

**CREWS Initial Phase
External Evaluation
Terms of Reference**

Call for Expressions of Interest

Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS) Initiative Initial Phase External Evaluation

Contents

1. Brief Background on CREWS and Context	2
2. Purpose, Scope and Approach of the Evaluation	3
2.1 Purpose	3
2.2 Scope.....	3
2.3 Methodology.....	4
3. Evaluation Objectives	4
3.1 Criteria 1: Relevance	4
3.2 Criteria 2: Effectiveness	5
3.3 Criteria 3: Sustainability (potential)	5
3.4 Criteria 4: Coherence	6
3.5 Criteria 5: Efficiency	6
4. Lead Evaluator	6
5. Key Deliverables.....	7
6. Timeframe.....	8

1. Brief Background on CREWS and Context

1. The specialized CREWS Initiative saves lives, assets and livelihoods through increased access to early weather warnings and risk information for people in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) – the world’s most vulnerable countries.
2. CREWS was established in 2015 as a financing mechanism leveraging the expertise and specialized networks of its Implementing Partners. It is driven by countries and expert partners, which CREWS projects put in the lead. This ensures the most urgent needs are met first and funds generate maximum impacts.
3. Australia, France, Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom contribute to the pooled CREWS Trust Fund and provide oversight to CREWS operations through the CREWS Steering Committee, which is currently chaired by Luxembourg. Canada supports CREWS objectives through additional funds to WMO for related CREWS activities.
4. The first financing decisions for LDCs and SIDS were made on June 2017 at the 3rd CREWS Steering Committee meeting. Financing decisions have been made on a regular basis since then. The current number of projects is 16 for a total of approximately USD 41 million. To date none of the country or regional portfolios have been finalized.
5. The CREWS Governance Document notes the institutional structure for the CREWS Initiative: (i) CREWS Steering Committee currently chaired by Luxembourg and comprised of representatives from the seven Contributing Members; (ii) Implementing Partners which are the World Bank/Global Fund for Disaster Risk Reduction, World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Office for

Disaster Risk Reduction; (iii) Trustee, which is the World Bank and (iv) Secretariat, hosted by the WMO.

6. The CREWS Monitoring Framework as contained in the CREWS Operational Procedures Note No. 2 on Monitoring and Evaluation specifies the overall objective, outcomes and outputs through which the CREWS initiative will be monitored against. The monitoring framework is an attempt to demonstrate the broader contribution of CREWS to sustainable development, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
7. At the 11th meeting of the CREWS Steering Committee, the Contributing Members agreed to initiate an external evaluation noting that the timing would be appropriate after 3 years of CREWS operations. It has requested the CREWS Secretariat to prepare the Terms of Reference while the Contributing Members were invited to provide written views to the CREWS Secretariat that would feed the Terms of Reference. Discussions with representatives from the Implementing Partners were also held to obtain their insights on the evaluation.
8. The Terms of Reference was approved at the CREWS Steering Committee Inter-Sessional meeting held in November 2020 and allocation was decided on December 2020.

2. Purpose, Scope and Approach of the Evaluation

2.1 Purpose

9. After about five years since its establishment and three years since the first financing decisions, the external evaluation of the CREWS initiative will cover the initial phase of the interventions and will focus on what worked, key achievements, good practices and areas for improvement. The evaluation further aims at putting forward recommendations to strengthen the initiative's future directions.
10. The outcomes of the evaluation will provide an opportunity to assess the relevance of the initiative's directions as it relates to the objectives and expected results as well as consider its effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and potential sustainability of outcomes.
11. Knowledge and information obtained from the evaluation will be used to inform the strategic direction of the CREWS Initiative and the CREWS Vision 2025, that is being developed in parallel to the external evaluation, as well as the design of future CREWS projects. The CREWS Vision 2025 will be updated, as necessary to incorporate relevant findings and recommendations from the external evaluation.
12. The intended clients and users of the evaluation are: Steering Committee, Implementing Partners, Trustee, Secretariat, Observers and key national and regional stakeholders in the countries and regions with CREWS investments.

2.2 Scope

13. The period covered for the evaluation is from the launch of the initiative until 30 June 2020.
14. The evaluation shall include the following stages of CREWS programming: the mapping of gaps, demand, and leveraging potential, the pipelining process, selection of countries/regions for full proposal development, project development process, implementation of projects, selection of partners such as national hydromet services from developed countries, monitoring and reporting of progress. The evaluation shall also refer to the achieved outcomes and how lessons learned and recommendations were progressively followed up to attain the desired results. The evaluation shall also look at actual implementation mechanisms in line with initially planned implementation mechanisms, from the set up to the implementation plan and budget expenditures; how the strategies and approaches have progressed, changed or evolved since its establishment shall be examined to draw lessons from and assess the role and interaction with national actors from design and implementation.
15. The evaluation will also review the operational modalities of the CREWS initiative by examining the

oversight of the programming of the Steering Committee, the support provided by the Trustee, the approach to programming by the Implementing Partners and the interaction with and functions of the CREWS Secretariat as they contribute to the delivery of the initiative's objectives.

16. It will also review the advancement of the CREWS initiative towards achievement of its initial funding target of at least US\$100 million by FY2020 to strengthen multi-hazards early warning systems in least developed countries and small island developing states to assess the status and projections of funds and if the level of ambition is sufficient.
17. The evaluation will look at evaluating the overall project portfolio while at the same time selecting a sample of projects to be "case studies", focusing on two or three specific aspects to be evaluated, in one or two countries and in one of the CREWS regions (West Africa, Caribbean, Pacific). The Steering Committee will decide on which countries will be the focus of the evaluation.

2.3 Methodology

18. The evaluation will adhere to the standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and will follow the criteria set by the OECD DAC, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and coherence¹. As the evaluation focuses on the inception phase of the initiative, it is proposed to prioritize on the following criteria: (1) relevance; (2) effectiveness; (3) sustainability (potential); (4) coherence; (5) efficiency. The potential for impact can also be looked into and documented should there be any evidence or information available.
19. Progress against the six value-propositions² of the CREWS Initiative will also be looked at by the evaluators. In particular, gender responsiveness, as a key CREWS value proposition, will need to be addressed as a cross-cutting element in the evaluation.
20. The ongoing COVID-19 crisis, in particular the related travel restrictions, needs to be taken into consideration in defining the methodology.
21. The evaluation will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods and the final methodology will be determined by the evaluator, taking into account the suggestions from the stakeholders, in consultation with the CREWS Secretariat. The detailed methodology will be elaborated by the evaluator on the basis of this TORs and documented in an Inception Report, which is subject for review of the CREWS Secretariat and approval by the CREWS Steering Committee. The methods can include but not limited to: desk review of relevant documents, interviews with stakeholders, online consultations and workshops. Interview questionnaires will be prepared by the evaluator in consultation with the CREWS Secretariat. While the evaluator can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with the CREWS Secretariat.
22. All relevant data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and vulnerable groups should be considered throughout the evaluation process.
23. It is expected that the evaluator will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct. Transparency and objectivity will be observed at all times.

3. Evaluation Objectives

3.1 Criteria 1: Relevance - The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

Examples of driving questions:

¹ Definition of each criteria taken and available at: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

² Gender-responsive, Multiplier, People-centered, Promote Coherence, Innovation and Solution-oriented, Unique.

- How relevant is CREWS in the current context of policy discussions and global frameworks on climate change, disaster risk reduction, green recovery and sustainable development?
- What is the comparative advantage of CREWS in relation to other early warning programs?
- How relevant is CREWS in contributing to the strategic objectives of the Implementing Partners?
- How relevant is CREWS in addressing the countries' needs?
- To what extent is CREWS responding to beneficiaries' requirements?
- To what extent is CREWS expected to contribute to long-term results and impacts?

