

REPORT OF THE 14th BOARD MEETING

The 14th meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held in hybrid format on June 22, 2021. The approved agenda for the 14th meeting of the Governing Board is contained in Annex 1 and the participant list in Annex 2 of this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Mr Stefano Manservigi, opened the meeting, thanking all for their flexibility to hold the meeting in hybrid format given continued restrictions due to the global COVID-19 pandemic. He expressed well wishes to all and their families and thanked those who had been able to travel to Geneva to attend in person. The Chair encouraged a frank and open discussion.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Mr Daniel Frank, Alternate Board Member for the Switzerland constituency kindly agreed to take the role.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.01: Mr Daniel Frank of Switzerland is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 14th Board meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.14/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.02: The agenda for the 14th Board meeting (BM.14/DOC.01) is approved.

Confirmation of new Board Members

2.5 The Chair welcomed new Board members and representatives from new donor and partner countries Burkina Faso, Germany, Italy, and Niger.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 13th Board meeting:

- **Canada and the United Kingdom:** Ms Christine Constantin replaces Mr Ramanand Kamineni as the Alternate Board Member;
- **European Union, France, Denmark and Italy:** Mr Jesper Steen Pedersen replaces Mr Olivier Luyckx as the Board member;
- **Foundations:** Ms Emman El-Badawy replaces Mr Matthew Lawrence as the Board Member;
- **Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso:** Ambassador Abiodun Richards Adejola replaces Ambassador Tunde Mukaila Mustapha as the Board Member;
- **Kosovo and North Macedonia:** Minister Xhelal Sveçla replaces Mr Lulzim Fushtica as the Board Member;
- **Tunisia and the Philippines:** Ms Neila Feki replaces Mr Mounir Ksiksi as the Board member;
- **United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany:** Mr Irfan Saeed replaces Ambassador Nathan A. Sales as the Board Member.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED), Dr Khalid Koser, to present his report (BM.14/DOC.02).

3.2 The ED welcomed the Chair to his first meeting, and also shared with the Board the regards of Carol Bellamy, former Chair of the Governing Board. He expressed appreciation for the rising level of representation on the Board, an important sign of the organisation's growing credibility. He also thanked all for the preparatory calls leading up to the Board meeting, all of which are instructive to ensure a productive meeting. The ED thanked the GCERF team, noting its small, diverse, dedicated Secretariat, with an increasing global presence and now around 70% programme-dedicated staff.

3.3 The ED commenced with some initial observations and thoughts. There was another attack on Operation Barkhane in Mali; offering commiserations, he reiterated that violent extremism is an ever-present threat, particularly in the Sahel region. He referenced the recently published Global Peace Index,¹ which indicates very clearly that peace is reducing around the world; echoing the messages received from the communities in which GCERF works, highlighting COVID-19 as exacerbating the problem. He also mentioned the ongoing

¹ <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/maps/#/>

review period for the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and its related debates about human rights, gender, and civil society. The ED recommended that instead of creating new funding structures, GCERF is the right organisation through which to channel grant-making authority.

3.4 The ED continued by offering examples of how GCERF is different from, yet complimentary to, UNOCT. GCERF has a broad donor base; a multi-stakeholder governing board; a focus on beneficiaries; GCERF is agile and non-bureaucratic; GCERF is a non-political organisation, while the field of PVE is becoming more and more politicised; and civil society, gender, and human rights are guiding principles for GCERF. GCERF partners with UNOCT and looks forward to continuing to do so, noting the above differences and in particular, GCERF's distinct added value in grant-making.

3.5 The ED introduced BM.14/DOC.02, explaining its primary focus on the replenishment campaign as: (i) the most efficient way to obtain multi-year financing for GCERF's upcoming strategy period, as requested by the Board; (ii) providing an opportunity to pivot from a start-up organisation to an established, international institution and (iii) the most effective way to promote the continued, increased engagement of the Board.

3.6 The ED briefly summarised the three areas covered by the report:

- i. Firm Fundamentals – These are essential to a replenishment campaign, specifically strong financials and financial management, a clear and powerful strategy, strong governance, and clear and impressive results. Especially in the context of COVID-19, GCERF has achieved increasing reach, effectiveness, sustainability, standard-setting internal systems, and positive external evaluations. There is also increasing demand for the work GCERF is doing.
- ii. A Political Campaign – Human and financial resources have been dedicated to the replenishment campaign, including through an external consulting firm; a successful campaign will make these investments worthwhile, with current plans for a pledging conference at the UN General Assembly in September 2021, chaired by the Rt Hon Tony Blair and co-hosted by the United States, European Union, G5 Sahel, and Switzerland.
- iii. Commitment and Engagement from the Governing Board – There is a continued request for support in replenishment efforts from the Board, for renewed, increased commitments and high-level meetings from donor countries, and for partner countries to help promote GCERF's added value.

3.6 The Chair thanked the ED for a clear and powerful intervention. The replenishment is about money but also credibility and action. He expressed that this is a high-level political

operation requiring an extraordinary effort and more money, but also the establishment of a platform for international cooperation and policy dialogue around PVE. The Chair opened the session to comments and questions.

Discussion

3.7 Speaking for the United States, the Board member for the United States of America, The Netherlands, Norway and Germany thanked the Chair, the Executive Director and the Secretariat, and commended them for continuing their work throughout the pandemic, noting some other organisations have not managed to progress in the same way. He offered thanks to Ambassador Nathan Sales and Mr Chris Harnisch, who have moved on.

3.8 Given the change in administration, the Board member outlined the new priorities of the department, with an increased focus on fragility, resilience, and overall prevention. Given that, GCERF is well placed to receive continued support at the highest levels of the US administration. He noted that the 20-year anniversary of 9/11 offers a good inflection point for all, including GCERF five years in. While acknowledging that GCERF doesn't work on this, the acting Board member announced that the US will increase their focus on countering racially or ethnically motivated violent extremism, having recently released its National Strategy for Countering Domestic Terrorism.

3.9 The Board member congratulated GCERF on the replenishment campaign and announced the finalisation of the US contribution for this year of USD 5m, a threefold increase from previous years; noting that the funding cycle prevents multi-year pledges, he expressed the intention to request similar levels of contribution through 2023, pending approval. In addition to this, USAID recently signed an agreement with GCERF for a contribution of up to USD 10m, so there is the potential for a contribution of up to USD 25m for the next three years.

3.10 The Chair of the Governing Board thanked the United States for their contribution and noted the importance of funding from both security and development actors.

3.11 Speaking for Burkina Faso, the constituency member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger, and Burkina Faso thanked the Chair. He noted that the countries of the Sahel are on the front line of the fight against violent extremism, which comes in various forms and requires tailored approaches. GCERF's is the right approach and he expressed appreciation for the support.

3.12 The Alternate Board member for Bangladesh thanked all. He reiterated Bangladesh's whole-of-society approach to prevention and zero tolerance policy towards violent extremism and applauded the positive outcomes produced by GCERF's programmes so far. He noted that challenges are also growing, including funding shortages, and expressed

hopes that the replenishment campaign sees more flexible, unearmarked funding for programmes. He reiterated that each country has its own challenges related to PVE and therefore requires tailored approaches and close collaboration with the partner country governments.

3.13 Speaking for Nigeria, the Board member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger, and Burkina Faso expressed thanks and appreciation for the efforts of GCERF. He was encouraged by the Chair and Executive Director's interventions, and by the contribution from the United States. He described PVE as a work in progress, with a need for growing political support and the right messaging to donors and the private sector. The Board member expressed appreciation for the Carol Bellamy Fellowship to be launched in Nigeria and assured the Board that Nigeria is doing its best to complement the work being done. He also offered that GCERF has yet to reach its full potential as a multilateral body across the world.

3.14 Speaking for Mali, the Alternate Board member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger, and Burkina Faso thanked GCERF for the remarkable work undertaken. He greeted all Board members, in particular new constituency members Burkina Faso and Niger. GCERF's expansion in the Sahel will increase its impact in the region, and he reassured all that he does not think the recent actions in Mali will impact the work of GCERF. An information session on the replenishment campaign will take place in Bamako on 15 July, where CSM members will speak with partners about an expansive approach to the region, including in the south of Mali. He encouraged these initiatives and expressed support for the replenishment campaign, welcoming the US contribution and hoping it will lead to further pledges.

3.15 The Board member for Switzerland expressed gratitude that the meeting could take place partially in person and was glad that Geneva could serve its purpose to further multilateralism and global meetings. He thanked the Secretariat for having done an excellent job these past months during the pandemic, and in particular for the work on the replenishment campaign and getting someone with the global reputation of the Rt Hon Tony Blair to support it

3.16 The Board member for Switzerland stressed that COVID-19 has exacerbated challenges for development agencies, with many field workers repatriated back to headquarters; leaving gaps in support for local communities and administrations, which is where GCERF has a particular advantage. He believes GCERF's strong financial management and governance can invest more money, and he encouraged the continued development of CSM ownership and the expansion of skill and representation across GCERF and its Board.

3.17 A representative for Sri Lanka thanked the Board for its support and offered a brief update on GCERF's pilot programme in Sri Lanka, having successfully launched the programme and established the Accelerated Funding Panel.

3.18 Speaking for the European Union, the Board member for the European Union, France, Denmark, and Italy echoed the Board's thanks to the Secretariat for its work during the pandemic and for even expanding its response. The threat of violent extremism must continue to be addressed, and in December the EU adopted a new Counter-Terrorism agenda with four pillars: Anticipate, Prevent, Protect, and Respond; under its "Prevent" pillar, the Board member noted activities aligned with GCERF's portfolio for PVE and including radicalisation in prisons.

3.19 The Board member for the EU announced that EU institutions have contributed around USD 2m per year to GCERF over the last six years and are planning to treble this to USD 6m this year, with additional resources anticipated next year. He noted that Europe as a whole represents 50% of all GCERF funding, a strong show of support. He echoed the importance of funding for GCERF from development agencies and looks forward to seeing partners jointly progress towards a more sustainable, diverse funding stream.

3.20 Speaking for Niger, the constituency member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger, and Burkina Faso thanked all for their work. He noted that Niger has a newly elected president, so they are in a significant period of transition. Violent extremism isn't just linked to radicalism, but it is a crisis of governance and communities expressing distrust in their states. He stressed the need to strengthen democracy and community resilience. He expressed his desire for GCERF to remain a leader in PVE, relying on support through a commitment of resources and through political will.

3.21 The Chair thanked the representative and expressed thanks to the President of Niger for his trust and friendship.

3.22 Speaking for France, the Alternate Board member for the European Union, France, Denmark, and Italy thanked all and warmly welcomed the Sahel representatives. He echoed the Board member from Switzerland's words about the high impact of the replenishment campaign, noting its success on social media. All of this shows the positive trajectory of GCERF and France intends to play its part, contributing not only through the EU but also with an additional USD 400,000 this year. The Alternate Board member expressed the intention to do more in the years to come, not only through pledges but through flexibility and visibility of its support, which is offered due to satisfaction with GCERF and because investing in PVE means investing in collective global security. He warmly welcomed the Strategy 2025, which

demonstrates how GCERF will capitalise on its successes to become a major player in the fight against VE.

3.23 Speaking for Italy, the constituency member for the European Union, France, Denmark, and Italy thanked all and expressed commitment to working with partners. He expressed support for the Sahel strategy and the launch of new portfolios.

3.24 A representative for the Board member for Canada and the United Kingdom thanked GCERF for its work on the strategy and replenishment. He stressed the challenges posed by the pandemic, but that the UK will offer its support to the replenishment campaign. He appreciated the increased focus on measuring impact.

3.25 Speaking for Germany, the constituency member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway, and Germany expressed gratitude for the chance to meet colleagues in person as a new member country, with Germany's first contribution a conscious decision to join like-minded colleagues on a multi-stakeholder Governing Board. She agrees that the replenishment campaign is the right method to transition from a start-up to better-established, more mature organisation, and assured that Germany will do its best to support the replenishment, noting that this is an election year so any flexibility for an increased contribution would be for next year. P/CVE is part of Germany's long-term strategy, and she expressed the need for both short- and long-term projects, as envisaged in the Strategy 2025.

3.26 The Alternate Board member for Tunisia and the Philippines expressed gratitude to be able to represent the Philippines and serve as Chair of its CSM. He thanked GCERF for continued support towards sustainable and lasting peace and offered a brief summary of programming in the Philippines since 2018. He explained the value of GCERF, which is the only fund for PVE working in the Philippines, as enabling a focus a topic and sharing lessons learned, enabling consultations with grantees, and helping the government to realise a whole-of-community approach. He stressed that the threat of VE remains high, with many groups taking advantage of the COVID-19 pandemic, therefore even more support is needed to combat VE.

3.27 Speaking for Norway, the constituency member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway, and Germany thanked all and expressed hope that the replenishment campaign is a success and said that Norway is working on its new contribution, noting ongoing elections. He highlighted in the importance of attracting new donors and partners.

3.28 The representative for Albania expressed support for efforts towards a comprehensive, multi-agency approach. She offered an overview of GCERF's work in Albania on rehabilitation and reintegration of returning foreign terrorist

fighters (RFTFs). She expressed appreciation for the timing and flexibility of GCERF to launch a call for expressions of interest (EOIs) despite the pandemic. She noted that Albania is currently drafting a new CVE strategy to replace the one from 2015 and appreciated GCERF and Board members for their continued support for the Western Balkans.

3.29 The Board member for Qatar thanked the Chair, Executive Director, and Secretariat. He said that Qatar remains a strong supporter of GCERF, with Qatar and its relevant organisations open for further collaboration. He looks forward to welcoming the Chair in Doha in July, and noted the importance of the replenishment campaign, which requires realistic targets and collective engagement for success. He looks forward to the unique opportunity offered by the pledging conference and encouraged high-level participation.

3.30 The Chair thanked all for their interventions and noted the point made clearly by many about the need to combine security and development support for GCERF. He stressed the need to recognise PVE as a global issue, not just local, and the importance of support from both donor and partner countries for the replenishment campaign.

3.31 The Executive Director thanked the United States and the European Union for setting the bar high by tripling their annual contributions, and noted the positive indications from France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Qatar, and Switzerland to increase their contributions. He expressed gratitude to Switzerland for noting GCERF's capacity to invest more money and for attracting the support of the Rt Hon Tony Blair to chair the pledging conference. He thanked all for their offers of high-level political support for the replenishment campaign.

3.32 He reiterated points made by partner countries on the importance of building communities and resilience, especially in the context of COVID-19, and the strong performance in national coordination. He acknowledged the comment by Nigeria about engaging the private sector, noting that the Chair has sent a letter to Nigerian entrepreneur Tony Elumelu and that GCERF is thinking about launching a commission to explore private sector support for PVE.

4. FINANCIAL MATTERS

4.1 The Chair introduced Financial Matters, including five sessions: (i) the Finance and Audit Committee Report (BM.14/DOC.03); (ii) the 2020 Audited Financial Statements (BM.14/DOC.04); (iii) the Internal Control System (ICS) (BM.14/DOC.05); (iv) the Funding Situation (BM.14/DOC.06); and the Policy on Contributions (BM.14/DOC.07), three of which have a decision attached. The Chair invited the Finance and Compliance Manager (FCM) to introduce the sessions.

Finance & Audit Committee (FAC) Report

4.2 A representative of the FAC briefly presented the report of the Committee (BM.14/DOC.03). He highlighted the February working session on multi-year, non-earmarked funding and the May formal meeting, during which the FAC endorsed the 2020 audited financial statements, the internal control system, the funding situation, and the revised policy on contributions.

Audited Financial Statements

4.3 The Chair invited the external auditors, BDO SA, to present the 2020 audited financial statements (BM.14/DOC.04). Mr Jürg Gehring and Mr Olivier Griot briefly presented their report on the 2020 audited statements, expressing an “unqualified” opinion, indicating they present a true and fair view of GCERF’s financial position.

4.4 The Finance and Compliance Manager briefly presented additional points regarding the budget performance for 2020, in particular describing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on it.

Internal Control System (ICS)

4.5 The Finance and Compliance Manager briefly presented the ICS (BM.14/DOC.05), highlighting the “acceptable risks” it allows due to the nature of the organisation, and assuring the continuous update of the ICS to ensure it suits the needs of the organisation.

Funding Situation

4.6 The FCM presented the Funding Situation (BM.14/DOC.06), highlighting: GCERF reaching USD 100m contributions; the revised budget for 2021; full coverage of the 2021 budget; and the need for a predictable funding horizon going forward.

Contributions Policy

4.7 The FCM provided an overview of the revised Policy on Contributions (BM.14/DOC.07), noting that its main principles remain and highlighting the changes to note: (i) the addition of the private sector, noting that a document is under development for future presentation to the Board; (ii) the ability to decline contributions; and (iii) the removal of the point on creation of a Contributions Committee, given the operational FAC.

Discussion

4.8 The Alternate Board member for the Private Sector constituency asked about learnings over the last 18 months, in particular regarding the utilisation of cost-efficient virtual tools that might continue permanently to reduce travel costs. He also asked if there is a minimum grant size, below which the administrative burden becomes too high; and conversely, if contributions must also be above a certain amount to be worthwhile.

4.9 The FCM replied that those methods that can be adopted have been but reminded that visiting partner countries is essential to the work of GCERF. He explained there is an average grant size of around USD 700,000–800,000, and there are currently around 40 grants, agreeing that GCERF might consider this further. The ED agreed the possibility of a minimum donor contribution has been discussed before and should be considered.

4.10 Speaking for New Zealand, the Board member for Australia, Japan and New Zealand offered confidence in the finance work being done by the Secretariat, noting that New Zealand is a member of the Finance and Audit Committee. She expressed support for the changes to the Policy in Contributions, including the option to decline contributions should there be a need. She requested more information on the private sector document under development, and any ongoing engagement with the private sector as part of the replenishment campaign.

4.11 In response, the ED reiterated GCERF's commitment to increasing engagement with the private sector while cautioning all to be realistic about the potential for direct financial contributions to GCERF. He referenced the idea of a private sector commission or task force suggested during the ED report discussion. With regard to the private sector document, this will be shared with the Board once it is further developed.

4.12 The Board member for Switzerland offered the perspective that many donors are contributing to GCERF because it has the ability to travel and work when and where governments do not. He reiterated his satisfaction with GCERF's work during the pandemic and urged that performance and impact is best done in the field.

4.13 The Chair reiterated the need to set a policy and framework to aid GCERF in its pursuit of the private sector. He thanked all for their interventions and presented the related decisions to the Board.

4.14 The Board took the following decisions:

BM.14/DEC.04: The Board approves the financial statements prepared in US Dollars and in accordance with IFRS for SMEs and the statutory financial statements presented in Swiss Francs (CHF).

BM.14/DEC.05: The Board approves the internal control measures currently in place. It requests the Secretariat to continue developing and operating the internal control system on the basis of the principles and approach described in document BM.14/DOC.05.

BM.14/DEC.06: The Board approves the revised Policy on Contributions (BM.14/DOC.07).

5. STRATEGY 2025

5.1 The ED presented the Strategy (BM.14/DOC.08) and its purpose. He highlighted that an effective strategy must be clear and straightforward and provide a high-level framework within which GCERF can work. The Strategy was widely consulted with relevant stakeholders, including a Strategy Reference Group made up of Board members, and all comments on a final draft are reflected in the latest version for approval. Upon approval of the Strategy, the ED suggested that time is set aside at the next Board meeting to discuss its implementation.

5.2 The ED highlighted key features of the Strategy: (i) a definition of what GCERF can and cannot do; (ii) an outline of entry and exit criteria; (iii) a definition of GCERF's added value in the field of PVE; (iv) an outline of clear principles, including results-based management and conflict-sensitive programming; (v) focus, flexibility, and adaptability within its framework; and (vi) a commitment to streamline efficiency. He said the Strategy is intended to offer clarity, purpose, and added value.

5.3 The ED reflected on learnings from the previous strategy cycle, in particular that the Board must "own" the Strategy so that they may be advocates for it, which is why he suggests a more substantive session on the strategy at the next Board meeting

5.4 The Chair invited the Chair of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) to make an intervention.

5.5 The Chair of the IRP thanked the Chair for the opportunity to comment on the Strategy. The IRP, represented by colleagues around the world, offered feedback on the Strategy and regularly also do so on country and regional strategies, and are pleased to see many of their comments integrated. He highlighted six points on the Strategy, which is ambitious but cognisant of realities: (i) focus on sustainability, including entry and exit criteria allowing for further future planning; (ii) digital solutions at all levels, including supporting digital literacy and responsible digital citizenship towards prevention of online radicalisation; (iii) suggestion to establish an emerging issues fund with a rapid response ability, the first the Chair of the IRP has seen; (iv) realistic, analysis of efficient Secretariat resources and capacity; (v) defining what success looks like in programmes through its four

pillars; and (vi) working towards a noble but ambitious vision to live in a world without violent extremism.

5.6 The Chair presented two video interventions, by Think Peace Mali and the Community Development Fund, grantees in Mali and Kosovo, respectively. They reinforced their appreciation of GCERF's work, and the specific approach outlined in the Strategy.

Discussion

5.7 The representative for Somalia expressed thanks and appreciation for GCERF's collaboration on PVE in Somalia, and for the opportunity to be a part of this unique network. He explained that Somalis have suffered a great deal from violent extremism and and despite financial constraints, are dedicated to continuing working against Al-Shabaab. He stressed that the strategic vision must be long-term and offered a brief overview of the current GCERF-supported programming in Somalia.

5.8 Speaking for Tunisia, the Board member for Tunisia and the Philippines offered praise for the professionalism and quality of work carried out by GCERF, all of which supports Tunisia's efforts. Tunisia adopted its first National Strategy against Extremism and Terrorism, which develops some mechanisms and legal, digital, and strategic frameworks. The Board member stressed that GCERF's global, holistic approach, including developing the capacities of states and civil society, is important, especially due to the challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. She appealed for a strategy renewal in Tunisia and offered an overview of the progress made to date by GCERF programmes in Tunisia.

5.9 Speaking for the Netherlands, the Alternate Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway, and Germany confirmed that the Netherlands will continue to support GCERF in the coming years. She offered support for the Strategy, noting that it is as ambitious as it should be. She also called for a renewed focus on prevention work, echoing the point by the Executive Director that it is necessary to be focused and to resist the urge to do everything, everywhere. The Alternate Board member applauded GCERF's growth and expansion but cautioned that it must focus on its existing work, which she believes can be done through the Strategy and an active and engaged Board.

5.10 The Board member for the United States complimented the Strategy, noting that it is high level, and he looks forward to subsequent discussion on its implementation. He appreciated its holistic approach and its emphasis on the role of technology and digitalisation. Noting that this role has changed in the last few years, it is important to make

sure grantees have digital literacy and the tools to battle disinformation, and he offered support from the United States in this.

5.11 The Board member for Canada and the United Kingdom offered the UK's supportive commitment and encouraged the continued development of knowledge sharing and an evidence base. She was pleased to see references to online and extreme right-wing radicalisation, and comprehensive, results-based management. She offered strong support for the private sector policy and requested more information on the types of organisations and institutions from which GCERF will seek support.

5.12 The representative for Germany highlighted that the Strategy was an important, well-rounded document that included all stakeholders, and that it would require a strong communications campaign to support it. She supported the idea of labour sharing between different organisations, noting that GCERF cannot do everything and even the replenishment campaign may not allow for that capability. To that end, the representative suggested a mid-term review to assess progress of the Strategy and any changes that should be made. She acknowledged that the entry and exit criteria offer a realistic view of operations, as finances will not allow for GCERF to remain in countries indefinitely. She would like to see a further focus on gender, including a specific approach for engaging women. She also offered to provide further comments for consideration in written form.

5.13 The Board member for Switzerland appreciated the increased attention to online radicalisation. He supported the idea of a further in-person session to discuss implementation of the Strategy. In addition to questions posed by colleagues on the Board, he would like to further discuss how to measure specific benchmarks against goals outlined in the Strategy.

5.14 The Board member for the European Union joined colleagues in commending GCERF's efforts on the Strategy. He was glad to see a gender dimension in the Strategy and suggested perhaps a broader conversation is needed on masculinity ideals and VE. He mentioned the new neighbourhood development and international cooperation instrument by the EU, which encourages development specifically on this issue.

5.15 The Board member for Qatar thanked the Secretariat for the important document and looks forward to more time to discuss it. He stressed that a Strategy document must be clear, practical, and pragmatic, and that it is enforceable and implementable. He agreed that GCERF has achieved a lot of success but still falls short in a few areas, which should be addressed in the Strategy. He noted that GCERF is not global enough or visible enough, despite being the only global fund for PVE and having a global mandate.

5.16 The Board member for Qatar reiterated suggestions made previously, including that GCERF should: (i) invest more in high-profile conflicts; (ii) strategically plan beyond COVID-19; and (iii) clarify the entry and exit criteria. On this last point, the Board member suggested further distinction between criteria for communities and criteria for countries and a clear timeframe of investment, and he suggests investments of no more than three years as sufficient time to build capacity and compliment the PVE efforts of the partner governments. While acknowledging the proposal to have a future discussion on implementation, the Board member requested some resolutions in order to proceed.

5.17 The representative for Norway thanked the Secretariat for the Strategy and agreed it is a good document but that it will be important to discuss its operationalisation. He requested an emphasis on a gender focus and on the entry and exit criteria, agreeing there is more work to be done. He agreed with the Board member for Qatar that GCERF should work in high-profile contexts and expand globally but cautioned that GCERF should be conservative until it has sufficient investment, resources, and staff for this. He also suggested that GCERF should not enter areas with a high existing level of conflict without a reasonable level of certain success, as many high-conflict areas require long-term investment.

5.18 The Chair expressed thanks and offered some observations: (i) GCERF has left the start-up stage and is maturing but doing so in an environment that is changing; (ii) the Strategy must consider lessons learned and dialogue with partners while remaining flexible to this changing environment and local contexts; (iii) PVE work must balance between the sometimes-differing perspectives between development and security. Going forward, GCERF must define its approach and strategy, while leaving the flexibility required for prevention of violent extremism.

5.19 The representative for Niger commended the Executive Director for the Strategy, which is well-written and offers a clear detail of plans. He suggested that the role of national governments could be further highlighted, as their engagement and work is often not sufficiently clear to donors. He would like to see the national governments in the driving seat, central to ensuring justice and security while supporting CSOs and others to take the lead on programming.

5.20 The Executive Director agreed that a key principle laid out in the Strategy is the relationship with the partner country governments. He offered four points in reply to the interventions made: (i) the Strategy was consulted widely, offering sufficient time for feedback and suggestions; (ii) the global Strategy offers a high-level strategic direction with flexibility and guidance on what to do and what not to do; (iii) there is a clear distinction between such a Strategy and its implementation plan, which would address many of the comments made, such as on gender, an emerging issues fund, and entry and exit; and (iv)

the Strategy will be reviewed and updated regularly, with regular review. He also reminded the Board that in addition to the global Strategy, GCERF obtains Board approval for each regional or country strategy, which provide detailed implementation plans with a three-year duration.

5.21 The Board member for Qatar thanked the Chair and the Executive Director for their responses. He reiterated his request for clarity on the issues mentioned and expressed that all are working towards a common objective of a pragmatic, effective Strategy. Regarding approval of the Strategy, he asked if it would be advantageous to continue to reflect on it to ensure its effectiveness and credibility.

5.22 The Chair agreed that the Strategy decision should have consensus and stressed that he agreed the Strategy must leave room for flexibility to local contexts and a changing environment. He acknowledged there remains the opportunity to better explain intentions, should the Board feel it is necessary, but urged an expedient process to ensure progress.

5.23 The Board member for the European Union offered full support to the Strategy and proposed adding to the decision language a point acknowledging that the Strategy is a living document which must be regularly reviewed, and that GCERF investments are time-bound.

5.24 The Chair, the Executive Director, and the Board members for the European Union and Qatar agreed on the addition of decision language expressing the necessity to regularly review the Strategy.

5.25 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.07: The Board:

- a. approves GCERF's Strategy 2025 contained in Annex 1 of BM.14/DOC.08 Strategy 2025;
- b. thanks the Strategy Reference Group, and acknowledges and thanks the wide range of additional stakeholders who provided helpful feedback;
- c. looks forward to a substantive discussion on implementing the strategy at the 15th GCERF Board Meeting;
- d. notes that the Strategy is a living document, that GCERF operations are not intended to be open-ended and that the term of investment is three years, renewable, with consideration of the specificity of the projects, to be assessed on a case-by-case basis; and

e. commits actively to promote and support the Strategy.

6. REPLENISHMENT UPDATE

6.1 Due to the hybrid nature of the meeting and for virtual attendees just joining the meeting, the Executive Director summarised key points from the session on the Report of the Executive Director (BM.14/DOC.01).

7. GOVERNANCE UPDATE

7.1 The Chair invited the Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) to briefly present the GEC Report (BM.14/DOC.09), which has a decision associated.

7.2 The Chair of the GEC thanked the members of the GEC for their commitment and the Secretariat for their support to the Committee. He briefly summarised the GEC report, highlighting five points: (i) the change in membership for the Committee member from Canada, included for decision; (ii) there have been no conflicts of interest since the 13th Meeting of the GCERF Governing Board, however there remain missing forms by Board members which must be submitted; (iii) per the GCERF Bylaws and the GEC Terms of Reference, the Governing Board Self-Assessment (BM.14/DOC.09/ANNEX.02) is proposed for decision; (iv) a January 2021 meeting discussed the role of non-governmental constituencies and conflicts of interest, agreeing that no current change of the constituency model is needed but that any future review of GCERF's governance may consider it; and (v) governance reform.

7.3 Regarding governance reform, the Chair of the GEC explained that in response to some questions raised regarding voting procedures and governance structure, the Secretariat prepared a background paper (BM.14/DOC.09/ANNEX.01) which outlines possible alternative voting procedures and ultimately recommends a more thorough review of GCERF's governance after the conclusion of the replenishment campaign. Should the Board request it, the GEC will conduct a thorough review for presentation and in-depth discussion at the 15th Meeting of the GCERF Governing Board and for potential revision and decision at the 16th Meeting of the GCERF Governing Board. The Chair of the GEC reminded that governance reform is a major issue that requires a comprehensive, politically sensitive, and thoughtful approach. It also would require a change in the Bylaws, administrative and time commitments. The Chair invited the Executive Director to provide an overview of the scenarios proposed in the background paper.

7.4 The Executive Director briefly summarised the background paper (BM.14/DOC.09/ANNEX.01), including the informal comments from Board members that

inspired it. The ED offered the position of the Secretariat, which is that none of the scenarios posed in the paper are better than the existing governance structure. He reiterated the recommendation that a thorough governance review take place over time, including but not restricted to voting procedures, by the GEC and offered the support of the Secretariat.

7.5 The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

Discussion

7.6 The Board member for the United States acknowledged that having too many donors interested in Board seats is a good problem to have, reflective of GCERF's expansion. He would like to ensure GCERF's governance reflects this so requests the GEC to proceed with a review for decision during the 15th Meeting of the GCERF Governing Board.

7.7 The Board member for the European Union requested the GEC proceed with a broader governance review with flexibility on decision timing and offered his full support and belief in the ability of the GEC. He urged pragmatic creativity, and the allowance for a broad discussion on the subject.

7.8 The Board member for Switzerland offered advice based on prior experience with governance reform, cautioning against taking a decision at the same time as an in-depth discussion on the subject. Often a period of negotiation is required. He also reminded the Board that during a visible, ambitious replenishment campaign, GCERF and its Governing Board should present strongly, which doesn't hinder GCERF from beginning a governance review but does recommend it reports after the replenishment campaign. He offered support for the timeline proposed by the GEC.

7.9 The representative for Germany offered that the goal of GCERF and its structure were the major draw for Germany to join as a new Board member, rather than their voting rights. She understands that voting rights are important, particularly for those contributing funding, but supported the constituency system which forces the Board to strategically consider how to work together. She suggested that the should the replenishment campaign succeed, the same questions could come up again in a changed context, so encouraged regular discussion regarding governance systems.

7.10 The Chair thanked all for their interventions and feedback. He explained that he requested the GEC come prepared to discuss this topic because he sees the potential need; however, he stressed efficiency and recommended that a decision not come before the outcomes of the replenishment campaign are known. He thanked the GEC and Secretariat for their work providing a basis for this discussion and suggested to determine the right timing for a decision as the discussion continues and develops.

7.11 The Chair of the GEC thanked all for the trust they place in the GEC. He agreed that the results of the replenishment campaign should be included in a conversation about governance reform. He offered that the overall challenges that will be important to consider are how to maintain a representative, efficient, and multistakeholder board. He suggested that the GEC open a period of feedback for the Board to submit suggestions and comments, and that the GEC expand on them for a discussion at BM.15.

7.12 The Board member for the United States agreed that trust in the GEC remains. He requested that, in order for constituencies to provide feedback, the GEC clarify any parameters within which to work: number of constituencies, how they can be broken up, etc. The Chair of the GEC replied that the Bylaws may be changed to suit the needs of the Board, but changes must be reasonable and lead to a manageable, efficient Board.

7.13 The Board member for the EU agreed these parameters are important and must represent the principle of equality.

7.14 The Board member for Nigeria suggested that the Board seems to have consensus that there be a time for reflection, to consider and discuss options before arriving at a decision. He said that the scenario of one vote per constituency may create problems when the constituencies are imbalanced.

7.15 The Chair thanked all and agreed that the GEC will consult with the Board and provide a report on governance reform for further discussion at BM.15, during which it will consider if the matter is ready for decision.

7.16 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.08: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of **Mr Ramanand Kamineni**, Canada and United Kingdom constituency, as member of the Governance and Ethics Committee, and thanks him for his service;
- b. approves the appointment of **Ms Christine Constantin**, Canada and United Kingdom constituency, as member of the Governance and Ethics Committee in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee; and
- c. approves the Governing Board Self-Assessment presented in Annex 2.

8. RESULTS UPDATE

8.1 The Chair invited the Performance and Impact Manager (PIM) to present the Results update (BM.14/DOC.10). The PIM briefly presented the Results update, impressing upon the Board that despite the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, GCERF has signed new grants and reached new people – 2.2m direct beneficiaries and 13.4m indirect beneficiaries, almost 50% of whom are women and girls. In addition, GCERF has conducted key assessments such as the ex-post evaluation in Nigeria and the baseline assessment in Bangladesh.

8.2 The PIM offered an overview of the annexes to the paper, which provide lessons learned and a way forward. He highlighted key points: (i) the AFM is a powerful tool for engaging grassroots organisations and experimentation, including experimenting with private sector engagement; (ii) the County Engagement Forums (CEFs) in Kenya helped encourage localisation and bring together different actors; (iii) looking forward, quasi-experimental evaluations will take place to encourage innovation in results; and (iv) GCERF will share lessons and feed policy initiatives, recognising it should act as a knowledge leader for PVE and a convener of local and global actors.

Discussion

8.3 The Alternate Board member for the Private Sector agreed it will be important to articulate a well-thought-out private sector strategy when going into countries. He highlighted the violent extremist risk to local private sector, which should encourage them to participate in prevention.

8.4 The Alternate Board member for Mali said these initiatives come at the right time and are necessary for future GCERF actions and progress. He congratulated GCERF on encouraging results and would like to see them further amplified.

8.5 The Board member for the European Union congratulated GCERF on increased ambitions and impressive steps, highlighting those from Cox's Bazar and the Sahel region. He was pleased to see an increased local presence. He noted positive feedback from the EU in Somalia on collaboration and communication with GCERF; and less positive feedback from the EU in Nigeria about CSM participation, with the acknowledgement that this has since been addressed.

8.6 The representative for Somalia said the CSM met for the first time a week ago, and thanked GCERF for its support. He stressed that many governments, including Somalia's, don't have the resources to address violent extremism on their own. He outlined the Somali government bodies working on PVE and said the GCERF Strategy is in line with Somalia's national strategy.

8.7 The Board member for Tunisia thanked the PIM for a rich report and reported that in Tunisia, they have found the private sector to be reluctant to become involved in PVE. She suggested it is important to highlight the role the sector can play in terms of economic initiatives. She reported that Tunisia has been strengthening its own research initiatives, with a number of ongoing projects in collaboration with implementing partners.

8.8 The Board member for Policy, Think and Do Tanks thanked the Secretariat for the report and congratulated them on the progress made. He commended GCERF's approach to partnerships that have a lasting impact beyond specific grants, including an instance where his organisation, the Global Center for Cooperative Security (GCCS), is now working with an original GCERF grantee on Kenya prison rehabilitation, an introduction facilitated by GCERF. He noted that this type of action, with a priority on local partners, is still quite unique and should be acknowledged.

