

REPORT OF THE 1ST BOARD MEETING

The inaugural meeting of the Governing Board of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) was held on 17-18 November 2014 in Geneva, Switzerland. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in **Annex 1** to this report and an attendance list is in **Annex 2**.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 Ambassador Stephan Husy, Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland opened the meeting and provided welcoming remarks. Ambassador Husy expressed the enthusiasm of the Government of Switzerland for participating in the exciting new initiative and in hosting GCERF.

2. LEGAL STATUS

2.1 Ambassador Husy summarized the background of the establishment of GCERF, which is detailed in BM.01/DOC.02. The notion and basic structure of GCERF were discussed at three Steering Group meetings held in November 2013 in Lucerne, Switzerland, December 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland and February 2014 in Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Representatives from governments, international organisations, foundations, civil society organisations, and the private sector attended. The outcome of these meetings was a Framework Document that was used as a guide to the GCERF Interim Secretariat in preparing the papers being presented to the Board at this first meeting.

2.2 The process of incorporation of GCERF as a Swiss foundation with international status in Switzerland was reviewed. On 9 September 2014, the formal deed of the foundation, including its Statutes, which is akin to the “constitution” of GCERF, was filed with the Commerce Registry in Geneva. The Statutes were intentionally drafted at a very general level in order to allow the Board to shape the nature of GCERF in accordance with needs and intentions.

2.3 As the sole founding Board member, Ambassador Husy looked forward to being joined by others to form a truly public-private organisation. He introduced Ms Carol Bellamy and Dr Khalid Koser, who had been instrumental to the establishment of GCERF. Ms Bellamy had facilitated the Steering Group meetings and assisted the GCERF Interim Secretariat during its establishment. Dr Khalid Koser had been serving as the Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat since May 2014.

3. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

3.1 The founding Board member advised that he would be appointing Ms Bellamy to chair the meeting, and that a discussion on the appointment of a chair for GCERF on a more permanent basis would be made by the full Board the next day.

3.2 The founding Board member took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.01: Ms Carol Bellamy is appointed as Chair of the 1st Board meeting.

4. CONFIRMATION OF BOARD MEMBERS

4.1 The Chair thanked Ambassador Husy and all of those in attendance at the meeting, including those who would be joining as Board members and those who had attended to observe. She also thanked the Government of Switzerland for its leadership in establishing GCERF and the Interim Secretariat for its hard work planning the meeting.

4.2 The Chair explained that while GCERF exists as a legal entity, this first meeting was very important to put in place the policies and systems for it to operate. The Statutes specified that the Board is made up of donor and recipient countries, foundations, civil society, foundations and the Swiss host state. The proposed Bylaws outlined a constituency-based governing structure and the seating arrangement at the table had assumed that the Bylaws would be approved. The Chair asked all persons seated around the table ready to confirm their interest in joining the Board and to introduce themselves as the Board Member or, where applicable, Alternate Board Member.

4.3 The following persons were confirmed as new voting Board members representing the constituencies in the Bylaws that were approved at the meeting:

Constituency	Board Member/Alternate Board Member
Australia	Board Member: Mr Ian McConville, Deputy Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations in Geneva
Bangladesh	Board Member: His Excellency Md. Shahidul Haque, Foreign Secretary, Bangladesh Ministry of Foreign Affairs Alternate Board Member: Mr Muhammad Mahfuzur, Director General, Bangladesh Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Canada and United Kingdom	Board Member: Ms Sue Breeze, Head of Equalities & Non Discrimination Team, Foreign & Commonwealth Office, Human Rights and Democracy Department Alternate Board Member: Ms Nell Stewart, Director, Capacity Building Program Division, Non-Proliferation and Security Threat Reduction Bureau, Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada ¹
Civil Society²	Board Member: Mr Fulco Van Deventer, Deputy Director, Human Security Collective Alternate Board Member: Dr Edit Schlaffer, Founder and Executive Director,

¹ Ms Stewart was not in attendance. Ms Elsa Mouelhi-Rondeau, Second Secretary, Disarmament and Peace Security, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations in Geneva advised that Ms Stewart would be the Alternate Board member and that she was participating in the meeting on behalf of Ms Stewart.

² Previously known as the “Non-Governmental Organisations” constituency. The name was changed following the Board’s discussion and approval of the Bylaws.

Constituency	Board Member/Alternate Board Member
	Women without Borders / Sisters Against Violent Extremism
European Union	Board Member: Mr Adriaan van der Meer, Head of Unit, Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace - Global and Transregional Threats, European Commission Alternate Board Member: Mr Harald Freyer, Policy Adviser and Judicial Expert, European External Action Service
Foundations	Board Member: Ms Charlotte Keenan, Chief Executive, Tony Blair Faith Foundation Alternate Board Member: Mr Alistair Millar, Executive Director, Global Center on Cooperative Security
Mali	Board Member: Ambassador Aya Thiam Diallo, Permanent Mission of Mali to the UN in Geneva
Morocco	Board Member: Mr Hassane Boukili, Minister Counselor, Permanent Mission of Morocco to the UN in Geneva
Nigeria	Board Member: Ambassador Orjiako Umunna, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the UN in Geneva
Policy, Think, and Do Tanks³	Board Member: Mr Maqsood Kruse, Executive Director, Hedayah Alternate Board Member: Mr Mark Singleton, Director, International Centre for Counter-Terrorism - The Hague
Private Sector	Board Member: Mr Richard Barrett, Senior Vice President, The Soufan Group Alternate Board Member: Mr Gib Bulloch, Executive Director of Accenture Development Partnerships, Accenture
Qatar	Board Member: Ambassador Mutlaq Al-Qahtani Director of International Organizations Department, Qatar Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Switzerland	Board Member: Ambassador Stephan Husy, Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Switzerland Federal Department of Foreign Affairs Alternate Board Member: Mr Daniel Frank, Deputy Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Switzerland Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
United States of America⁴	Board Member: Ambassador Tina Kaidanow, Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State

4.4 The representative from Pakistan noted that he was not yet in a position to join the Board.

³ Previously known as the “Research Institutions” constituency. The name was changed following the Board’s discussion and approval of the Bylaws.

⁴ Ambassador Kaidanow was not in attendance. Mr Eric Rosand, Director, Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State advised that Ambassador Kaidanow would be the Board member and that he was participating in the meeting on behalf of Ambassador Kaidanow.

4.5 The Chair noted that many observers were in attendance and expressed the hope that they would in the future join constituencies of the Board. These included representatives from Belgium, CARE International, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Spain, Turkey, and the United Nations.

5. APPOINTMENT OF THE RAPPORTEUR

5.1 The Chair advised that as the first order of business, the new Board would be appointing a rapporteur. Mr Mark Singleton from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency had kindly agreed to act as rapporteur, and the Chair thanked him on behalf of the Board.

5.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.02: Mr Mark Singleton is appointed the rapporteur of the 1st Board meeting.

6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

6.1 The Chair introduced the agenda, which had been distributed to participants before the meeting. Having received no comments or suggestions for amendments on the agenda, the Chair confirmed that the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.03: The agenda for the 1st Board meeting (BM.01/DOC.01) is approved.

7. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

7.1 The Chair introduced Dr Khalid Koser, Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat, to present his report (BM.01/DOC.03).

7.2 The presentation started with a reminder to all participants of why they were there: everyone is concerned about the global rise of violent extremism that is destroying lives and families; undermining economic growth and prosperity; threatening national security; and distorting religious, moral and ethical principles of societies around the world. Governments are developing and implementing strategies to counter this phenomenon, which GCERF and the international community should support. Focusing on local communities is important, and there is a funding gap in supporting their activities. Around the table are all important stakeholders and the Interim Secretariat is immensely grateful for their support.

7.3 Each of the Interim Secretariat's team was introduced.

7.4 The financial and in-kind contributions of donors were acknowledged, as well as other contributions from Board members including the Chair. The utility of the Framework Document was also acknowledged. It was noted that some of the Interim Secretariat's proposals diverged from the Framework Document based on consultation and further reflection.

7.5 The presentation included a review of the activities of the Secretariat since August 2014 including in governance, resource mobilisation, operations development, communications;

human resources; and finance and office administration. The expenditures to date were also reviewed.

7.6 To date, GCERF had firm pledges of approximately USD 24 million, with USD 2.1 million contributed. There were many challenges ahead – in particular, resource mobilisation. The figure of USD 200 million that had been projected for GCERF for the next ten years is far from being reached; but given GCERF’s work at the nexus of security and development, this is an opportunity to tap into different donor government budgets. Engagement with the private sector is also an opportunity that must be seized.

7.7 2015 will be a pilot year, and it will be important for GCERF clearly to identify its role and added value. The year will be spent working with the pilot countries and piloting the funding model. There are a lot of people who are still not convinced about GCERF’s mission, including in governments, both donor and beneficiary, and civil society.

Discussion

7.8 Board members thanked the Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat for his comprehensive and informative report. Many expressed their strong support for this much-needed initiative. Board members were looking forward to contributing their expertise and experience to GCERF. They acknowledged and expressed their appreciation for the work that has been done and recognised that much more work would be needed moving forward.

7.9 Some Board members cautioned that complicated processes should not slow down progress. Others also stressed the importance of gaining Official Development Assistance (ODA) status. Ensuring that the Fund has worldwide reach was also emphasised.

7.10 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat thanked Board members for their comments and support. He noted that the engagement of beneficiary countries must be the first step in engaging all stakeholders. Once the GCERF starts supporting projects on the ground, it should make fundraising easier.

8. GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS: BYLAWS

8.1 Ms Tal Sagorsky, Senior Legal and Policy Advisor at the Interim Secretariat presented the proposed Bylaws, which were detailed in Annex 1 to BM.01/DOC.04 (Part 1).

8.2 The Statutes and the Bylaws state that the Governing Board is the supreme governing body with the authority to appoint the auditor and the Executive Director. The Board may also form committees and delegate its powers to such committees or other governance structures, including the Secretariat.

8.3 The presentation contained a description of the constituency model. Each Board member is not acting in his or her personal capacity and, in many cases, represents not only his or her government or organisation, but a constituency made up of several governments and/or types of organisations. Members of the constituency choose a Board member and an Alternate Board member to represent them in GCERF processes; such Board members and Alternate Board

members, once selected, have an obligation to consult their constituency members widely before contributing to Board deliberations. It was stressed that the status of the Board Member and the Alternate Board Member is the same within the governance system.

8.4 The proposed Bylaws set out the 15 voting constituencies, each with one vote. There would also be three non-voting constituencies: the Chair, Executive Director and Trustee, once appointed.

8.5 Board decisions would generally be made by consensus (or, when necessary, by majority vote) in Board meetings held face-to-face or by teleconference. In exceptional circumstances, decisions could be made by a no objection email vote. In emergency situations, decisions will be taken by the Chair and Executive Director with immediate notification to the Board.

Discussion

8.6 Board members were supportive of the Bylaws and the constituency model and asked clarifying questions regarding the membership and operations of constituencies. The Secretariat stressed that while the constituencies were self-governing based on each constituency's needs, there was a great deal of lessons learned and best practices from other multi-stakeholder organisations that could be shared. A suggestion was made that GCERF establish an advisory council to include all relevant constituencies and to ensure that decisions can be made quickly.

8.7 One Board member asked about the privileges and immunities granted to Board members under the anticipated Headquarters Agreement and any remaining liability of Board members. Swiss counsel advised that the Statutes state that only the assets of GCERF are liable for its debts, so there would be no personal liability of Board members for such debts. However, liability in tort is reserved. Regarding the privileges and immunities, the principle has been established to recognize GCERF as an international organisation in Switzerland. Under the future Headquarters Agreement, GCERF will be provided with all the privileges and immunities generally accorded to international organisations with host seats in Switzerland. Board members and Alternate Board members will be immune from arrest and from all acts performed in pursuit of their official functions; and will enjoy inviolability of documents, customs privileges, and facilities to come to all GCERF meetings in Switzerland. The Senior Legal and Policy Officer also advised that the Secretariat was exploring, and had budgeted for, Directors and Officers insurance coverage.

8.8 A few Board members requested clarifications on the meaning of an "emergency" and language was suggested as an amendment to provide greater precision. Another Board member requested the addition of language regarding the Executive Director's obligation to manage the Secretariat under financial and human resource policies approved by the Board and to present an annual budget for Board approval. A suggestion was made to add to the Secretariat's responsibilities regarding lessons learned and to amend the reference to "supranational organisations" to "international organisations". In addition, the Research Institutions constituency requested to change its name to "Policy, Think, and Do Tanks," and another Board member suggested that the name of the Non-Governmental Organisations constituency be changed to "Civil Society". These were all incorporated into a version 2 of the Bylaws.

8.9 Finally, one Board member asked whether an individual donor could join the Board in his or her individual capacity. Swiss counsel noted that this would be prohibited by the Statutes. However, should the issue arise, the Board could amend the Statutes accordingly.

8.10 Following a short presentation by the Chair of the amendments to the Bylaws outlined in paragraph 8.8 above, the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.04: The Board approves the Bylaws attached as Annex 1 (Version 2) to BM.01/DOC.04 (Part 1), and requests the Secretariat to:

- a. file the Bylaws with the Swiss Supervisory Authority for foundations; and
- b. once approval is received, post them on the GCERF website.

9. FUNDING MODEL: CORE FUNDING MECHANISM

9.1 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat presented on the proposed Core Funding Mechanism (“CFM”), which is detailed in BM.01/DOC.05. The CFM is the mechanism to implement the *raison d’être* of GCERF, to give grants to local community-based, grassroots organisations working to counter violent extremism. The principles of GCERF include national consultation, sustainable impact, harmonisation and leverage.

9.2 GCERF’s goal was to make grants quickly and to do so within a year. The eligibility criteria were reviewed, and Bangladesh, Mali, Morocco, and Nigeria had all agreed to act as pilot beneficiary countries. It was noted that Pakistan had been included in the documentation leading up to the Board meeting, but its government was not yet in a position to make a decision about whether to volunteer as a pilot.

9.3 Pilot beneficiary countries will be asked to set up Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”). These will comprise local government and non-governmental stakeholders and will be established and operate under the guidelines included in the paper. Convening these groups is one of the “value-adds” of GCERF.

9.4 It was planned that within the next three months, the international Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) will be formed. The CSM would work with the IRP to identify its needs through an assessment. The IRP will make a recommendation and the Board will approve each country’s allocation of funds. The Principal Recipient, a locally registered legal entity, will be selected by the CSM in consultation with the IRP. Principal Recipients will then be asked to build a consortium to include a range of grassroots organisations and develop a joint proposal for submission. Once complete, each country’s National Application will be sent to the Secretariat and reviewed by the IRP.

9.5 The intention is that by September 2015, the IRP’s funding recommendations on each National Application will be presented to the Board. Once the Board approves a National Application, grant agreements will be signed with each successful Principal Recipient, and funds will be disbursed. After funds have been received, and project implementation has commenced, robust programmatic and financial reporting requirements will be enforced.

Discussion

9.6 Board members commended the Secretariat on its proposed funding model but noted inherent risks that need to be managed. These include inadvertently funding violent extremism and the high administrative cost of the proposed infrastructure, both in terms of time and money, in order to reach the community level. It was clarified during the discussions that in order to avoid funding proscribed groups, provisions will be included in both contribution agreements to GCERF and in grant agreements between GCERF and Principal Recipients.

9.7 Some Board members noted with concern that CSMs were expected to be self-funded and that they may not receive the support they need to fulfil their roles. One Board member suggested that donors and beneficiary countries on the Board may partner in order to provide the support needed to strengthen the CSM in each country. This was supported by the private sector constituency that suggested that they may also be in a position to offer assistance.

9.8 Many Board members noted the importance of reaching vulnerable groups and communities rather than the traditional recipients of international aid. Outreach within communities should include religious and traditional leaders who can form a platform with authority and build trust. One Board member stressed the importance of giving non-registered grassroots entities the opportunity to access GCERF funds, and also noted the need to balance speed against the quality and rigour of managing funds. One Board member also suggested that remuneration of the IRP be increased.

9.9 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat noted that the Board's comments demonstrated the tensions within the model with which the Secretariat had been grappling when designing it: the tension between speed and quality; a national consultation process and independent review; and funding small grassroots organisations from a small Secretariat working out of Geneva. The model tries to resolve these tensions to satisfy all stakeholders, but it is not perfect and therefore the piloting is an important component. He also noted the need to "reach the unreachable," but that this came with an administrative cost on which the Board will need to take a decision.

9.10 One Board member noted that the funding model reflected the spirit of the Framework Document. The Secretariat is lean, and partners are encouraged to provide high-quality secondments to assist. In addition, Board members emphasized that the Secretariat and the Board needed to be ambitious but realistic and "not let the perfect be the enemy of the good", in particular during the pilot phase.

9.11 Following discussion of some minor amendments to the proposed decision, the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. notes the important role of GCERF as the first global effort to support community-focused initiatives aimed at strengthening resilience to violent extremist agendas and to sustainably address the drivers of radicalisation to such agendas and other sources of insecurity;

- b. recognizes the unique contextual challenges that differentiate GCERF from other multi-stakeholder funding mechanisms, and therefore justify the piloting and subsequent evaluation of the Core Funding Mechanism (“CFM”);
- c. endorses the Core Funding Mechanism, including its structures and processes, as proposed in Section 4, Part 2 of the Proposal for the Funding Model (BM.01/DOC.05)(Version 2);
- d. invites a small number of countries that may include Bangladesh, Mali, Morocco and Nigeria as potential pilot beneficiary countries in 2015 and encourages such countries to commence the establishment of their Country Support Mechanism as soon as possible;
- e. requests the Executive Director (to be appointed) to:
 - i. oversee the implementation of the structures and processes of the Core Funding Mechanism and where appropriate explore adaptations and alternatives;
 - ii. oversee the Secretariat’s work with potential pilot beneficiary countries in establishing their Country Support Mechanisms, with appropriate support from the Board; and
 - iii. elaborate and present for approval in the second quarter of 2015 detailed beneficiary country eligibility criteria for Board approval; and
- f. requests the Chair (to be appointed) to oversee the establishment of the international Independent Review Panel under the terms of reference contained in Annex 2 to BM.01/DOC.05 (Version 2).

10. FUNDING MODEL: ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM

10.1 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat presented on the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM). The AFM has quite different principles and mechanisms from the CFM. The AFM was not envisaged in the Framework Document. Its genesis was in the Global Counterterrorism Forum, as one of the responses to the rise of the group known as ISIL, ISIS or *Da’esh*.

10.2 The purpose of the AFM is to facilitate rapid, coordinated and coherent responses to the recent escalation in violent extremism worldwide and its current manifestations. There had been some questioning whether this mechanism should be focused on ISIL, or whether it should be a rapid response mechanism to emerging crises more generally.

10.3 Grants under the AFM would go to NGOs and sub-national authorities and would range between USD 10,000 and 100,000. The themes would include counter-messaging, providing positive alternatives, civil society capacity building, supporting activism against radicalisation to

violent extremism, promoting pluralism, diversity, and tolerance; and facilitating dialogue and collaborative responses.

10.4 The proposed eligible countries that were included in the paper distributed before the meeting were deleted from the presentation due to concerns expressed by some of the Board members. Eligibility criteria would need to be defined quickly.

10.5 The AFM will be a Secretariat-managed process via a public open call for applications. There will be a proposal form and online application process. The Secretariat will screen applications and make funding recommendations to an Accelerated Funding Panel (AFP), which is a small and representative group of Board constituencies, to whom the Board delegates the authority to approve the grants.

10.6 There are cost implications to launching the AFM, both for grants and for operating expenses. Performance monitoring and evaluation will be streamlined but will depend on the size of the grant.

Discussion

10.7 Several Board members expressed support for the AFM, including its intended speed to meet urgent situations. Many expressed reservation on limiting the scope of the AFM to issues relating to ISIL and noted that it should be flexible to meet emerging needs which are constantly evolving. However, the added value and differentiation of the AFM from the CFM needed to be developed and articulated. Several Board members cautioned that the AFM should not duplicate what is already the response of the international community to ISIL; that the needs should be assessed; and that evidence-based practices should be used. It was suggested that Hedayah may assist in this process. In addition, many cautioned against diverting funds from the CFM to fund the AFM.

10.8 Regarding eligibility, many Board members expressed appreciation for removal of the proposed list of countries. One Board member suggested using the Global Terrorism Index as a basis for eligibility and another suggested that political parties should be excluded from eligibility. Some Board members objected to the use of the term Islamic State to describe ISIL.

10.9 Several donor Board members requested that the number of donor country members of the AFP be increased from two to three. The Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency also questioned why they had been excluded. As a consequence, an amendment to the AFP composition was made in version 2 of the document, which was approved by the Board.

10.10 Several Board members raised concerns regarding language in the document that suggested that GCERF could proceed to fund initiatives in a country without government consent, because this would impinge on state sovereignty. The final, approved version 2 of the document deleted this reference.

10.11 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat acknowledged that the detail in the AFM proposal was not as developed as that of the CFM due to the short notice that the Secretariat received to draft it. He noted that it was fundamentally important that the AFM does

not take funds away from the CFM so as not to undermine the purpose of GCERF or jeopardize its application to be included on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee ("DAC") List of Official Development Assistance ("ODA")-Eligible International Organisations. He acknowledged that more work was also needed to define the AFM's value-add. He noted that the operating expenses budget that would be presented would include three additional Secretariat staff members to manage it.

10.12 Following agreement to the amendment contained in version 2 of the document, the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.06: The Board:

- a. welcomes the Secretariat's proposal of an Accelerated Funding Mechanism ("AFM") to provide an efficient and effective way for the global community to provide fast and flexible support to projects responding to the recent escalation in violent extremism worldwide and its current manifestations;
- b. recognizes that, while maintaining appropriately robust standards of transparency and accountability, the AFM described in Section 4, Part 3 of the Proposal for the Funding Model (BM.01/DOC.05) (version 2) will support projects that may necessarily adapt and evolve in the current, rapidly changing environment;
- c. notes that the viability of the AFM will depend on recognition of the need for flexibility and pragmatism in funding and associated reporting requirements by potential donors;
- d. in light of the above, requests that potential donors agree to adjust their requirements on monitoring and evaluation in their contribution agreements relating to the AFM;
- e. approves in principle the AFM, including its thematic and geographical priorities, structures and processes, for an initial period of two years once launched;
- f. requests the Chair (to be appointed) to consult Board Members regarding their interest in participating in the Accelerated Funding Panel ("AFP") and present a recommendation on the membership of the AFP to the Board for approval; and
- g. authorizes the Executive Director (to be appointed) to:
 - i. launch the AFM and oversee its operationalization by the Secretariat as soon as practicable, subject to the further Board decision on the proposed funding and operating expenses budget for the AFM proposed in BM.01/DOC.07; and
 - ii. provide the Board with a recommendation concerning the potential continuation of the AFM after the initial period of two years, based on an evaluation of its value and assessment of its functioning.

10.13 The European Union (EU) constituency requested that the following statement be included in the minutes of the meeting:

The EU welcomes the initiative under the GCERF to contribute to countering violent extremism. The EU takes note that the Board has decided to approve the Funding Mechanisms proposed to the Board (both the Core Funding Mechanism and the Accelerated Funding Mechanism). The EU asks the Board to take note that the grant agreement between the EU and GCERF needs to reflect the minimum requirements to bring the EU contribution in line with EU policies, regulations and the legal decision allowing to financially support GCERF, notably regarding sub granting to third parties. The EU reserves the right for earmarked funding via sub granting.

11. GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS: POLICY ON ETHICS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

11.1 The Chair noted that this agenda item was being deferred to a later time. The Senior Legal and Policy Officer advised that some Board members had requested more detail on what would be included in the annual disclosure form before approving the policy. As such, a new version including such detail would be provided for Board comment by email.

11.2 One member of a Board constituency requested that the policy include a provision to allow Board members who are subject to their employer's conflict of interest policies to file the same annual disclosure form, provided it contains substantially the same information.

12. RESOURCE MOBILISATION: RESOURCE MOBILISATION PLAN

12.1 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat presented the Resource Mobilisation Plan 2015 (BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 1)). He noted that the Global Terrorism Index had just been released, and it reported an increase in deaths from terrorism worldwide. This demonstrated the need for and relevance of initiatives such as GCERF. The "added value" of GCERF is as a public-private partnership. In addition, working at the nexus of security and development gives GCERF a more opportunities for raising funds, using development tools and adhering to development principles. Donors understand the benefit of working with communities at risk.

12.2 There would be benefit for GCERF to be included in the DAC List of ODA-Eligible International Organisations. Global counter-terrorism budgets are limited, and tapping into available development funds from donor countries will be important. The process includes an application via a DAC member in February of each year, with a decision made by June of that year. However, if an application fails, there is a five-year moratorium. GCERF is unlikely to receive a positive decision until it is funding projects. Therefore, the request should be made in February 2016 with, hopefully, a positive decision by June 2016.

12.3 Regarding the trustee, several donors have indicated that it would facilitate their contribution if a UN entity could act as trustee. The Interim Secretariat has been in discussions with the UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, the World Bank, and UNICEF to explore whether they could serve in a trustee capacity. Negotiations are ongoing and the Secretariat will return to the Board when a decision can be made.

12.4 By 2024, GCERF would need USD 200 million to make grants and even more will have to be raised to cover operating expenses. At this point, approximately USD 24 million had been pledged. The ambition is to secure financial contributions to GCERF amounting to a minimum of USD 15.5 million for 2015 and USD 20 million for 2016.

12.5 The need to go beyond the security departments of governments, which have thus far comprised the donor base, to include development organisations was reiterated. Foundations, the private sector, and high-net-worth individuals will also be approached. At this stage, it is unlikely to leverage significant financial contributions from the private sector; to date, only in-kind contributions have been under discussion.

12.6 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat stressed the importance of the Board's support for resource mobilisation efforts. He noted that the recruitment of an additional staff member to work on resource mobilisation was included in the proposed budget for Board approval.

Discussion

12.7 One Board member encouraged all donors to develop long-term funding strategies for GCERF to minimize the Secretariat resources needed for resource mobilisation. All donor countries were encouraged to secure contributions through parts of their budgets other than counter-terrorism. In-kind donations should also be encouraged.

12.8 With regards to the private sector, it was noted that it could contribute advice, connections, expertise, innovation, jobs, marketing skills, and administrative/logistical support – and not just contribute cash. The U.S. Board member mentioned that it is sponsoring a GCERF outreach effort in Silicon Valley on 5 December 2014 to identify concrete ways for GCERF to engage with the private sector, specifically technology and social media companies, and that this model could be replicated in other countries.

12.9 The point was emphasized that donors could report grant funds contributed to GCERF as bilateral ODA.

12.10 In addition, a suggestion was made to establish an endowment and questions were asked about the applicable fees for establishing the trust fund. The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat noted that there are transaction costs in setting up a trust fund and that the Secretariat will need to discern whether, given these costs, establishing a trust fund makes financial sense.

12.11 Following its discussion the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.07: The Board:

- a. welcomes the Resource Mobilisation Plan 2015, as set out in Annex 1 and described in Part 1 of BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 1), and requests the Secretariat to implement it;

- b. requests the Executive Director (to be appointed) to oversee the development by the Secretariat of its Resource Mobilisation Strategy 2016-2018, for presentation at a face-to-face meeting of the Board to be scheduled in the last quarter of 2015;
- c. notes the implication on resource mobilisation efforts of inclusion of GCERF in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (the "DAC") List of Official Development Assistance ("ODA") - Eligible International Organisations, as detailed in Part 2 of BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 1); and
- d. authorises the Executive Director (to be appointed) to:
 - i. oversee the Secretariat's application for inclusion in the DAC List of ODA-Eligible International Organisations at the earliest opportunity of a successful application; and
 - ii. seek the agreement of a donor Board member that is a DAC member to present GCERF's application on its behalf.

13. RESOURCE MOBILISATION: POLICY ON CONTRIBUTIONS

13.1 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat presented on the Policy on Contributions (BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 2)). He noted the difference between restricted and unrestricted financial contributions. There are risks related to restricted contributions, including undermining the Board's authority; undermining the benefit of anonymity of the donors; ensuring that operating expenses are covered; and the complications of administration and tracking, as well as negotiation of the terms of such restrictions. Therefore, unrestricted funding is preferred, but it is recognized it may not be possible for some governments.

13.2 Non-financial contributions of goods and services are also welcome. However, these also have risks, including administration costs, ensuring quality and generating reliance on one supplier.

13.3 The Policy includes the following guiding principles: the Board makes all financial decisions; grant funds can only be used for Board-approved activities; all donors share responsibility for operating expenses; there should be no unreasonable transactions costs or significant changes to rules or procedures as a result of restricted funding; the majority of funding should be earmarked; and all restrictions must be provided in writing.

13.4 The Policy was to accept restricted financial contributions based on geographic or thematic criteria, provided that at least 15 percent is allocated to operating expenses. With regards to donations of goods and services, the Executive Director needs to determine if they are of benefit to the Secretariat.

13.5 Any exceptions or waivers could be made by a Contribution Committee, which includes the Chair, and a Board member from a donor country that is not directly affected by the issue at hand, a beneficiary country, and one from non-governmental constituency.

Discussion

13.6 A Board member suggested that innovative funding should be explored and may be transformative. Another suggested that the AFM should be used by those donors that wish to earmark. Another Board member noted that for the CFM, the only possible earmarking would be for the pilot countries already approved by the Board, so this would not be an issue.

13.7 A Board member noted that the Board is delegating to the AFP the financial decisions for the AFM. Another Board member noted that a future Board discussion should focus on from which donors the GCERF should accept contributions.

13.8 The Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.08: The Board approves:

- a. the Policy on Contributions attached as Annex 1 to BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 2); and
- b. the terms of reference of the Contributions Committee attached as Annex 2 to BM.01/DOC.06 (Part 2).

The Board requests the Chair (to be appointed) to consult with Board members interested in membership in the Contributions Committee and to present the membership to the Board for approval as soon as possible using the procedure set out in Article 2.9a of the Bylaws.

14. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SECRETARIAT AND OPERATING EXPENSES BUDGET 1 JANUARY – 31 DECEMBER 2015

14.1 The Executive Director of the Interim Secretariat presented on the establishment of the Secretariat and Operating Expenses Budget (BM.01/DOC.07). He noted that a Headquarters Agreement would be signed by the end of March 2015. The Secretariat was working on policies on human resource management, financial management and administration. They would be sure to look at such policies from similar organisations to incorporate lessons learned. Once the policies are established, the Secretariat staff can be transferred to GCERF from the GCSP.

14.2 The Secretariat work plan was summarized, including work on governance, resource mobilisation, grant management, operations management, external relations and communications, finance, human resources and administration.

14.3 The budget had been developed using a bottom-up approach based on actual costs. Set-up costs are expensive and the operating expenses as a percentage of the Fund would go down in subsequent years.

14.4 There was need for an additional amount to manage the AFM, as the current Secretariat is at maximum capacity in order to implement the CFM.

Discussion: Establishment of the Secretariat and Operating Expenses Budget

14.5 A Board member underscored the need for the Secretariat to maintain a robust separation between operational and financial management. He also recommended that future recruitment reflect a slight geographical re-balancing. The need for robust human resources policies was emphasised.

14.6 One Board member suggested that if more funds were contributed, the operating expenses budget could be increased. