

## **REPORT OF THE 7<sup>th</sup> BOARD MEETING**

---

The 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 5-6 December 2017 at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar in Doha. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in Annex 1, and the attendance list in Annex 2 of this report.

### **1. WELCOMING REMARKS**

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, thanking the State of Qatar for hosting the meeting, and acknowledging the interesting discussion during the event on Preventing Violent Extremism the day before at the Diplomatic Institute at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She thanked Board members for their attendance, explaining that Policy, Think and Do Tanks, and the Private Sector (due to a last minute visa problem on the part of Tam Nguyen from Bechtel) were the only constituencies not represented, and thanked observers for their interest and feedback.

### **2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

#### *Appointment of the Rapporteur*

2.1 The Chair requested the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Mr Matthew Lawrence of the Foundations constituency kindly agreed to take on the role.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.01:** Mr Matthew Lawrence of the Foundations constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 7<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

#### *Approval of the Agenda*

2.2 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.07/DOC.01: Draft Agenda) distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.02:** The agenda for the 7<sup>th</sup> Board meeting (BM.07/DOC.01) is approved.

#### *Changes to constituencies*

2.3 The Chair noted that some adjustments had been made to the constituencies and reminded the Board that the Secretariat is required to file this information with the Swiss authorities.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.03:** The Board notes the following changes in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 6<sup>th</sup> Board meeting:

- a. Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Mr Yujiro Hayashi replaces Mr Shingo Miyamoto as the Board Member;
- b. Kenya (Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa):** Ambassador Stephen Ndungu Karau is the Board Member for this new constituency;
- c. Switzerland:** Ambassador Thomas Greminger has resigned and the seat is currently vacant;
- d. Tunisia:** Mr Hedi Mekni is the Board Member for this new constituency;
- e. United States of America and the Netherlands:** Ambassador Nathan A. Sales replaces Ambassador Justin Siberell as the Board Member.

*Report of the last Board Meeting*

- 2.4 The Chair asked for approval of the Report of the 6<sup>th</sup> GCERF Governing Board meeting.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.04:** The Board approves the Report of the 6<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting held from 26-28 June 2017 in London, United Kingdom, attached as Annex 1 to BM.07/DOC.02.

### **3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

The Chair invited the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser, to present the Report of the Executive Director.

3.1. The Executive Director thanked the State of Qatar for its generosity in hosting the meeting. He thanked the Board members for travelling to the meeting and for their continued commitment, and thanked the Chair and Secretariat for their hard work.

3.2. The Executive Director noted that GCERF celebrated its third birthday in September 2017 and significant achievements had been made in a short period of time, especially for a global fund working on a challenging and unproven concept. GCERF has now made grants in four countries and it has the potential to fulfill its Strategy to Engage Communities and Address the Drivers of Violent Extremism (2017-2020). He said while GCERF is a relatively young organisation, it is maturing, and has the competence and capacity to be self-critical, responsive and opportunistic.

Examples of these traits include: (i) carrying out the Country Support Mechanism (CSM) review; (ii) responding to concerns about GCERF's potential added value in Tunisia through launching missions to speak with relevant interlocutors in country to determine the niche that GCERF can fill; and (iii) quickly developing a proposal to support community PVE efforts in Cox's Bazar when the humanitarian situation worsened in the second half of 2017.

3.3. In addition, the Executive Director reported that an MoU with Hedayah has been signed and one with United Nations Counterterrorism Committee (UNCTED) is under development. Furthermore, GCERF intends to advance relations with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

3.4. Despite this progress the Executive Director highlighted that GCERF remains chronically underfunded which undermines the purpose for which it was established—to prevent violent extremism at scale through long term sustainable efforts to bring about lasting change at the level of communities and individuals. In this context, the Executive Director made the point that the reason for setting up a Global Fund is to pool funds to achieve the desired scale of results, to allow for strategic decision making and investment, to leverage other funding, and to benefit from economies of scale and share risk.

3.5. Looking ahead the Executive Director stated that he hoped, by the end of 2018, GCERF would have: a sound financial footing; more and better results; an even more engaged Board; and enhanced capacity. Looking further ahead, by December 2020 GCERF should intend to be working in seven to ten countries at scale with significant impact; several successive rounds of funding should have taken place in those countries; and GCERF should have demonstrated that its actions have sustainably made at-risk communities more resilient to violent extremism. To get there, in the short term, he said GCERF needs to further strengthen and broaden the reporting of results to the Board and the Secretariat needs the Board's further engagement and political leverage to tap into support from other countries.

#### *Discussion*

3.6. The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency opened the discussion by thanking the Executive Director for the report. He pointed out that this is the third Board meeting where the Executive Director has raised the alarm about funding and questioned the feasibility of the proposed funding targets. In response the Executive Director acknowledged that the target is ambitious, but reminded the Board we are developing a new funding strategy as part of the implementation of the overall GCERF strategy which he believed would allow us to meet our ambitions.

3.7. The representative of the Board member for the Netherlands/the United States of America (USA) stated that the US remains strongly committed to GCERF and emphasised that GCERF is critical to address the growing risk of violent extremism. She said that it is important for GCERF to show results and work through partnerships, including in countries where GCERF works in order to avoid duplication. She also acknowledged the professional leap of faith taken

by GCERF staff members. She announced that the US Government aims to provide another USD 3m to GCERF in 2018, subject to congressional approval. She stated that she sees huge value in the proposal outlined in the Executive Director's report to identify core donors, and stressed that donors should understand that it is important to support the institution beyond the value of grants for its own continuity and resilience as without covering administration costs it will not be possible to implement and oversee the grants. She reiterated the importance of communication around results to build support going forward. The Executive Director agreed and said that we are achieving results but may not be effectively communicating them, and he thanked Canada in advance for its potential support in regards to communications.

3.8. The representative of the Board member for the European Union (EU)/France welcomed the report by the Executive Director and said that it sets the right tone. He said that the EU looks forward to following future developments in GCERF's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) work. He also announced the recent signing between the EU and GCERF of a grant for Euro 3m. The Executive Director added that GCERF received Euro 200'000 from France in December.

3.9. The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland stated that the Executive Director's report shows that GCERF is beginning to have an impact and said this was also evident during Switzerland's participation in a recent field trip to Nigeria with the Executive Director and the Chair. He questioned the reasons why GCERF remains underfunded. Is it because GCERF is still seen as being too close to counter-terrorism efforts? Do development actors think that GCERF is doing nothing new because development efforts intrinsically work towards PVE outcomes? He stated that GCERF works on a scale not matched by other development actors and that it should demonstrate how its work complements the work of other development actors, and also that it is delivering on the Secretary General's Plan of Action on PVE. He announced that Switzerland is currently working on a further multi-year and non-earmarked contribution. He proposed the idea of having a mandatory yearly contribution of USD 1m (for example) to secure a place on the Board as a donor. Finally, he stated that Switzerland expects GCERF to continue to attract new donors, and continuous review of the ratio between grants and operating expenses.

3.10. Several other Board members and representatives, including Australia and Qatar expressed support for Switzerland's proposal of a mandatory yearly USD 1m contribution. The Executive Director said that this was noted as was the idea, raised in the last Board meeting, of setting up an advisory council to support the Chair, Executive Director and the Board in raising GCERF's profile and mobilising resources, consisting of senior figures in a position to carry out high level advocacy for GCERF.