8.9 The Board member for the United Kingdom congratulated the Secretariat on its increasing results, recognising the challenge of results and impact within PVE. She advocated for demonstrating new capacities built amongst beneficiaries. She echoed the Board member for the EU, encouraging GCERF to engage with constituencies on the ground and offering full support to facilitate this coordination.

8.10 The PIM thanked all for their interventions. He agreed the private sector needs careful thought and that the results of the AFM in Kenya offered useful perspectives on this. He reiterated that GCERF takes performance and impact very seriously and will continue to do experiment, improve, and develop new methods.

8.11 The Executive Director thanked all for their interventions and reminded the Board of the new hiring of National Advisors in many countries, who will help facilitate increased collaboration with donor constituencies on the ground and increased monitoring and evaluations.

9. PORTFOLIO UPDATE

9.1 The Chair invited the Head of the Portfolio Management Unit (HPMU) to briefly present the Portfolio Update (BM.14/DOC.11). The HPMU stressed that while all are eager to plan for beyond the COVID-19 pandemic, it has impacted operations for both the Secretariat and the grantees; programmes managed to expand and operate but the HPMU noted higher burnout rates, revised programme timelines, and overall less expenditure due to limitations.

9.2 The HPMU offered a brief overview of the Portfolio Update, highlighting:

- i. New, innovative solutions such as moving some activities online and developing online applications. She noted the success of programmes despite the pandemic, proving that the GCERF model works because grantees remained in communities throughout the pandemic, addressing needs as they arose and continuing to build trust.
- ii. Operationalisation of regional approaches to PVE, in the Horn of Africa, the Sahel, and the Western Balkans.
- iii. Increased partnerships and co-creation, continuing partnerships with relevant organisations and governments, noting that partnerships require the dedication and commitment of both parties. She committed to new investments relying on mutual partnership with the partner governments.

The HPMU reminded the Board that GCERF's model is one that pools risks, tests ideas, and strengthens control systems.

9.3 The HPMU highlighted a few key innovations taking place, including Global Communities of Practice, digital choropleth mapping, piloted in Nigeria, and ongoing quality improvements. She updated that during the reporting period, GCERF has signed 30 new grant agreements, investing USD 7.2m and including 29 new partners. She thanked all for their contributions and ongoing support and collaboration.

9.4 The HPMU offered a brief look ahead, including expansion to new countries, creation of a platform for dialogue, and continued investment in PVE. The Chair thanked the HPMU and opened the floor for discussion.

Discussion

9.5 The representative for the Board member for Kosovo thanked GCERF for its support and reiterated a commitment to helping fulfil plans to increase the knowledge and capacities of local NGOs and CSOs who are now moving in a comprehensive, clear direction. He commended GCERF on its model, which genuinely allows local design according to needs. He agreed that we need to continue improving local capacities so GCERF can one day move on to help new communities and countries.

9.6 The Chair of the IRP congratulated the Secretariat for their work and reiterated the strong collaboration between the two. He highlighted how GCERF's work: (i) is driven by strategic thinking and innovative approaches that take into consideration new and changing circumstances; (ii) expands learnings from the ground and across global portfolios, particularly in the Global Community of Practice meetings; and that (iii) the grant portfolio is building up regional coordination and collaboration.

9.7 The Board member for Nigeria commended the collaborative programming and requested to see where GCERF might continue to work following the end of current grants in December.

9.8 The representative of the National Counter Terrorism Center (NCTC) for Kenya offered appreciation for GCERF's support and for its flexibility during the pandemic, which has paved the way for other partners and organisations to adjust and progress. He noted the transition from the CFM to AFM has helped progress and reaches more people exposed to violent extremism.

9.9 The representative for Germany commended the interesting report and recommended exploring a collaboration with Germany's PREVU team, who are working on early warning, crisis prevention, and stabilisation projects and conducting regular analyses. She asked how GCERF distributes knowledge to other fora, such as the GCTF? The HPMU agreed this is important and said while sharing happens on an ad hoc basis currently, making this more systematic is a key priority now. The PIM reminded the Board of an upcoming initiative in collaboration with the GCTF, which will also progress this objective.

10. 2020 ANNUAL REPORT FOR SWISS SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

10.1 The Chair introduced the final agenda item, the 2020 Annual Report for the Swiss Supervisory Authority (BM.14/DOC.12), which requires approval by Board before submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority each year. He opened the floor for questions or comments and hearing none, presented the decision.

10.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.14/DEC.09: The Board approves the 2020 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.14/DOC.12 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

11. Any Other Business

11.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director to make any closing remarks.

11.2 The ED congratulated the Chair on his first Board meeting and thanked all those who joined the meeting, virtually and in person. He acknowledged the clear passion from all, proof that GCERF is doing worthwhile work. He thanked the GCERF team.

11.3 The Chair thanked all for their interaction during the meeting and expressed hopes that the next meeting will see more Board members in person. He encouraged all to keep countering negative phenomena with positive energy.

11.4 The Chair closed the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
BM.14/DOC.01 AGENDA**

TUESDAY 22 JUNE 2021

Location – Hybrid (9:00 – 5:00 CET), Conference Room “Geneva”, Varembe Conference Centre (CCV), 9-11 Rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
8:30 – 9:20	Welcome Coffee / Security Check-In		
9:20 – 9:30	Safety Briefing		Conference Centre
9:30 – 9:45	Welcoming Remarks		Board Chair / Executive Director
9:45 – 10:00	Preliminary Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members 	DOC.01 (for decision)	Board Chair / Executive Director
10:00 – 11:00	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
11:00 – 11:15	Finance and Audit Committee	DOC.03 (for information)	Chair of the FAC
11:15 – 11:45	Coffee Break		
11:45 – 12:30	Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audited Financial Statements • Internal Control System • Funding Situation • Contributions Policy 	DOC.04 (for decision) DOC.05 (for decision) DOC.06 (for information) DOC.07 (for decision)	Executive Director / Finance & Compliance Manager
12:30 – 13:15	Strategy 2025	DOC.08 (for decision)	Executive Director
13:15 – 13:30	Replenishment Update	See DOC.02 (for information)	Board Chair / Executive Director
13:30 – 14:00	Governance Update	DOC.09 (for decision)	Board Chair / Executive Director / Chair of the GEC
14:00 – 14:45	Lunch		
14:45 – 16:15	Results & Portfolio Update	DOC.10 (for information) DOC.11 (for information)	P&I Manager / Head of Portfolio Management
16:15 – 16:30	2020 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority	DOC.12 (for decision)	Executive Director
16:30 – 17:00	Any Other Business		Board Chair
17:30 – 19:30	Reception		