3.2 Criteria 2: Effectiveness - The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Examples of driving questions:

- How effective were CREWS projects developed? What was the process for project design? How robust is monitoring and evaluation integrated into project design and how was this implemented in the projects? Are there any systematic issues across projects along the project cycle (planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting)?
- How did CREWS target the end users of Early Warning Services? How CREWS was able to design and deliver tailor-made early warnings, adapted to the different end-users (i.e farmers, fisherfolk, civil protection, etc.)? (linked to CREWS Output 1)
- How did CREWS support increased access to early warnings and risk information in particular for the most vulnerable populations? How has risk information generated for impact-based forecasts and early warnings been linked with risk financing? (linked to CREWS Output 2)?
- To what degree did CREWS projects connect 1) assessment of risks, 2) local hazard monitoring (forecast), 3) warning service for dissemination and communication and 4) reaction of the population? (linked to CREWS Output 3)
- How did CREWS foster the connections between providers of forecast and prediction products and preparedness and response plans (linked to CREWS Output 4)?
- At which level – regional, national, local – did CREWS support activities **on awareness raising on early warnings**? (linked to CREWS Output 5)
- Has CREWS investments provided an environment to enhancing the hydromet infrastructure observations network and how?
- How have CREWS projects so far integrated **aspects of gender consideration**? For example, is there a method for a gender-disaggregated collection of data on beneficiaries, gender-analysis undertaken or any targeted interventions implemented (linked to CREWS Output 6)?

3.3 Criteria 3: Sustainability (potential) – This criteria looks into the potential of the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed as well as the probability of continued long-term benefits. In the case of the CREWS initiative, it is important to look at how sustainability has been addressed in the early stages of programming and project design.

Examples of driving questions:

- To which extent the net benefits of the CREWS projects likely to continue? Special focus on the institutional capacities of the systems needed to sustain net benefits over time. What systems and structures have CREWS projects put in place to sustain delivery beyond the timescales of the CREWS Initiative?
- How did CREWS follow a comprehensive approach to risk governance, for example in contributing to enhanced capacities for strategic planning?

- How has CREWS leveraged additional financing? Either through co-financing, triggering additional financing, informing the design of investment project and promoting the awareness about the need for additional financing? What were the approaches taken and what was the result?
- How innovative approaches are integrated into the CREWS projects? What links has CREWS established between early warning and risk management/risk financing?

3.4 Criteria 4: Coherence – The understanding of the role of an intervention within a particular system (organisation, sector, thematic area, country), as opposed to taking an exclusively intervention- or institution-centric perspective.

Examples of driving questions:

- How consistent are the CREWS projects with other actors' interventions in the same contexts? What is CREWS's added value? How do they complement and coordinate with others, such as InsuResilience, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort?
- How do you assess the ability of the CREWS initiative in mobilizing expertise of other partner institutions as well as its capacity to mobilize additional funds/investments from development partners?
- How is CREWS positioned in relation to other global initiatives and partnerships?
- How do you assess the alignment of the M&E frameworks of CREWS and other relevant partnerships, such as Risk Informed Early Action Partnership (REAP), InsuResilience, and others? What are suggestions to have them better aligned?

3.5 Criteria 5: Efficiency - A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results

Examples of driving questions:

- To what extent have CREWS projects delivered, or are likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way? Including: is the CREWS project development process (pipeline, development, approval, implementation) adapted to respond to countries' needs?
- What is the efficiency of the CREWS initiative in relation to other existing early warning programs?

4. Lead Evaluator

- The Lead evaluator will be responsible for:
 - Producing all the evaluation deliverables;
 - Recommending additional experts for recruitment, as needed, for the purposes of this evaluation, such as:
 - Technical expert in climate, or early warning, or preparedness and response
 - Technical expert in strategic planning and development programming.
- Ensuring the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report will be written in an evidence-based manner.

