, policy, external relations, and resource mobilization to support the Scaling-Up Framework, the Accelerated Support Window, and new implementing partners. A revised organigram was introduced organized around two pillars—programming & operations, and policy & external relations—with a senior adviser role, on a consultancy basis, to strengthen strategic outreach and fundraising.

61. Responding to Members' questions, it was emphasized that staffing arrangements remain subject to annual Steering Committee review, highlighted strengthened monitoring and evaluation capacity. It was noted that future budget documents would routinely include the ratio of administrative to operational costs to support Members' oversight.

62. The Chair explained that, after working with the Secretariat and incorporating comments from Members, a revised organigram was prepared that refined functions without materially affecting the budget. The rationale for separating policy, external relations, communications, and resource mobilization from operations was described, while strengthening operational leadership through a P5 position overseeing project management, monitoring and evaluation, innovation, and implementation support. The Chair reiterated that the Members' formal responsibility was to approve the overall administrative budget rather than individual staffing grades or organizational details, while acknowledging the value of providing strategic guidance to the Secretariat Director.

63. The UK welcomed the proposed strengthening of the Secretariat and commended the transfer of staffing costs from non-staff activity budgets into the staffing budget as an important transparency improvement. It was emphasized that resource mobilization should be embedded as a core, ongoing Secretariat responsibility rather than relying solely on senior advisers, and suggested clarifying where this function would sit institutionally. Closer coordination with the REAP Secretariat was also encouraged particularly around partnership functions, to identify opportunities for shared approaches and greater efficiency across the CREWS ecosystem.

64. Norway expressed strong support for strengthening what was described as a lean, efficient, but heavily burdened Secretariat, noting that the proposal appropriately followed up on decisions taken at the 22nd meeting. Clarification was sought on the staffing implications of the proposal, asking about the addition of two new staff positions, including the rationale for the P5 level, and the reduction in temporary staff, but these were already clarified. It was also observed that while the current discussion focused on the FY27 budget, broader staffing considerations for FY 28 would naturally be revisited alongside future funding discussions.

65. Switzerland agreed that CREWS' expanding ambitions justified additional Secretariat resources but questioned the organizational relationship between the proposed senior adviser on resource mobilization, who would report directly to the Director, and the program officer responsible for resource mobilization lower in the structure. It was noted that the reporting arrangement appeared disconnected and sought clarification on how the two functions would interact.

66. The Trustee summarized the trustee budget, explaining that FY2026 trustee expenditures were expected to total approximately US$166,500, slightly below the approved US$175,000 budget because investment management fees were lower than anticipated due to a smaller average trust fund balance. The fees are calculated using a straightforward formula based on average balances and treasury management charges. For the following fiscal year, the trustee proposed a largely unchanged budget of approximately US$176,000, covering financial program management, investment management, accounting, reporting, and legal services.

67. The Secretariat responded to Members' questions on the proposed Secretariat structure and staffing, emphasizing transparency and welcoming continued bilateral feedback. It was clarified that the proposed P5 position is not a new post but a reclassification of the existing P4 position reflecting the substantial growth in CREWS' portfolio and responsibilities. It was stressed that all Secretariat positions are reviewed annually by the Steering Committee, rather than being considered permanent, ensuring continued accountability. Regarding the proposed senior adviser,

the consultant would provide high-level strategic guidance and help create opportunities—particularly for resource mobilization—while the Secretariat would retain responsibility for following up on those opportunities. If approved, the changes would still need to go through WMO human resources procedures before implementation.

68. The Secretariat also responded to a previous request from Switzerland to provide information on administrative costs relative to operational expenditures. Data was presented showing the percentage of administrative costs over time compared with operational costs, explaining that this information is intended to support the Steering Committee's budget oversight and help members justify funding requests within their own organizations. This analysis will become a standard element of future administrative budget presentations to ensure consistent reporting and transparency.

SC23/Item2/Decision 2.4: The Steering Committee approves an estimated FY 27 budget of USD 2,649,800 and authorizes the Trustee to commit and transfer the following amounts to each entity: a.) WMO as host of the Secretariat USD 2,473,800 and b.) IBRD as Trustee USD 176,000 and decrease of FY26 Trustee fees of USD 8,500.