3.11. The Board member for Qatar announced that the State of Qatar planned to accelerate disbursement of its current multi-year commitment, and will work towards a new contribution amounting to USD 2m a year. He mentioned that the Executive Director and the Chair had scheduled discussions with the Qatar Development Fund and that they want to see results. He offered several ideas regarding the funding challenge, including that (i) GCERF should make itself indispensable and the best means through which countries can do PVE, including by adopting innovative and creative approaches; (ii) focus on building partnerships, including with

representatives of Board members in partner countries and with the UN; and (iii) consider reducing the funding cycle from three rounds to two rounds—he invited input from recipient countries on this. The representative of the Board member for Bangladesh explained that given the time involved in the grant application process it does not seem cost effective and worth the effort to shorten the cycle. In response, the Executive Director responded that while we always need to review our processes and work to reduce the application time, we are unlikely to have a sustainable development impact if we reduce the funding rounds.

3.12. The Board member for the Australia, Japan and New Zealand constituency said that Japan is in the process of finalising its budget for the next fiscal year and did not yet have a final figure to announce. He also raised the point that Global Counter Terrorism Forum (GCTF) members should be encouraged to engage with GCERF. In regards to the drop in unrestricted funding, he asked if GCERF needs to adapt its model to reflect this increasing reality? The Executive Director responded that GCERF needs to strike a balance between non-earmarked funding to run the Secretariat and the fact that some countries have priorities that mean they have to do soft earmarking.

3.13. The Nigerian member of the Mali and Nigeria (West and Central Africa) constituency expressed gratitude to GCERF for contributing to addressing the challenge of violent extremism. He said that terrorist organisations attract vulnerable people and Nigeria is deeply appreciative of GCERF's work to prevent violent extremism. He remarked that the conclusions in the Executive Director's report regarding the funding situation are troubling and he suggested that GCERF needs to reconsolidate before it expands. Furthermore, he raised concern about funding being redirected to other countries before funds committed to current countries have not yet been distributed. The Executive Director responded by clarifying that money may be allocated to a country but not spent, such as the case currently with Kenya due to the elections, however, if money has been allocated and ultimately money cannot be spent in that country, it would be a matter for the Board to approve its reallocation

3.14. A representative of the Netherlands from the Netherlands/USA constituency announced a new contribution of USD 1.25m. On resource mobilisation, he said that the Netherlands is working on a bilateral visit for the Executive Director and the Chair and raised the point of the importance of advocacy within government and across departments. He stated that the Netherlands, as GCTF co-chair, will continue to reach out to GCTF donors.

3.15. The Alternate Board member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency said that Australia is looking at a new multi-year contribution. He also highlighted the importance of high level political support and suggested looking at ways to get ministers more involved, such as, through a ministerial meeting, for example around GCERF's fifth birthday.

3.16. The representative of the Board member for Kenya (Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa constituency) expressed appreciation for the various donor contributions, stating that PVE is a niche area and without the GCERF funding there would be a significant shortfall in this area.

He said that PVE involves poverty eradication and suggested approaching development finance institutions for support, such as the African Development Bank.

3.17. The representative of the Board member for Bangladesh stated that Bangladesh is a proud member of GCERF and recognises the positive impact that the GCERF funded projects are creating in Bangladesh society. She said that in the light of Bangladesh's experience with GCERF, it prefers receiving funding from GCERF and this preference is often conveyed to donors. She added, however, that GCERF needs to make a stronger case for itself to the donors as to why they should direct resources through GCERF and not through other institutions. The representative of the Board member for Bangladesh made the point that the local organisations receiving GCERF funding have played an important role in responding to the recent influx of forcibly displaced nationals from Myanmar into Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh, which clearly testifies to the increased capacity of the local organisations working under the GCERF umbrella. With regard to the possible role of GCERF in addressing violent extremism in the Rohingya community, she noted that given that 58 percent of the Rohingya population is under the age of 18 and they have experienced extreme forms of human rights violations in Myanmar, it is possible that they could be vulnerable to violent extremism. However, the Government is keeping a close watch on this issue. Nevertheless, Bangladesh would be ready to examine the proposals to engage existing GCERF supported organisations in bringing their PVE experience to their response to this humanitarian situation.

3.18. The Board member for Tunisia (North Africa and Middle East constituency) stated that Tunisia is grateful to now be a Board member. With reference to GCERF's niche in Tunisia, the Board member said that the challenge in Tunisia is not in cities but in areas that are hard to reach, and he looks forward to being a part of GCERF to explore how populations in remote areas can be reached. Responding to this, the Executive Director said that GCERF plays a role in supporting the implementation of national PVE action plans and that he sees a role for GCERF in Tunisia regarding local implementation of the national plans.

3.19. The Board Member for Foundations constituency stated that he agreed with the United States that violent extremism is not an issue that has gone away and it remains very important. Highlighting that GCERF works in a sector that continues to be on a very steep learning curve he applauded GCERF's investment in M&E. He said that beyond numbers, the importance of demonstrating behavioural, attitudinal and societal change is crucial for donor countries and that it is important that the Board continues to work together to build the best possible structures and mechanisms for evaluating programs. Furthermore, he applauded GCERF's investment in capacity building with local organisations in an area that is very hard to work in, noting that it is not only a topic that is hard to measure but it is also hard to build trust and capacity on the ground, that is crucial for success. He pointed out that capacity building needs a significant amount of time and investment, and security of investment. He noted GCERF's ability to work across many countries and to begin to understand the different situations on the ground. With reference to the Ambassador of Nigeria's comments around where we need to invest and how quickly we expand, the Board Member for Foundations said that these questions need to be considered, including understanding how we demonstrate success in one area that can be

replicated elsewhere. Finally, the Board Member for Foundations expressed support for the Alternate Board Member for Australia, Japan and New Zealand's suggestion of a ministerial meeting, and proposed perhaps doing a review of the previous ministerial meeting—including looking at who was at the meeting and the commitments made.

3.20. A representative of Norway confirmed a contribution of NOK 15m. He stated that there is a lot of work to be done in this area and Norway firmly believes that GCERF has a role to play. He added that Norway is not a Board member at the moment for internal policy reasons but this might change.

#### **4. RESULTS – PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE REPORTS**

4.1. The Chair invited the Executive Director and GCERF's Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser to present the results paper.

4.2. The Executive Director highlighted that through grant implementation under the Core Funding Mechanism GCERF had reached 312,000 people by the end of June 2017 and that number represented a 3.5-fold increase in the number of people reached by the end of March and 2017, demonstrating considerable acceleration of GCERF's outreach. He further noted that all activities address multiple strategic leverage points as set out in the three-year Strategy: social cohesion, community agency, equal access to opportunities and sense of purpose.

##### *Discussion*

4.3. A constituency member from Switzerland stated that he highly appreciated the focus on the four leverage points and suggested having a set of reference indicators for the leverage points. He further suggested that we might improve reporting regarding commitments and disbursements to show better ratios; performance was presented against the overall value of grant commitments made by GCERF as opposed to cash disbursements made by GCERF to grantees. The Secretariat agreed to present performance on that basis in future. Regarding the indicators, the Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser responded that we are developing indicators for the leverage points that are able to reflect GCERF's contribution to the achievement of results.

4.4. The Board member for the Canada/UK constituency reported that colleagues in-country are concerned about GCERF's ability to reach those not reached by other projects and suggested it would be good to use M&E tools to show GCERF's reach. The Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser responded that there is already one measure, that is that all 65 sub-recipients (SRs) are genuinely grassroots and have not previously received funding from the international donor community for PVE.

4.5. There was some discussion on the issue of where GCERF operates within beneficiary countries. A constituency member for Mali and Nigeria said that GCERF works only in the North Central states in Nigeria and he believes it needs to go where it can add value, which may be

where extremism is already present. The Representative of the Board member for EU/France echoed that they believe GCERF needs to work in hard to reach places and said that they would like to have a discussion on this for the next round of funding in Nigeria. The Executive Director explained that the Board and the Independent Review Panel (IRP) make decisions regarding where to focus within countries and all actors agreed at the time of making GCERF's existing funding commitments to focus on prevention in the North Central states rather than on states in the North East where the insurgency and armed conflict would limit access and prevention work. The CSM and in-country donors have reported that this was the right decision, evidenced by the growing risk in the North Central states. He added that the Board made a strategic decision to work in areas where violent extremism is not already deeply widespread. The Chair noted the EU/France constituency's and Nigeria's comments and said they would be taken into account for the next round of funding.