Minimum Qualifications for the Lead Evaluator:

- *A minimum of 10 years' experience in design, management and evaluation of development projects, experience in designing evaluation tools that fit the need of the exercise, conducting desk reviews and evaluation missions, drafting of evaluation reports;*
- *Experience in evaluations of World Bank and/or UN programmes and projects;*

- *Experience in the technical areas of climate and early warning, preparedness and response, strategic planning and development programming;*
- *Experience and knowledge of LDCs and SIDS;*
- *Ability/experience to facilitate consultation workshops;*
- *Knowledge in gender and vulnerability issues is also preferable;*
- *Ability to write concisely in English; proficiency in French and/or Spanish is an asset.*

5. Key Deliverables

5.1 Deliverable 1: Draft Inception Report - The draft inception report should set out any changes proposed to the methodology or any other issues of importance in the further conduct of the evaluation. The inception report will:

- (i) describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
- (ii) present an evaluation matrix: sets out in some detail the approach for data collection, the evaluation methodology, i.e. how evaluation questions will be answered by way of data collection methods, data sources, sampling and selection criteria, and indicators;
- (iii) provide a detailed work plan for the evaluation, which indicates the phases in the evaluation and key deliverables;
- (iv) set out a plan for data collection, interviews or discussions;
- (v) sets out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed

5.2 Deliverable 2: Inception Report – The inception report will be finalized upon consultation with the Secretariat and the Steering Committee Members (minimum of 2 weeks review).

5.3 Deliverable 3: Draft Evaluation Report – including an Executive Summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

24. The draft evaluation report will be produced upon completion of the desk review and after the conduct of interviews and consultations with the stakeholders and hold informal feedback meetings with stakeholders. The draft report will be validated through:
 - (i) an evaluation stakeholders' workshop (possibly online due to the COVID-19 crisis) to be organized by the CREWS Secretariat. The evaluator is expected to facilitate during and deliver a presentation at the stakeholders' workshop.
 - (ii) An inter-sessional Steering Committee meeting to be participated by the CREWS Contributing Members. The evaluator is expected to facilitate during and deliver a presentation at the inter-sessional Steering Committee meeting.

5.4 Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report incorporating feedback from stakeholders, for review of the CREWS Secretariat and approval by the CREWS Steering Committee.

25. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 50 pages for the main report, excluding annexes. Annexes can provide background and further details on specific components of the project evaluated.
26. The evaluation report should include:
 1. Title page
 2. Table of contents
 3. Executive summary
 4. Acronyms

5. Background and description
6. Purpose of evaluation
7. Evaluation methodology and evaluation questions
8. Findings per criteria
9. Lessons learnt and potential good practices and models of intervention
10. Conclusions and recommendations
11. Annexes (list of interviews, overview of meetings, proceedings stakeholder meetings, other relevant information)

5.5 Deliverable 5: Stand-alone Evaluation Summary (format to be discussed with the CREWS Secretariat, to be uploaded in the CREWS website after approval)

All reports must be submitted in English.

6. Timeframe

29. The estimated number of working days is **41 working days (to be discussed with candidates)** to complete the evaluation.

Candidates intending to submit an expression of interest must supply the following information:

1. Cover letter with the following information
 - A description of how their skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the requirements of the assignment.
 - A list of previous evaluations that are relevant to the context and subject of this assignment.
 - A statement confirming their availability to conduct the assignment and the budget (please indicate currency of amount).
 - A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the delivery of the work of CREWS or any personal relationship with anyone engaged in CREWS projects.
2. Curriculum vitae of the Lead Evaluator and as attachments the names and CVs of the evaluation team members

The deadline to submit expressions of interest for the evaluation is by close of business on **21 August 2021** sent by email with a subject header ***“Evaluation of CREWS initial phase”*** to Mrs. Maria Lourdes Kathleen Macasil at mlkmacasil@wmo.int.