Agenda Item 3 – CREWS Initiative Operational Plan 2030

68. Demetrio Innocenti, consultant, presented the draft CREWS Operational Plan (2026-2030), describing it as the "delivery architecture" for the 2030 Strategy (*CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.3*). The Plan marks a fundamental shift in ambition, moving from a project-by-project delivery model toward a programmatic approach aimed at achieving systemic transformation in LDCs and SIDS. A core theme of the plan is the role of CREWS as a "bridge financing" institution. By providing agile and rapid funding, CREWS helps countries become "investment-ready" for larger climate finance institutions like the Green Climate Fund (GCF) or the Adaptation Fund, which are built for scale rather than speed.

69. The Plan is structured around three strategic priorities: building institutional foundations, catalyzing large-scale finance, and testing next-generation innovations. Priority 1 focuses on strengthening meteorological services and regulatory frameworks to attract investment. Priority 2 aims to de-risk concepts for larger funds, while Priority 3 explores new technologies like AI-enabled impact-based forecasting and cell broadcast alerts.

70. The Chair noted that the consultation process had generated 134 comments that had been addressed. He acknowledged the challenge of balancing the desire to move quickly with the need to establish a strong, broadly supported foundation for implementation.

71. France requested a correction of an inaccurate reference to the G7 commitment to early warnings. It was argued that the project pipeline should be presented as a dynamic rather than static mechanism, since it will evolve over time. France also suggested that "scale-up" should be framed more broadly to encompass future innovative approaches for expanding CREWS projects rather than replicating a single model.

72. Finland recommended to streamline the Plan by removing redundant content and relying more on cross-references. It was also suggested to show clearer alignment and cross-referencing with the MEAL framework indicators.

73. Norway welcomed the inclusion of clear targets, baselines, interim milestones, and indicators that would support accountability and reporting. Echoing Finland, Norway supported better cross-referencing with the MEAL framework to improve clarity. The importance of learning and knowledge generation alongside monitoring was emphasized, encouraging CREWS to make full use of its partnership with REAP to identify effective practices, evaluate project performance, and incorporate broader scientific knowledge on early warning systems into future work.

74. The UK emphasized that the operational plan should function as a practical management instrument for implementing the already agreed strategy rather than reopening strategic debates. While supporting the overall direction, a question was raised on how the document would support accountability and highlighted several areas needing refinement, including stronger integration of people-centred approaches, clearer definitions of leverage beyond the GCF model, greater attention to domestic and private sector financing, more systematic use of gender-disaggregated data, and ensuring ambitious commitments on anticipatory action and innovation could realistically be delivered. The strategic challenge posed by graduating Least Developed Countries (LDCs) was raised.

75. Germany focused on the terminology surrounding replication of the GCF scaling-up framework. It was argued that "replication" implied duplication and did not reflect the need for different forms of collaboration with different partners. The section on engagement with the private sector could be further developed through the upcoming resource mobilization strategy.

76. Switzerland emphasized that the Operational Plan should become a concrete management tool by including clearer timelines and deliverables. Switzerland supported strengthening gender-disaggregated indicators. The plan focused too heavily on technical capacity building while giving insufficient attention to governance, including institutional roles, responsibilities, financing arrangements, sustainability, and the political economy of early warning systems. These governance dimensions should be more fully reflected in the document.

77. The Secretariat welcomed the comments constructively and largely straightforward to incorporate. Responding to concerns about the document's length, Operational Plan's naturally expand as Members request additional content and suggested producing, subsequently, a much shorter version. It was acknowledged that some aspirations, such as measuring people-centred outcomes consistently across all projects, remain technically challenging because standardized methodologies are still evolving.

78. The Chair observed broad agreement and a shared desire for additional refinements. He proposed allowing Members more time to submit written comments, giving the Secretariat an opportunity to revise the document accordingly, and then seeking approval through an intersessional process before the September meeting.

79. The UK emphasized that finalizing the Operational Plan should remain closely linked to reaching agreement on the future management of the project pipeline.