4.6. The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency asked for clarification of the categories of people reached 'directly' and 'indirectly' and people 'engaged'. The Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser explained that 'directly' refers to those participating in trainings, for example, and 'indirectly' to those who attend major gatherings (like cultural events), whereas 'engaged' refers to people the PRs and SRs interact with to get buy-in, such as local governments.

4.7. The representative of the Board member for the Netherlands/USA constituency commended the Secretariat for the detailed reports, including their inclusion of 'stories'. She noted, however, that in future reporting it would be useful to show the context for GCERF activities, and their more lasting impact. In response to the request from several Board members to see outcomes, the Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser said he shared concerns about the need to report on outcomes. He noted that as the portfolio expands and matures, the empirical evidence evolves and the Secretariat's and grantees' M&E capacities strengthen, the reporting will include outcomes and ultimately impact information. He added that current evidence shows significant buy-in and traction at the community level, exemplified by the upsurge of activities and reach in Q2 2017. Furthermore, he said that work on documenting results is not only about reporting and accountability but also about learning, including how we can scale up and expand, and also share and transfer lessons learned across countries.

4.8. The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency also asked why female participation is the lowest in Nigeria. Also in regard to Nigeria, the representative of the Board member for EU/France asked for clarification about the reported delays and if the pace of implementation would catch up by the end of the implementation period. The Chief Operating Officer confirmed that the implementation rate has picked up substantially in Q3 and Q4. Regarding female participation, he also explained that simple female participation rates in activities can convey a misleading picture because the primary focus for many GCERF funded activities is male youth who are deemed to be the most vulnerable to violent extremism.

4.9. With reference to the comments about the need for results to access further funding, the constituency member of the Canada/UK constituency pointed out that as a new organisation there should not be an expectation that GCERF can yet produce advanced results reporting, and she invited the Secretariat to outline what it could do with more financial support for monitoring and evaluation. The Senior Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser thanked Canada and the UK for their support in this area thus far. He explained that we have a three-year M&E work programme aligned with the Strategy, including setting up an M&E system for better documentation, developing an M&E handbook drawing on existing best practices, investing in technology for quantitative and qualitative data collection, and starting work on end-of-grant evaluations. He outlined that the Secretariat also needs to focus on developing the M&E capacity of PRs and SRs in order to improve their reporting – including offering e-Learning opportunities.

## **5. INSIGHTS FROM THE FIELD**

5.1. The Chair invited three representatives of Principal Recipients (PRs) in Bangladesh, Nigeria and Mali to present respectively.

5.2. Grantee from Bangladesh presented on programmes with drop-out and unemployed youth, students (college, and madrasa) and women in Bangladesh. Highlights from his presentation include: (i) programs where youth leaders train other youth in life skills to strengthen their PVE capacity; (ii) how youth are now self-organising events for the general population; (iii) initiatives and capacity building for women to play stronger roles in PVE, including through initiatives such as folk songs with PVE messaging, cultural events and debate competitions; and (iv) engagement of local government representatives with civil society organisations, media and faith-based organisations to address violent extremism.

5.3. Grantee from Nigeria spoke about its organisation’s work with young people, women and ‘gatekeepers’ (traditional and religious leaders and government officials). She stressed the value of mentoring and the development of ‘safe spaces’ for youth, including how involving diverse groups to be part of the safe spaces has encouraged peaceful co-existence. She also reported that providing counselling for mental health problems and reintegration into schools and livelihood/skills acquisition training is building resilience to violent extremism. She said that another important feature of the organisation’s work is engagement between the community and local authorities on conflict resolution and community dialogues to secure community buy-in. Furthermore, she said that livelihood opportunities are essential to counter recruitment as Boko Haram recruits from across Nigeria, using financial incentives.

5.4. Grantee from Mali presented on the organisation’s work to develop social and economic resilience to violent extremism by building understanding of violent extremism and supporting people to develop financial autonomy so as not to be lured by extremist groups. He reported that religious leaders are essential in framing messages for PVE, and for behavioural change work to be effective the time required is longer than the three-year project cycle. He explained that the challenge in Mali is that if there is a void—lack of governance and presence of civil society in a particular area—it risks being filled by extremist groups. In this context, he said, it is crucial that

his organisation continues to work despite the complexity of the intervention environment. Finally, he reported on a success story of a 30-year-old school drop-out who was once in danger of being recruited by violent extremists because of the financial benefits he would accrue. He has now undertaken vocational training to repair motorcycles and has become a 'fortress' against violent extremist recruiters and encourages other young people to follow in his footsteps.

### *Discussion*

5.5. Following the presentations there was a lively Q&A session that highlighted the importance of forming genuine partnerships and the value and uniqueness of GCERF's support at the very local level. Board members thanked the presenters for the enlightening and inspiring presentations and asked questions around the advantages and challenges of working with GCERF compared to other donors. Grantee from Nigeria said that through working with GCERF her organisation has developed many useful policies to guide their work and they had increased their knowledge and capacity and been encouraged to think outside the box. Grantee from Bangladesh said that it was hard to find a donor to support capacity development; they usually focus on the programme only, but GCERF supports capacity development and provides specific feedback on all documents. In addition to capacity support, grantee from Mali commented that GCERF really ensures that initiatives are truly bottom-up, noting that often where local organisations are funded it works the other way around: ideas are put together by the international community and community buy-in is sought during implementation. He also mentioned the large share of funding that goes to communities as opposed to management and the strengthening of the capacity of technical staff.

5.6. There was discussion regarding financial incentives as a driver to violent extremism. Grantee from Nigeria said that from her experience while there are many drivers, money is the most significant factor. This view was echoed by the grantee from Bangladesh who said that according to a survey his organisation conducted, 80 percent of people thought that poverty and unemployment are the main drivers. Grantee from Mali said that ideology plays a role but poverty was the main driver; he explained that extremist groups encircle communities and 'asphyxiate' them until there are no more employment opportunities.

5.7. The Board member for Qatar asked the presenters if they work in isolation or in synergy with other CSOs. The PRs said that they work in coordination, pointing out that the GCERF inspired and facilitated 'communities of practice' in Bangladesh and Nigeria are used to develop a common approach and share best practices, and in Mali the social cohesion cluster was mentioned as a way to coordinate and avoid overlaps.

5.8. The Board member for the Civil Society constituency asked if communities know where the funding is coming from and if working on PVE brings any risks to their organisations. Grantee from Nigeria responded that, based on the original understanding with GCERF, most organisations do not know who GCERF is and GCERF's name is left out of publications. She said that sub-recipients act like an early warning system and provide advice on potential security risks. Coming back to the point about the importance of working at the very grassroots level,

grantee from Mali stressed that in order to do this type of work effectively, you need to have a local base and staff that are from and live in the areas where we work. While in Bangladesh, the grantee reported that as a PR they are facilitating the formation of grassroots groups and working closely with them on crafting messaging around PVE to minimise their security risks.

5.9. The representative of the Board member for Kenya asked if there were any gaps or ways things could be done better, and if there were other organisations carrying out relevant activities that should be brought to the attention of the Board. Grantee from Nigeria noted that the important thing is the quality of the activities; it is not just about gathering large crowds. She said that most other organisations are working to fulfill humanitarian needs, and while this is important more work needs to be done on messaging to prevent violent extremism. Grantee from Bangladesh explained that there are gaps in this kind of programming in Bangladesh, and other organisations and even the government are taking the successes from the work of his organisation and replicating them elsewhere.