**ANNEX 2
PARTICIPANTS LIST (*attending in-person)**

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Mr Stefano Manservigi*

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

Board Member: Ms Cecile Hillyer, Head, International Security and Disarmament Division, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade, Wellington

Alternate Board Member: Mr Peter Scott, Acting Assistant Secretary, Counter-Terrorism Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

Constituency Members:

Japan: Mr Chitaru Shimizu, Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

H.E. Mr Jeffrey Roach, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Satoshi Mori, Assistant Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

Bangladesh

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Mr Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Constituency Member: Mr Md Baky Billah, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: H.E. Ms Miriam Shearman, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations in Geneva

Constituency Members:

Mr George Braun, Deputy Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs (ICC), Global Affairs Canada

Mr Alex Murphy, Head of Prevent and RICU International, the UK Home Office, London

Ms Katherine North, Senior Programme Manager, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

European Union, France, Denmark and Italy

Board Member: Mr Jesper Steen Pedersen*, Deputy Head of Unit, FPI.I –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

Alternate Board Member: Mr Adrien Frier, Head of the Suppression of Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Constituency Members:

Denmark: Mr Adam Ravnkilde, Chief Adviser / Counterterrorism Coordinator, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

Italy: Mr Arnaldo Minuti, Head Office VII (International cooperation in counter-terrorism, transnational organized crime, drug trafficking), General Directorate for Political Affairs and Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rome

Ms Henriette Bindsbol Holm Johansen, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

Ms Hermine Carde, Counterterrorism Expert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Ms Alessandra Fraschini, Office VII DGAP, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rome

Kenya

Board Member: Ms. Susan Wakiaga*, Immigration Attaché on behalf of H.E. Dr Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Constituency Member: Mr Njenga Miiri, Head Prevention and Resilience, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC), Nairobi

Kosovo and North Macedonia

Board Member: Mr Mensur Hoti, Director of Department for Public Safety, Ministry Internal Affairs on behalf of H.E. Mr Mr Xhelal Svecla, Minister of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

Alternate Board Member: Mr Borce Petrevski, National CVE/CT Coordinator of North Macedonia, Skopje

Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso

Board Member: H.E. Mr Abiodun Richards Adejola*, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Mr Mamadou Henri Konate*, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Constituency Members:

Niger: Brigadier General Mahamadou Abou Tarka*, Minister and President of the High Authority for the Consolidation of Peace (HACP), Niamey

Burkina Faso: H.E. Mr Pengwendé Clément Sawadogo*, Minister of State of Burkina Faso, Minister of Territorial Administration and Decentralization, Ouagadougou

Mr Bruce Emmanuel Sawadogo*, Director General for Public Liberties and Political Affairs at the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization, and Chief of Burkina Faso Regional Cell for the Prevention of Radicalisation (CELLRAD), Ouagadougou

H.E. Mr Laouali Labo, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Niger to the United Nations Office in Geneva

H.E. Mr Tunde Mukaila Mustapha*, Ambassador and Chargé d'affaires a.i., Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Adama Coulibaly*, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Policy, Think and Do Tanks

Alternate Board Member: Mr Eelco Kessels, Executive Director, Global Center on Cooperative Security, New York

Private Sector

Board Member: Ms Jessica Long, CSO & Managing Director, Closed Loop Partners, New York

Alternate Board Member: Mr Tony Carroll*, Founding Director, Acorus Capital; Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.

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

Somalia

Mr Ahmed Jama Omar*, Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia, Mogadishu

Switzerland

Board Member: H.E. Mr Thomas Gass*, Ambassador, Vice-Director and Head of the South Cooperation Department, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

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

Constituency Members:

Dr Derek Müller*, Head of Division Middle East and Northern Africa and Fragility, Conflict & Human Rights Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Ms Inanna Göbel-Bösch*, Policy Advisor, Fragility, Conflict and Human Rights, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Tunisia and the Philippines

Board Member: Ms Neila Feki, Vice-President, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Alternate Board Member: Mr Alexander Macario, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Peace and Security, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Republic of the Philippines, Manila

Constituency Members:

Ms Sonia Abbassi, Permanent Secretary, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Ms Nourchène Mlaouah, Director Responsible for Relations with Civil society, international cooperation and training, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany

Board Member: Mr Irfan Saeed*, Deputy Coordinator (Acting) for Prevention & Detention, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: Ms Naomi Yorks, Deputy Head of Section, Counterterrorism & National Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Constituency Members:

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

Germany: Ms Heike Thiele*, Director for Civilian Crisis Prevention and Stabilisation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Mr Matthias Kennert*, Desk Officer, Crisis Prevention, Stabilization, Peacebuilding Sahel / West Africa, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Ms Laurie Freeman, Deputy Director, CT Programs, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

OBSERVERS

Afghanistan

H.E. Mr Nasir Ahmad Andisha, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Albania

Ms Lejdi Dervishi, Director, The Coordination Center for Countering Violent Extremism, Tirana

Mr Donjet Gjoka, Head of Civil Society & Security Division, The Coordination Center for Countering Violent Extremism, Tirana

Kazakhstan

Mr Abzal Mambetalinov, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Slovenia

Ms Irina Goršič, Minister Plenipotentiary (Humanitarian Affairs & Migration, Environment, UNECE, Peace and Security), Permanent Mission of the Republic of Slovenia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Sri Lanka

Major General (Retd) Maj Gen (Retd) Ruwan Kulatunga, Chief of National Intelligence, Ministry of Defence of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Ms Mahesha Jayawardana, Acting Deputy Director, International Security & Counter Terrorism Division, Ministry of Foreign Relations of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Qatar Fund for Development

Ms Aisha Al Kuwari, Development Projects Researcher Third, Qatar Fund for Development, Doha

Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Mr Keneshbek B. Sainazarov, IRP Chair and Central Asia Programs Director, Search For Common Ground, Bishkek

GCERF Secretariat