80. The Secretariat agreed that the evolving approach to pipeline management should be reflected in the revised Operational Plan. The importance of defining key concepts such as leverage with sufficient clarity so that the Steering Committee could confidently measure and report results—for example was also stressed, ensuring there was a common understanding of what was meant by leveraging billions of dollars through the CREWS portfolio to avoid future ambiguity or accountability issues.

SC23/Item3/Decision 3: The Steering Committee:

3.1 requests the Secretariat to revise the Operational Plan 2026-2030 in line with comments from Members and partners made at the meeting and to submit a revised version to the Steering Committee for approval at the 11th inter-sessional meeting.

3.2 invites Members and partners to submit final comments in writing to the Secretariat by July 17, 2026.

Agenda Item 4 – Reaching CREWS Funding Targets

81. Dr. Jerry Velasquez, CREWS Senior Adviser on Resource Mobilization, presented the updated Resource Mobilization Strategy (2026–2030), framing it not as a "funding gap narrative" but as an "investment platform narrative" (*CREWS/SC.23/workdoc.4*). The Strategy establishes clear mobilization targets: USD 175 million by 2030 to fully deliver the initiative's ambition. It was emphasized that CREWS is uniquely positioned as the primary multilateral investment vehicle for the Early Warnings for All (EW4All) initiative in LDCs and SIDS. The Strategy outlines three scenarios: a "Strategy 2030" scenario (USD 135m) reaching additional 200 million people, and an "Optimal" acceleration case (USD215m) that would reach additional 300 million people.

82. A key pillar of the Strategy is leveraging and scaling up. It was explained that the goal is not merely to fund projects but to provide the readiness and proof-of-concept that unlocks larger financing. Targets are set for CREWS to secure at least one additional replication agreement with a major financing institution, similar to the GCF framework, by 2030. The Strategy sets the base for deeper private sector engagement, moving beyond treating companies as simple technology vendors to involving them in co-investment and public-interest delivery. The Strategy stressed that while partnerships are vital, they are not a substitute for core contributions to the CREWS Trust Fund, which provides the predictable capital needed for agility.

83. The Chair noted that one of the issues raised was on how CREWS conceptualizes and presents its pipeline, both in relation to current operations and its longer-term strategy. He emphasized that the presentation addressed this issue directly, while also proposing broader ideas for positioning CREWS to mobilize resources and achieve its ambitions through 2028–2030. The Chair stressed the importance of distinguishing between delivering the current pipeline and pursuing CREWS' broader strategic ambitions, as these are separate issues that are often easily conflated.

84. The UK noted that the Resource Mobilization Strategy conveyed the interconnected nature of CREWS' challenges clearly. The Steering Committee should distinguish between three different objectives: mobilizing resources for CREWS itself, mobilizing resources to implement CREWS' 2030 strategy, and mobilizing resources for effective end-to-end early warning systems more broadly. CREWS should not focus solely on raising funds for itself but also on improving the overall quality and scale of financing for early warning systems. The need to substantiate claims that CREWS is uniquely positioned to deliver the full early warning value chain, supported by stronger evidence on value for money and impact was emphasized.

85. Looking ahead, the UK suggested that CREWS should rethink its Resource Mobilization strategy with greater emphasis on domestic financing, private sector engagement, and designing a pipeline

that actively generates sustainable financing for early warning systems. The assumptions about leverage ratios highlighted the importance of complementary initiatives such as the UK's WISER programme. Finally, organizational readiness was noted as important, arguing that the Steering Committee should increasingly focus on strengthening CREWS as an organization and managing its portfolio strategically. Emphasizing the importance of multi-sectoral approaches and ensuring that investments build sustainable, long-term early warning systems rather than short-term solutions are crucial.

86. France reflected on its resource mobilization efforts to elevate CREWS and early warning systems politically, particularly through France’s G7 presidency. It was noted that the experience provided valuable lessons about the current geopolitical environment. There are encouraging signs, including growing political interest in CREWS among Ministers, increasing international recognition that early warning systems require greater attention, and positive momentum created by recent donor contributions. The Steering Committee and Secretariat should provide stronger evidence, clearer messaging, and practical advocacy materials to help political leaders explain CREWS’ impact, justify funding needs, and make a compelling case to potential donors.