5.10 Grantee from Mali stated that the GCERF approach and funding allows the anchoring of activities at community level which allows for a truly bottom-up approach. He also mentioned the importance of working through local NGOs who stay with communities even when security conditions deteriorate.

## **6. KOSOVO NATIONAL APPLICATION: FUNDING DECISION**

6.1 The Executive Director began the session by reminding the Board that it approved a pre-funding allocation of USD 2.5m for the specific geographic location of the Municipality of Kacanik, District of Ferizaj in June 2016. He went on to recall that further to a request from the Kosovo CSM in May 2017, the Board approved the division of the original allocation into two-parts: (i) USD 1m for the Municipality of Kacanik which was allocated by the Board in June 2017, and (ii) USD 1.5m which was pre-allocated to the wider geographical area of the Districts of Gjilan, Ferizaj, Mitrovica, Pristina, and Prizren. The Executive Director said that the National Application before the Board relates to the second part of the allocation and comprises three consortia proposals for three potential principal recipients (PPRs) and 11 potential sub-recipients (SRs). The Chair noted that the responsiveness of the Secretariat to the Kosovo CSM's request highlighted that modifications can be made when necessary.

6.2 The Chair of the CSM in Kosovo reported that in 2015 the Kosovo government approved a national strategy and action plan on PVE and said that the efforts of his government could not be successful without access to funds. He went on to express gratitude to GCERF for supporting activities that will help Kosovo implement its national strategy. Referring to the National Application, he went on to highlight that activities in Kosovo will support youth to develop skills and employment opportunities to access the job market and raise the capacity of students, teachers and parents to keep young people safe online. Efforts will also be focused on reintegrating prisoners and returnees. He thanked the Independent Review Panel (IRP) for the valuable insights on the National Application, including on deepening its PVE specificity.

6.3 The Chair of the IRP said that overall the IRP's recommendation is that the National Application be funded subject to the issues raised by the IRP. She said that in each of the proposals it was clear how they all work in different ways to achieve the same objectives. She highlighted that the proposed projects all deal with specific issues but none of them are able to fix the system which is creating the vulnerabilities, including challenges in the education system and other broader systemic issues. She said the IRP recommends the first two PPRs—Community Building Mitrovica – CBM; Community Development Fund – CDF—be funded without reservation and that ATRC be funded after the details regarding how the objectives will be achieved are made clearer. She also noted that before grant agreements are signed the Secretariat should ensure that risks are mitigated, gender information is disaggregated and activity plans are sufficiently detailed.

*Discussion*

6.4 The representative of the Board member for the Netherlands/USA constituency thanked the Board and the Secretariat for collaborating at the local level with other institutions working on these issues, noting this has resulted in a strong set of proposals. She also pointed out that this could be a model for work in other countries in the Balkans. The constituency member for Switzerland reiterated the representative of the Board member for Netherlands/USA's comments and added that he encouraged GCERF to use the donor group in-country to link programmes with the National Action Plan and avoid duplication.

6.5 The Chair put the decision regarding the Kosovo National Application before the Board.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.05:** The Board:

- a. welcomes the National Application submitted by the Kosovo Country Support Mechanism ("CSM") and the recommendations and feedback provided by the Independent Review Panel ("IRP") as detailed in BM.07/DOC.05;
- b. approves the National Application of the Kosovo CSM as presented in Annex 6 "Signed Kosovo National Application in full" of BM.07/DOC.05;
- c. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the finalisation of grant agreements with the selected Potential Principal Recipients ("PPRs") as described in Section 7 "Next Steps" in BM.07/DOC.05; and
- d. authorises the Secretariat to enter into grant agreements with the selected PPRs as identified in BM.07/DOC.05, for a total of not more than USD 1,5 million.

## **7. OPERATIONS UPDATE**

7.1 The Executive Director presented headline items in the operations update, including: (i) the focus on the CFM in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria and grant management activities with emphasis on the monitoring of grant implementation and special conditions and developing communities of practice; (ii) the launch of the CFM and the AFM in Kenya; (iii) the signing of first grant agreements in Kosovo; (iv) the selection of a host partner for GCERF's first in-country presence in Bangladesh to implement the AFM; and (v) the exploration of options with two Board members for engaging in the Philippines and Somalia.

7.2 In addition, he noted that the Board approved Tunisia as a beneficiary country and that it is important that a fund on PVE has a foothold in North Africa. In this regard, he said that we had launched three missions to Tunisia to understand how GCERF can add value. The consensus from speaking with representatives of GCERF donors in country and other stakeholders is that GCERF can add value; however, given the plethora of actors, the selection of partners will be critical; and grants to local organisations should be modest and focus on innovation.

7.3 The Executive Director also gave an update on operations in Myanmar. He said that in June an MoU with the Ministry of Border Affairs (MOBA) was being worked on but then the crisis struck. He explained that GCERF has a consultant based in Yangon still working on this and the current message from MoBA is that, while the collaboration is interesting, the Ministry of Social Affairs might be a better vehicle for collaboration given they are not so directly tied with the military.

### *Discussion*

7.4 The Board Member for Civil Society asked about Mali and the mechanism for conducting M&E in the context of security concerns. The COO responded that the situation has deteriorated leading to a decision to suspend field visits at this time due to security concerns for GCERF staff, as well as GCERF's grantees and the communities in which they work. He noted, however, that all PRs have offices in Bamako and monitoring visits have continued there. Finally, he noted that should the security situation not improve in 2018, the Secretariat will consider employing local consultants for field monitoring purposes.

7.5 The Alternate Board member for Foundations asked about the Expression of Interest (EoI) process and also the way that GCERF is viewed on the ground. The COO explained that the first stage of the EoI process is designed to minimise the investment made by organisations that do not meet GCERF's requirements. Regarding the way GCERF is viewed, he explained that when we engage in any country we seek to engage with the donor coordination mechanism in country. He said that in each case we seek to be as open and transparent as possible and look to the Board members to help sensitise colleagues in country on what GCERF is doing and what we represent. He highlighted that the challenge is to explain to in-country Board representation that they are a member of GCERF's Governing Board and already support GCERF, and that GCERF is an additional donor rather than implementing organisation.

7.6 The representative of the Board member for the Netherlands/USA commented that extending the reach of GCERF is important and should match the resources available. She encouraged expansion but said it would be important to have a clear strategy on expansion. She added that GCERF should link with actors on the ground before the decision is made to go into a new country. The Executive Director responded that the GCERF Strategy identifies a judicious expansion plan which emphasises doubling down where we are currently working and expanding on the basis of lessons learned. He added that while GCERF is open to requests from Board members to explore options to expand into other countries, ultimately it is a decision for the Board to determine where we work.

7.7 Responding to the Executive Director's comments about engaging in the Philippines, the Alternate Board member for Australia, Japan and New Zealand, speaking on behalf of Australia, commented that they had encouraged the Secretariat to explore if there is a gap that GCERF could fill in the Philippines, and not exclusively in Mindanao. He added there may or may not be a gap but it might be useful to carry out some exploration with the Government of the Philippines and civil society, including through a visit. The Board member for Qatar explained that the same applied regarding Qatar encouraging the Secretariat to explore possible engagement in Somalia.

7.8 The Board member for Qatar stated his disappointment at how slowly the process was moving in Myanmar despite the gravity of the situation there and offered to support the process politically. The Executive Director pointed out that GCERF would never work in a country without country ownership, and noted that it was the former government that invited GCERF to work there and that the Secretariat is currently working with the new government to re-affirm its interest in GCERF operating there. He also reminded the Board that GCERF is already supporting Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh, and a proposal to boost this work had been circulated. The representative of the Board member for Bangladesh raised a question about the existence of civil society organisations working in relevant areas in Myanmar and their capacity to work on this complex issue.

## **8. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE**

The Chair invited the Chair of the Ethics Committee, Mr Daniel Frank, to give a status update.

8.1 The Chair of the Ethics Committee reported that, as in the past, there are no conflicts of interest to be reported and that, based on the Ethics Policy, the Ethics Officer confirmed that she received all declarations from covered individuals and noted that covered individuals have a duty to report if their situation changes and a conflict arises.

8.2 The Chair of the Ethics Committee said that appropriate mechanisms need to be established to monitor conflict of interest in beneficiary countries. He reported that grantees are not affected by the Ethics Policy but they should be subjected to the same principles. In addition, he said that none of the CSMs have established a conflict of interest policy yet. However, he said no cases of conflict of interest have been reported either by the CSM or recipients of funding.

8.3 The Chair of the Ethics Committee said that only three seats on the Ethics Committee are filled and following a consultation process, Mr Fulco Van Deventer had confirmed his interest to join the Ethics Committee.

8.4 The Chair (of the Governing Board) thanked Mr Daniel Frank for continuing to take on the responsibility of Chair of the Ethics Committee. The Chair presented the decision and stated that part b of the decision is about ensuring that we have appropriate policies in place, and it is not a reflection of any concerns but about ensuring that we operate in the most ethical way.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.07:** The Board:

- a. approves the appointment of Mr Fulco van Deventer of the Civil Society Constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee for the period from 6 December 2017 to 30 June 2019 in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee; and
- b. notes that GCERF's Policies and Guidelines on Ethics and Conflict of Interest will be reviewed to ensure that core principles and policies apply to all GCERF's stakeholders involved in grant making processes and operations.

## **9. INITIAL FINDINGS OF THE COUNTRY SUPPORT MECHANISM (CSM) REVIEW**

9.1 The Executive Director introduced the CSM review report by noting that CSMs are a fundamental part of the GCERF structure and recognising this, the Secretariat decided to carry out an assessment to provide a basis on which to ensure they can become even more effective. In conducting the review, the Secretariat solicited the views of all CSM members, government, donors and civil society in the beneficiary countries.

9.2 The Executive Director explained that the review undertook to look at CSM membership and proceedings, and the transparency of CSMs, among other aspects. Initial recommendations indicate that the balance of stakeholder groups could be improved, including diversity and gender representation, the role of the private sector could be further encouraged as could national ownership. Feedback from CSMs is that while the costs are low, operating effectively requires some limited funding, including for travel to attend CSM meetings. He added that some CSMs have requested modest funding and noted that the Secretariat agrees that limited funding may be reasonable. Regarding the Secretariat's role in CSMs, the Executive Director said that the Secretariat is not always aware when meetings take place nor are minutes of the meetings consistently submitted. He explained that we want to encourage country ownership while also shepherding the process. As such, the Secretariat is proposing a communication strategy for CSMs. The Executive Director said that the review has made clear that the CSMs can help push forward national policies and strategies and therefore the CSM Chairs should ideally be representatives of a national entity responsible for implementing national policies and strategies and that CSM Chairs should be invited to Board meetings.

9.3 The Alternate Board member for the Foundations constituency expressed concern regarding light civil society representation and asked if this was a result of a conflict of interest whereby civil society representatives withdraw from the CSM to be in a position to apply for funding. The Executive Director responded that it is not necessarily about conflict of interest but more about practicalities—for example, the invitations for CSM meetings may be sent out the day before the meeting and people are not able to reach the capital in time. The COO added that in some cases civil society representatives have been smaller organisations active in P/CVE while in other instances the CSM has sought the involvement of more mainstream civil society actors—and in these cases one or two large organisations can be very representative of civil society more broadly.

9.4 The constituency member for Switzerland suggested that existing development and policy networks in the field could be used when the CSMs are being established. In this context, the Board member for Civil Society said that during the original discussions around CSMs there was a dualistic approach: was the CSM in place to enhance GCERF projects or was its function to upscale or implement projects? He noted that the CSMs do have the potential, as a national mechanism, to upscale for systematic change in the country. The Executive Director responded that indeed we need to take advantage of existing mechanisms. He highlighted the situation in Tunisia where the National Counter-Terrorism Commission does what a CSM does, and while separate meetings would be needed the national commission could be used for the CSM. The COO added that in Kosovo the CSM is a subcommittee of a much larger government coordination mechanism that oversees PVE.

9.5 The representative of the Board member for Kenya gave a few suggestions, including: providing guidelines on the frequency of meetings and improving the CVE and PVE knowledge of CSM members through a short induction. This idea was welcomed by the representative of the Board member for Bangladesh. The Board member for Kenya also agreed with the proposal for CSM Chairs to attend Board meetings and sought clarification on what capacity they would attend in. The Executive Director responded that CSM Chairs could be invited when National Applications from their country are being considered.

9.6 The representative of the Board member for Kenya and the Nigerian representative of the Mali and Nigeria constituency reiterated the importance of country ownership and said that the guideline around at least 50 percent government membership on the CSM should be maintained. The Board Member for the Canada/UK said that if donors are not involved and thus not understanding what is going on at the country level it is difficult to attract support. She raised the idea of making sure that there is one donor representative on the CSM with the role of keeping other donors informed. The COO responded that the Secretariat regularly invites members of the donor community to take on the donor coordination function and will continue to do so. He also noted that at a country level it is not always clear who from the donor community should be engaged in the CSM; i.e. donor government representatives from the political, development or humanitarian side.

9.7 The Nigerian representative of the Mali and Nigeria constituency commented on the recommendation that the CSM Chair be a representative of a national entity responsible for either the development or implementation of the national PVE strategy. He said that given a key principle behind the CSM is country ownership, it would be better to leave the decision to the country to determine who chairs the CSM. The representative of the Board member for Bangladesh said that the CSM Chair in Bangladesh is the Foreign Secretary and is not only working on PVE, and she pointed out that in Bangladesh there is currently no specific focal point for PVE.

## **10. FINANCIAL MATTERS**

The Chair invited the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to present on financial matters.

### *Funding Situation and Other Financial Matters*

10.1 The CFO presented an overview of the financial situation, highlighting: (i) that up until a few days ago the resources received from 2014 to date were around USD 41m and with announcements made in the previous few days the total resources received were about USD 45m; (ii) that through 2017 approximately USD 14m is projected for grant commitments and USD 11m on operating expenses (the CFO pointed out that the proportion between the two seems high as operating expenses had to be incurred before grants could be launched); (iii) that USD 11m remains for grants in 2018 and USD 2m for operating costs; (iv) that the Secretariat will propose a budget of USD 22m and only 43 percent of it is funded (65 percent for both grants and operating expenses once pledges made on the first day of the Board meeting are confirmed)—funds are needed for a second CFM round in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria as well as for operating expenses which thanks to the announcement from the US are now 65% funded.

### *Proposed Budget*

10.2 The CFO presented the proposed budget. She highlighted that the 2018 budget includes: (i) plans to finalise the ongoing rounds of CFM funding in both Kenya and Kosovo; (ii) plans to launch a second round in the three wave 1 countries (Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria) which all together would represent USD 19.847m; and (iii) AFM commitments for the first time in GCERF's history (USD 2.469m). Furthermore, she said that should the budget be fully funded and grant commitments be able to proceed as planned, GCERF would be in a position to have committed close to USD 36m to grantees by the end of 2018.

10.3 The CFO further explained that the budget for operating expenses was developed around key organisational priorities which will be integrated into upcoming Strategy Implementation Plans. These priorities were cascaded through the functional workplans which together with the Human Resources Plan served to develop the budget. A “best value for money” approach was used to cost activities. Key budget risks, in addition to a funding shortfall, are a negative impact on GCERF funded-activities or plans due to the security situation in the countries where GCERF works, potential delays in making commitments because of circumstances outside of GCERF's

control and the need to respond to donor-specific requests that add to a Secretariat that is already stretched financially and operationally (the budget hardly includes any resources for activities in relation to Myanmar, Somalia or Tunisia in particular; the HR Plan is also sufficient to develop the new grant commitments but not necessarily to manage them once made). Revenue is budgeted at USD 25.137m. Total expenses are budgeted at USD 30.675m. Grant commitments are budgeted at USD 22.317m or close to three-quarters of the budget and operating expenses at USD 7.831m, including in-kind contributions. The CFM represents 89% of grant commitments budgeted for 2018. Operating expenses are directed mostly at the Secretariat (82%, the largest expense being staff), grant-related expenses (17%) which are essential to ensure the quality of grant performance as they include costs such as Country Needs Assessments, the IRP, grant recipient capacity strengthening or evaluation and audits. Governance represents 1% which is quite modest.

10.4 Regarding the funding gap for the CFM, a constituency member for the Netherlands/USA asked if the Secretariat was considering a threshold or funding target before launching another round in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria. The CFO responded that slightly below USD 5m is a threshold that has worked, that seems reasonable to donors and means we can run four or five projects at the right scale. Furthermore, the gap in commitments this year related to Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria; we have enough for one round and need almost another four million to launch another round each in Mali and Nigeria.

10.5 The representative of the Board member for the EU/France thanked the CFO for a helpful presentation and mentioned that there is always some concern about increases in Secretariat staff and external consultant fees and, while they can see the justification for new staff positions and with a relatively limited budget increase the situation is not alarming, they expect economies of scale to start to kick in and it would be a surprise if there were further staff increases. The CFO responded that the same concerns are shared, and reassured that the size of the Secretariat is reaching a 'cruising altitude' where economies of scale can be realised and where the cost of investing for donors decreases considerably.

10.6 The constituency member for Switzerland had a number of reactions in addition to his earlier comments on commitments and disbursement, including that each Board meeting starts with same comment: that we have pledges and commitments but we lack a sufficient level of funding. He suggested that in the future, commitments and disbursements from donors could be presented. He further noted that the spending projection is really good and overall the budget is reasonable and feasible. Responding to the commitments and disbursement issue, the CFO explained that given the funding situation, the totality of donor commitments has been taken into consideration, and that the Secretariat has not faced cash flow problems yet as disbursements to grantees are made over a three-year grant period. It was also mentioned that the budgeted amount represents the totality of the commitment made to the grantee in the year, not the value of cash disbursements planned to be made to grantees in that same year.

10.7 The Board member for Civil Society asked what is meant by 'money on the ground'; is it that which is transferred to PRs? The CFO responded that money on the ground means the

overall commitment, or the signed grant agreements which, except for one case in Bangladesh are all for three years. Additionally, the Board member asked if perhaps it was time for the Board to make a decision on the percentage of unrestricted funds. The CFO responded that we wish we could have a target for unrestricted funds, but individual donors may not always have the system to permit these contributions to GCERF.

10.8 The Chair put the budget decision before the Board.

The Board took the following decision:

**BM.07/DEC.06:** The Board:

- a. approves the 2018 budget as follows:
  - Revenue: USD 25.137m
  - Expenses, including grant commitments and operational expenses: USD 30.675m including USD 30.148m cash expenses; and
  
- b. notes that 43% of the proposed 2018 budget is funded at this time. Funding is needed for both grant commitments and operating expenses. The Board calls on donors to ensure that new resources are secured to ensure the viability and success of the organisation.

#### *Compensation survey*

10.9 The CFO explained that the Secretariat had carried out a compensation survey as discussed during the presentation of the 2017 workplan and budget. A specific survey on compensation and a number of Human Resource management practices was commissioned accordingly. The Secretariat was also able to use data from a comparative survey in which it participated with 26 other international nonprofit organisations based in Geneva. The survey revealed that the compensation package offered by GCERF is competitive and there is no need to change salary levels. Only two benefits need to be slightly adjusted to benefit both the organisation and staff.

10.10 The CFO noted that the compensation approach hinges on the fact that the key level for organisational effectiveness is that of the Senior Grants Officer. GCERF's competitive positioning is therefore clearly marked at that level where the salary level is placed at the 25th percentile compared to the six direct comparators GCERF identified--all international grant-making organisations. Positions in lower levels are positioned at the 50th percentile and more senior positions are positioned at the 75th percentile. A new job grading system will be introduced to ensure a transparent link between the value of the position as determined through a systematic, transparent evaluation methodology and the grade in which the position is placed.

10.11 The CFO also commented that staff had not received a salary increase since GCERF's inception. The CFO explained the longer term component added to the compensation approach.

Fixed compensation would increase on the basis of increased proficiency on a differentiated scale, depending on the type of position, the seniority of the position and performance. Performance would be rewarded through a bonus scheme. A very small performance award has been included in the 2018 budget. The CFO added that GCERF has implemented and will continue to develop progressive Human Resource Management practices that may not result in a direct financial cost but respond to the fact that GCERF cannot offer secure long term employment and requires many staff members to travel often to unsecure locations.

10.12 The Chair noted that Board plays an important role in fiduciary oversight, and while compensation is largely a management issue it is appropriate for management to keep the Board informed around compensation.

10.13 The representative of the Board member for the Netherlands/USA reiterated the importance of trying to mobilise resources outside of the particular departments of Board members and said the US is committed to doing that again. The Chair welcomed the opportunity and said we are prepared to inform other areas of government around the work GCERF does.

#### *Internal Control*

10.14 The CFO presented briefly on internal control. The risk appetite statement approved by the Board was reiterated: GCERF is willing to take on programmatic risks in pursuit of its mandate but is risk averse in areas linked to security and finances. She said the major risk categories have not changed. The funding risk has become more acute compared to the risk analysis provided in April and in the Strategy. The delivery risk now also includes the AFM. In terms of fiduciary risk, the CFO reported that the Secretariat is now able to adjust disbursements and the pace of financial examinations as the capacity of grantees is now better understood. Many grantees require substantial capacity support. She said that a constant concern is to make sure that the Secretariat uses funds judiciously in order to make the best use of available funds. Finally, the risk level of not being able to provide financial information that meets stakeholders' expectations has decreased due to an updated financial system and the hiring of a financial controller.

## **11. RESOURCE MOBILISATION**

11.1 The Chair opened the session by reminding the Board that the Secretariat is working on Strategy implementation plans, one of which is on resource mobilisation (RM), and noted that the Secretariat has engaged the International Fundraising Consultancy (IFC) to support the development of the RM plan.

#### *Update on Resource Mobilisation*

11.2 The Executive Director began by acknowledging the comments from the EU/France constituency about limiting the use of consultants with which the Secretariat agrees and stated

that they are still needed in some areas such as Resource Mobilisation (RM). He also thanked individual Board members who had talked to IFC.

11.3 The Executive Director provided a brief update on RM, highlighting that (i) the Fund is on an upward trajectory with contributions now totaling around USD 45m; (ii) while continuing to pursue foundations and the private sector we should be realistic that governments are the main source of funds; (iii) GCERF is grateful to have 14 government donors at present, which is quite an achievement for an organisation established three years ago and helps make for a compelling case when pitching to new donors; (iv) GCERF has a reasonably good spread of opportunity in terms of the proportional percentage of contributions from 16 donors; (v) two thirds of contributions come from five donors: EU, Qatar, Japan, Switzerland and the US and (vi) despite ongoing efforts by the Secretariat and the Chair, and the Board's lobbying efforts, no new government donors have contributed since June.

11.4 Looking forward, the Executive Director said that the RM goal is to raise USD 36m in 2018. He said the first priority was to reinvest in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria, second priority is to raise USD 5m for a first round in a new country and the third priority is a second round in Kenya and Kosovo. He reiterated that GCTF countries are obvious targets for new fundraising, and that the Secretariat will continue to work with the Board in order to: maintain contributions, identify other sources of funds including development funds, and lobby for new governments to engage and support GCERF.

#### *Resource Mobilisation Plan*

11.5 The Executive Director then reported on the RM plan, underscoring that the purpose of the plan is to: (i) identify priorities to optimise RM efforts; (ii) map funding opportunities; (iii) define modalities to access increased levels of funds in a more sustainable way; (iv) identify innovative approaches to be used in the future (being realistic that GCERF is a young fund and not able to do very innovative things just yet, while at the same time keeping in mind that one reason that a global fund is set up is to be innovative); and (v) establish GCERF's value proposition—the potential support from Canada for communications will also assist with this.

11.6 The Executive Director introduced the initial background findings from IFC's work on the RM plan: (i) due to the rise of violent extremism in rich western donor countries more focus (and resources) are being diverted to richer countries than in developing countries; (ii) there is a shift in some countries away from PVE to CVE—on this point, the Executive Director added that the prevention agenda is still fragile and it is up to GCERF to maintain the argument that prevention is a worthwhile investment that saves money down the line and has long term positive impacts for development; (iii) there is a major opportunity around Official Development Assistance (ODA) whereby any PVE contribution is 100 percent ODA eligible; (iv) SDG 16 gives GCERF the opportunity to move into more ODA opportunities; and (v) the final point that IFC have observed is that GCERF may soon be in competition with UNDP which is in the process of establishing its own USD 108m fund for PVE work.

11.7 The Executive Director highlighted some of the preliminary recommendations from IFC, including: (i) the majority of funding should be sourced from traditional donors and centrally; (ii) the donor approach needs to be primarily high level (policy level, government ministers); (iii) GCERF could benefit from a group of high profile champions or group of ambassadors at the highest level and the Board members and Chair of the Board have a crucial role to play in creating this; (iv) RM should always be on the Board meeting agenda and RM should be a priority item for Board members, even if GCERF gets to a more comfortable situation; (v) explore whether there are lessons to be learned from other global funds, such as matching contributions from beneficiary countries; (vi) creative and imaginative approaches should be developed for demonstrating impact and reporting back to donors on the difference GCERF is making ; (vii) efforts to explore opportunities of other sources of funding should be carried out, including related to the private sector and Foundations, albeit being realistic on the potential for direct funding; and (viii) GCERF should assess innovative finance models, such as social impact bonds and financial transaction taxes, which could have real potential but are complex, long term and involving multiple stakeholders. The Executive Director concluded that IFC still had work to do to develop these initial ideas, however he welcomed feedback from Board members.

#### *Discussion*

11.8 The Alternative Board member for Civil Society posed a question regarding funding barriers and asked the Board exactly where they are encountering obstacles? This question was not picked up by the Board, however the Executive Director commented that part of the challenge is that GCERF's work is situated in between security and development, that the counter-terrorism side of government is not always convinced that PVE delivers adequate results on time while the development side sometimes feels that development principles are being hijacked for security purposes. Furthermore, related to the earlier discussion about the importance of communicating results, he said that GCERF lives in the reality of short term budget cycles that require demonstration of results whereas the nature of prevention is about investing in long-term changes.

11.9 The Board member for Civil Society said it was surprising that some GCTF members were not supporting GCERF efforts and asked if there was a principal reason? The Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer explained that the Secretariat continues to engage with GCTF members, and there are many different reasons why some GCTF countries are yet to engage, including the status of GCERF as a private entity and/or related to communicating and demonstrating results.

11.10 The representative of the Board member for France/EU commended the Secretariat and the Chair for their efforts to attract new donors and stated that a decision around the advisory council could be a good way to enhance RM efforts. He added that he hoped the lessons learned from the AFM in Kenya will start to show and lead to broader initiatives in regards to the engagement of the private sector. The Board member for the Australia, Japan and New Zealand constituency stated that he generally liked the idea of an advisory council but would like to hear more about the role that it might play. Speaking on behalf of Japan, he said the key would be in the choice of individuals, adding that it should reflect a good balance in areas of expertise.

11.11 The Board member for Qatar commented that GCERF needs to be more proactive and creative, and it is extremely important to find ways to attract new sources of funding, including through charities and humanitarian focused foundations interested to work in the field of PVE. The Senior Resource Mobilisation officer pointed out the quandary that it takes time to access alternative sources of funding, including from the private sector, and through innovative funding models, while at the same time funding is required to develop proper communication material to support these efforts.

11.12 The Alternate Board member for Foundations said that there are opportunities from Foundations, however, given there are no foundations working specifically on PVE, in order to be proficient in raising funds there might need to be a tactical reorientation in how GCERF explains its work. That is, GCERF's work would need to be communicated in a way that highlights its relevance to foundations working on broader development issues. He noted that this might divert the GCERF brand but should help secure additional funds. The Executive Director responded and said that GCERF needs to think about how it aligns its work with other key issues while maintaining focus on the core agenda. He gave the example of migration where addressing the drivers of radicalisation may also address the drivers of displacement. GCERF could potentially tap into migration funding. He also said, PVE and humanitarian issues could be linked in the same way. In addition, the Executive Director mentioned that the Secretariat had met with the C&A Foundation and discussed a joint call for proposals. Furthermore, the Executive Director spoke about how private sector representatives always ask if GCERF is working in areas where they operate. In light of this, he said that if GCERF realistically wants to engage the private sector, it would need to support programmes in areas where target private sector companies have operations. Finally, the Executive Director welcomed the Foundations constituency's commitment to thinking about what it can and should do as a constituency, he also stated that the Secretariat will work with all non-government constituencies to think about their roles.

11.13 The Alternate Board member for Switzerland asked if the Secretariat had already been in touch with DAC members and considered how GCERF could assist DAC members in understanding the relevance of PVE to their work. The Executive Director responded that he has met the DAC Chair and she said that among her priorities were the security-development nexus and getting more money to local communities. The Executive Director pointed out that both of these challenges fit well with GCERF's mandate and consequently the Secretariat has offered to be an informal partner in supporting these issues.

11.14 The Executive Director noted and welcomed the support expressed by several Board members for the USD 1m entry fee to the Board, as proposed by Switzerland. He also reminded the Board of the other proposal outlined in the Executive Director's report that a small group of investors cover the operating support costs of GCERF and, combined with the USD 1m contribution, the organisation would then be well established and able to achieve what it was set up to do. The Chair commented that she was pleased to hear about the idea of an 'entry fee' for donors to participate in the Board, but cautioned that we cannot allow a situation where donors only pay the minimal entry fee.

11.15 The Chair said that we are going to be moving forward with an advisory council and we will be reaching out to the Board for advice, noting it requires diplomacy to get the right people.

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

12.1 The Chair said that the dates of the next Board meeting—likely end of May or beginning of June 2018—would be provided shortly.

12.2 The Chair of the Board joined the Executive Director in thanking the State of Qatar for hosting the meeting, the Board, Secretariat, and observers for their attendance at the Board Meeting.

12.3 The Chair adjourned the meeting.

**ANNEX 1**  
**BM.07/DOC.01: AGENDA**
**TUESDAY 5 DECEMBER 2017**

Location – Diplomatic Institute, Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Almirqab Tower, West Bay, Doha

| Time          | Topic   | Document                 | Presenter   |
|---------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| 08:30 – 10:00 | <b>Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome)</b>  |                          | Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Member of Ethics Committee |
| 10:00 – 10:15 | <b>Welcome Coffee</b>   |                          |   |
| 10:15 – 10:30 | <b>Welcoming Remarks</b>  |                          | Board Chair   |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | <b>Preliminary Matters</b>  | DOC.01                   | Board Chair   |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of Rapporteur</li> <li>• Approval of Agenda</li> <li>• Confirmation of new Board members</li> <li>• Approval of Report of the 6<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting on 26-28 June 2017</li> </ul> | DOC.02 (for decision)    |   |
| 10:45 – 12:00 | <b>Report of the Executive Director</b>   | DOC.03 (for information) | Executive Director  |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | <b>Buffet Lunch</b>   |                          |   |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | <b>Results</b>  |                          | Executive Director / Senior Performance Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor   |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portfolio Performance Report</li> </ul>  | DOC.04 (for information) |   |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | <b>Insights from the Field</b>  |                          | Executive Director / GCERF Grantees                                       |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation by Principal Recipients</li> </ul>  |                          |   |
| 15:00 – 15:15 | <b>Coffee Break</b>   |                          |   |
| 15:15 – 16:00 | <b>Kosovo National Application: Funding Decision</b>  | DOC.05 (for decision)    | Executive Director/ Kosovo CSM Chair/ IRP Chair                           |
| 16:00 – 16:30 | <b>Operations Update</b>  | DOC.06 (for information) | Executive Director/ Chief Operating Officer                               |
| 16:30 – 16:45 | <b>Coffee Break</b>   |                          |   |
| 16:45 – 18:00 | <b>Initial Findings of the Country Support Mechanism (CSM) Review</b>   | DOC.07 (for information) | Executive Director/ Chief Operating Officer                               |
| 20:00         | <b>Gala Dinner hosted by the State of Qatar at the Museum of Islamic Art</b>  |                          |   |

**WEDNESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2017**

Location – Diplomatic Institute, Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Almirqab Tower, West Bay, Doha

| <b>Time</b>   | <b>Topic</b>   | <b>Document</b>   | <b>Presenter</b>  |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| 09:00 – 10:30 | <b>Financial Matters</b>   |   | Chief Financial Officer                                 |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding Situation &amp; Other Financial Matters</li> <li>• Approval of 2018 proposed budget</li> <li>• Compensation Management</li> <li>• Internal Control</li> </ul> | DOC.08 (for information)<br><br>DOC.09 (for decision)<br>DOC.10 (for information)<br>DOC.11 (for information) |   |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | <b>Coffee break</b>  |   |   |
| 10:45 – 12:00 | <b>Resource Mobilisation</b>   | DOC.12 (for information)  | Executive Director/Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Resource Mobilisation</li> <li>• Resource Mobilisation Plan</li> </ul>  |   |   |
| 12:00 – 12:15 | <b>Report of the Ethics Committee</b>  | DOC.13 (for information and decision)   | Chair of Ethics Committee                               |
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status Update</li> <li>• Approval of membership</li> </ul>  |   |   |
| 12:15 – 12:30 | <b>Any other business</b>  |   | Board Chair/ Executive Director                         |
| 12:30         | <b>End of the meeting</b>  |   |   |
| 12:30 – 13:30 | <b>Buffet Lunch</b>  |   |   |
| 13:30 – 15:00 | <b>Donors' Meeting</b>   |   | Board Chair/ Executive Director                         |



## ANNEX 2

### 7<sup>th</sup> GCERF Board Meeting 5-6 December 2017 Doha, Qatar

#### PARTICIPANTS LIST

##### **GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR**

Ms Carol Bellamy

##### **BOARD MEMBERS**

###### **Australia, Japan and New Zealand**

**Board Member:** Mr Yujiro Hayashi, Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

**Alternate Board Member:** H.E. Mr Paul Foley, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

###### **Constituency Members:**

Mr Fergus McFarlane, Assistant Director, Counter-Terrorism Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Canberra

Mr Takeshi Muguruma, Official, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

---

###### **Bangladesh**

**Board Member:** Ms Mosammat Shahanara Monica, Director (United Nations & HR), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, on behalf of H.E. Mr Md. Shahidul Haque, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka

**Canada and United Kingdom**

**Board Member:** Ms Sue Breeze, Team Leader – Bilateral (Middle East & Asia), International Counter Extremism Group, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Michelle Cameron, Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

**Constituency Member:** Mr Dan Mantini, Political and Prosperity Secretary, British Embassy, Doha

---

**Civil Society**

**Board Member:** Mr Fulco Van Deventer, Vice-Director, Human Security Collective, The Hague

**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Selena Victor, Director of Policy and Advocacy, Mercy Corps in Europe, London

---

**European Union and France**

**Board Member:** Mr Anders Trelborg, Programme Manager, Global and Transregional Threats, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels, on behalf of Mr Olivier Luyckx, Head of Unit, Stability, Security, Development and Nuclear Safety, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO), European Commission, Brussels

---

**Foundations**

**Board Member:** Mr Matthew Lawrence, Managing Director, Co-existence, Tony Blair Institute for Global Change, London

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr David Barth, Director, Youth Opportunity and Learning, Ford Foundation

---

**Kenya (Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa)**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Andrew Kihurani, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva, on behalf of H.E. Dr Stephen Ndungu Karau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Constituency Member:** Mr Dume Wanda Odhiambo, Consular Officer, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Kosovo**

**Constituency Member:** Mr Kujtim Bytyqi, CSM Chair; Senior Security Policy Analyst, Secretariat of Kosovo Security Council, Pristina

---

**Mali and Nigeria (West and Central Africa)**

Mr Younoussa Tiramakan Traore, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva, on behalf of H.E. Mr Mamadou Henri Konate, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

H.E. Mr Audu Ayinla Kadiri, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

---

**Qatar**

**Board Member:** H.E. Dr Mutlaq Majed Al-Qahtani, Ambassador and Special Envoy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar for Counterterrorism and Mediation, Doha

---

**Switzerland**

**Alternate Board Member:** Dr Daniel Frank, Deputy Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

**Constituency Member:** Mr Nils Rosemann, Focal Point / Head of Conflict and Human Rights Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Bern

---

**Tunisia (North Africa and Middle East)**

**Board Member:** H.E. Minister Hedi Mekni, President of the National Counter Terrorism Commission of Tunisia, and Secretary General of the Government, Tunis

**Constituency Member:** Ms Neila Feki Ammar, Vice-President, National Counter-Terrorism Commission, Tunis

---

**United States of America and the Netherlands**

**Board Member:** Ms Alina Romanowski, Acting Principal Deputy Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, on behalf of H.E. Mr Nathan Sales, Ambassador and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

**Constituency Members:**

Mr Wink Joosten, Senior Policy Advisor, Counterterrorism and National Security Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Mr Irfan Saeed, Director for Countering Violent Extremism, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Mr Paul Sassen, Regional Counterterrorism Advisor Gulf, Royal Netherlands Embassy, Doha

---

**PRESENTERS**

GCERF's grantees from Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria

Chair of GCERF Independent Review Panel (IRP)

---

**OBSERVERS**

**India**

Mr Rajesh Kamble, Counsellor, Embassy of India, Doha

---

**Interpeace**

Mr Scott Weber, Director-General, Interpeace, Geneva

---

**Italy**

Mr Tommaso Giordano, Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Italy, Doha

---

**Morocco**

Mr Mohamed Chbaattou, Coordinator of Labor Affairs, Embassy of the Kingdom of Morocco, Doha

---

**Norway**

Mr Geir Michalsen, Senior Adviser, Section for Global Security and Disarmament, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo

---

**Philippines**

Mr Roy Ecraela, Special Assistant, Office of the Undersecretary for Civilian Security and Consular Concerns, Department of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, Manila

Ms Charisse F. Malabanan, Consular Assistant & Attaché, Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines, Doha

---

**Somalia**

Mr Abdulrazaq Ismail Abdi, First Secretary, Embassy of Somalia, Doha

---

**Sweden**

H.E. Ms Ewa Polano, Ambassador of Sweden, Embassy of Sweden, Doha

---

**GCERF Secretariat**