87. France observed that political leaders from developing countries rarely identify early warning systems as a top priority, making it harder to mobilize support from donor governments. Stronger advocacy from Global South leaders is needed to reinforce the importance of early warning systems and broaden the donor base to include private sector and other non-traditional partners. Looking ahead, the proposed Global Implementation Accelerator emerging from COP30 discussions is an opportunity to elevate early warning systems politically ahead of COP31. CREWS is encouraged to engage more actively in international political processes, complementing its technical strengths with stronger strategic advocacy. Finally, France stressed that successful resource mobilization requires sustained, long-term engagement rather than strategy documents alone, proposing more structured coordination among interested partners to pursue donors over time and ensure that fundraising efforts are actively managed rather than remaining aspirational.

88. Dr. Velasquez clarified that the document under consideration was intended to be a high-level resource mobilization strategy, while a more detailed implementation plan would follow. That plan would contain practical elements such as stakeholder engagement approaches, advocacy materials, communications tools, and detailed actions needed to support fundraising and political outreach. Many of the suggestions from Members, particularly around messaging and engagement, would be more appropriately developed in that resource mobilization plan.

89. Dr. Velasquez also responded to concerns about CREWS’ future role by citing the example of the Green Climate Fund project in the Central African Republic, on which he had worked. The project developers had approached CREWS because of its recognized expertise in ensuring the sustainability and continuity of early warning systems, particularly in addressing long-term operation and maintenance challenges. It was suggested that this demonstrated how CREWS’ reputation and technical strengths could naturally position it as a partner for scaling up sustainable early warning systems. While the Strategy introduces ideas such as private sector engagement, these concepts would be further elaborated in the forthcoming implementation plan, and assured Members that all comments would be taken into account.

90. Speaking in his capacity as Canada's representative. He argued that the resource mobilization strategy should be driven by CREWS’ broader ambition to achieve outcomes and save lives, rather than by the size or funding gap of the existing project pipeline. Presenting the pipeline as the primary rationale for fundraising risked creating a static and overly project-focused narrative,

whereas resource mobilization should instead be framed around achieving strategic impact and expanding early warning coverage. Given the Steering Committee's broader discussion about reviewing the pipeline, the strategy could further reduce its reliance on pipeline references.

91. To respond to the UK's question on the leveraging amount, Mr. Innocenti explained that the leverage figure represented the total amount of leveraged financing associated with the 29 projects currently in the CREWS pipeline divided by the total number of projects, resulting in an average leverage of US$17.4 million per project.

92. The Secretariat informed that it planned to rapidly translate the Strategy into a practical plan containing specific tools and actions. The Secretariat reassured Members that outreach efforts were already underway and would not wait for the formal adoption of the Strategy or future plan. Highlighting organizational readiness as a key priority, it stressed that the Secretariat was strengthening its internal capacity, systems, and coordination to meet CREWS' resource mobilization goals.

93. The Secretariat then outlined a series of upcoming outreach opportunities where Steering Committee support would be essential. These included events at the Ocean Space Forum in Monaco, briefings for Permanent Missions in New York unpacking the CREWS annual report, activities around the UN General Assembly and Climate Action Week, Pacific regional meetings leading into COP preparations, engagement with the Green Climate Fund Board, consultations on the post–Early Warnings for All agenda, and future G7 and G20 discussions.

94. Members are invited to identify additional opportunities and actively support outreach efforts to increase CREWS' visibility and secure tangible outcomes. It was noted that these activities would be incorporated into the forthcoming resource mobilization plan and would provide the initial work program for a proposed light resource mobilization working group.

95. The UK insisted that CREWS should place greater emphasis on cultivating senior political leadership and champions from the Global South. Outreach activities should be deliberately designed to build this constituency of advocates, rather than simply targeting traditional donor audiences. Opportunities to work alongside initiatives such as REAP, which is increasingly adopting country- and region-based approaches were suggested. CREWS was encouraged to invest strategically in nurturing leaders, arguing that this would strengthen political support for early warning systems well into the future.

96. The Chair clarified that the fundraising targets were consistent with figures already presented in the G7 context and therefore represented a continuation rather than a new commitment. Following suggestions from France, he proposed that the Secretariat, rather than the Steering Committee directly, establish the resource mobilization working group by inviting interested Members to participate.

97. UK and France supported the proposed fundraising targets, explaining that they appeared to be a reasonable order of magnitude based on previous Steering Committee discussions. At the same time, the importance of developing a more robust and consistent understanding of global financing needs for early warning systems. Referring to discussions with the Green Climate Fund, France noted the apparent discrepancy between the scale of reported investments and the actual delivery of early warning systems, suggesting that definitions and methodologies require greater consistency. Better defining financing needs would strengthen CREWS' resource mobilization efforts and improve its ability to communicate funding requirements to donors. France also supported the establishment of the resource mobilization working group.

<u>SC23/Item 4/Decision 4.1:</u> The Steering Committee:

a) **endorses the resource mobilization targets of USD 100 million by 2028 and USD 175 million by 2030 to deliver the CREWS Strategy 2030 and Operational Plan 2026 – 2030.**
b) **invites the Steering Committee Members to act as CREWS champions within their networks, including through peer outreach, political introductions and support for high level engagement.**
c) **invites the Secretariat to establish a light Resource Mobilization Working group or Champions group, with Steering Committee members, LDC/SIDS representatives, implementing partners and selected champions, to support implementation.**
d) **invites the Secretariat to revise the Resource Mobilization Strategy to incorporate comments from the Members and submit an updated version to the Steering Committee by the end of August 2026.**

<u>SC23/Item 4/Decision 4.2: The Steering Committee requests the Secretariat, in consultation with the Resource Mobilization working group, to finalize a Resource Mobilization Plan 2026 - 2030 and a detailed implementation plan for 2026 – 2027 with detailed actions, contributor/partner targeting, outreach materials, responsibilities and monitoring arrangements.</u>

Agenda Item 5 – Outreach and Strategic Partnerships

98. This session highlighted the vital role of regional and global partnerships in extending CREWS' impact. Ofa Faanunu, representing the Weather Ready Pacific (WRP) program, joined from Tonga to provide an update on the MOU signed between WRP and CREWS. It was requested that CREWS formally recognize and utilize WRP as its regional delivery platform in the Pacific to ensure better implementation through existing leader-endorsed frameworks. Australia backed this request, noting that WRP has the trust of its 18 Member States and should be the primary vehicle for the Early Warnings for All agenda in the region.

99. WMO presented on the "WMO Commons," clarifying that it is not a development fund like CREWS but a fund to support the global public infrastructure backbone. This infrastructure, which enables weather and climate intelligence globally, is often invisible but essential for every forecasting app and national service. WMO emphasized that while the Commons augments WMO's regular budget for system stewardship, it complements CREWS and SOFF by ensuring the technical coordination that makes their investments functional.

100. UNDRR and WMO informed of a planned high-level consultation on post-Early Warning for All, in Ethiopia in early September 2026, co-organized with the African Union. This event aims to gather lessons from the first phase of the Early Warnings for All initiative and to design the next phase with a stronger focus on national ownership and regional leadership.

Agenda Item 6 – Next Steps and Any Other Business

101. The Committee discussed the current El Niño emergency and the role of CREWS. The Secretariat presented an example of the CREWS-funded seasonal forecast systems in Papua New Guinea

(PNG), which was instrumental in the national government declaring an El Nino emergency. This reflects the fact that:

- All long-term climate services developed and funded through CREWS (institutional capacity of WMO regional climate centers, seasonal forecast products, national climate frameworks, climate outlook forums, both national and regional, seasonal predictions targeting key economic sectors) contribute to the capacity of countries to manage El Nino related events.
- In addition to above, many countries, and regional climate centers, are responding to the specific context of this year's El Nino. The kind of responses includes the issuance of specific climate outlooks aligned with the timing of El Nino, to respond to public and political demand, as well as the issuance of designated response plans. The Secretariat is exploring a rapid screening of such 'El Nino' specific adaptative measures across its portfolio and will share information with the Steering Committee.

102. The Steering Committee formally welcomed Canada's candidacy to continue as Chair for a second year. The Secretariat invited Members, interested in becoming the next Chair, to inform the Secretariat, prior to, or at the 24th meeting in early 2027. The Committee bid farewell to Gerard Howe (UK/FCDO), who concluded a remarkable service to the Steering Committee.

103. The next Steering Committee meetings includes: an 11th Intersessional Meeting to be held virtually, on 17 September 2026, focusing on the review of the CREWS pipeline, the concept note for the external review of the ASW and pre-COP and COP preparations. The 24th Steering Committee Meeting was set as a one and a half days, in-person Meeting, on 3–4 February 2027. A 25th Meeting is tentatively planned for June 2027 in Geneva.

SC23/Item 6/Decision 6.1: The Steering Committee welcomes Canada's offer to continue for a second year as Chair of the Steering Committee.

SC23/Item 6/Decision 6.2: Dates, venues and format for the 11th intersessional, 24th and 25th Meetings are approved as follows:

- 11th Intersessional Meeting, 17 September 2026, on-line, COP and pre-COP preparations

- 24th Meeting of the Steering Committee, 3rd and 4th February 2027, Geneva, Switzerland

- 25th Meeting of the Steering Committee, June 2027

SC23/Item 6/Decision 6.3: The Steering committee thanks Gerard Howe for his contribution to CREWS and the overall climate adaptation.

END OF MEETING

Annex 1 – List of Participants

MEMBERS	NAMES	STATUS
Australia	Peter Wilson, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) Australia	Confirmed online
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 (ECCC)	Confirmed in person
Finland	Outi Myatt-Hirvonen, Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) 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 France	Confirmed in person
Germany	Leona Hollasch, Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Germany (BMZ)	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 online

Norway	Lars Andres Lunde, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation Norway	Confirmed in person
	Lena Eskeland, Permanent Mission of Norway in Geneva	Confirmed online
Switzerland	Sergio Perez, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) Switzerland	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 n person
	Lisa Rudge, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, Government of the United Kingdom	Confirmed in person
	Aleksandra Ciezarek, Commonwealth & Development Office, Government of the United Kingdom	Confirmed online
UK Met	Nyree Pinder, UK Met Office	Confirmed in person
	Helen Ticehurst, UK Met Office	Confirmed in person
LDC Chair	Ambassador Adão Soares Barbosa	Confirmed online
OBSERVERS	**NAMES**	**STATUS**
China	Na Xiaodan, China Meteorological Administration	Confirmed online
Spain	Fernando Belda, State Meteorological Agency Spain	Confirmed online
Global Shield	Marike Brady	Confirmed online
	Meidyana Rayana	Confirmed online

PARTNERS	**NAMES**	**STATUS**
African Centre of Meteorological Application for Development (ACMAD)	Ousmane Ndiaye	Confirmed in person
Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Freddy Sotto	Confirmed online
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	Dominique Burgeon	Confirmed in person
	Nourou Macki Tall	Confirmed in person
Resurgence	Mark Harvey	Confirmed online
Risk-informed Early Action Partnership (REAP)	Catalina Jaime	Confirmed in person
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Ofa Fa'anunu	Confirmed online
Systematic Observations Financing Facility (SOFF)	Adaiana Lima	Confirmed in person
IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS	**NAME**	**STATUS**
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)	Jon Stone	Confirmed in person
	Stephanie Julmy	Confirmed in person
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	Anna Perlin	Confirmed in person
United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)	Loretta Hieber-Girardet	Confirmed in person
	Stephanie Dannenmam	Confirmed online
	Andrew Colin Spezowka	Confirmed in person

World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)	Henriette Mampuya	Confirmed in person
	Hugo Wesley	Confirmed online
	Abdou Karwa	Confirmed online
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)	Daniel Kull	Confirmed online
	Jean Baptiste Migraine	Confirmed in person
	Maria Julia Chasco	Confirmed online
	Stephanie Bardonner	Confirmed online
	Emma Liu	Confirmed online
	Ana Laura Zuanazzi	Confirmed online
WORLD BANK TRUSTEE	**NAMES**	**STATUS**
	Larissa Vovk	Confirmed in person
	Dmytro Dolinin	Confirmed in person
SECRETARIAT	**NAMES**	**STATUS**
	John Harding	Confirmed in person
	Maria Lourdes Macasil	Confirmed in person
	Catherine Thompson	Confirmed in person
	Mathias Mulumba	Confirmed in person
	Yi Wang	Confirmed in person
	Hap Rothsopong	Confirmed in person
	Rhodaline Tetteh-Narh	Confirmed in person
	Demetrio Innocenti (Consultant)	Confirmed in person
	Jerry Velasquez (Consultant)	Confirmed online
	Becky Venton (Consultant)	Confirmed in person

Annex 2 – Provisional Agenda

Time	Agenda Items, Related Documents and Decisions
09.00 – 09.45	Item 1 – Opening and Adoption of the Agenda 1. Welcome by the Chair 2. Remarks from the Chair of the LDC Group (UNFCCC), Ambassador Adão Soares Barbosa 3. Review of progress on Decisions taken at the 22nd Meeting (for information) 4. Adoption of the Agenda (for decision)
09.45 – 11.30 (with 30 minutes coffee/tea break)	Item 2 – CREWS Operations 1. Update by the Secretariat on activities and status of accreditation of IFRC and ITU (for information) 2. Update by the Trustee on activities and the status of the CREWS Trust Fund (for information) 3. Status of CREWS Portfolio (for information) • CREWS Annual Report 2025 – A Decade of Delivery • Accelerated Support Window status • GCF-CREWS Scaling-up Framework on Early Warning (by GCF Secretariat) 4. Funds to be ringfenced in the FIF for Accelerated Support Windows financing decisions in 2026 (for decision) 5. Updates on ongoing project preparation (for information) 6. Presentation of the CREWS Administrative Budget FY27 for review and approval (for decision)
11.30 – 13.00	Item 3 – CREWS Initiative Operational Plan 2030 1. Discussion and approval of the CREWS Operational Plan 2030, including the definition of its catalytic and leveraging role, the approval of a new workstream on the application of new technologies and innovation related budgetary considerations (for decision) • Deliverables, implementation modalities and performance measures for the three CREWS 2030 Strategy Priorities • Deliverables, implementation modalities and performance measures for CREWS Operational Procedures (Gender, People Centered, Private Sector and Fragile and Conflict Settings) • Monitoring, evaluation, accountability, learning, risk and assumptions

13.00 -14.00	Lunch break
14.00 – 15.00	Item 4 – Reaching CREWS Funding Targets 1. Discussion and approval of a Resource Mobilization Strategy and Plan to deliver on the CREWS 2030 Strategy (for decision) • Resource mobilization targets • Making the investment case, products and toolbox • Roles and responsibilities and organizational readiness • Measuring progress and risk 2. CREWS Outreach Plan for 2026 and 2027 (for information)
15.00 – 15.30	Coffee break
15.30 – 16.30	Item 5 – Outreach and Strategic Partnerships 1. Update on the roll-out of the MOU signed between Weather Ready Pacific and CREWS (by SPREP) (for information) 2. Link between CREWS and the efforts by WMO to sustain, strengthen and modernize the globally mandated backbone and system-enabling functions of weather, climate and water intelligence, called *WMO Commons* (by WMO) (for information)
16.30 – 17.00	Item 6 – Next Steps and Any Other Business 1. CREWS contribution to the El Nino response (for information) 2. CREWS contributions to consultations on the future of EW4All (by UNDRR and WMO) (for information) 3. Next Chair of the Steering Committee (for decision) 4. Dates, venues and format for the 24th and 25th Meeting (for decision) • 11th Inter-sessional Meeting, mid-September 2026, on-line, date and time tbc, to initiate project preparations, COP and pre-COP preparations • 24th Meeting of the Steering Committee, first quarter 2027, Geneva, Switzerland, date tbc • 25th Meeting of the Steering Committee, June 2027 tbc. 5. Any Other Business 6. Review of Decisions

The CREWS Initiative gratefully acknowledges the support of:

CREWS Members

Australia
Austria
Canada (Chair)
Finland
France
Germany
Luxembourg
Monaco
Netherlands
Norway
Switzerland
United Kingdom
AOSIS
UNFCCC LDC Group

CREWS Observers

Czech Republic
European Commission
Ireland
Japan
Mexico
New Zealand
Spain

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/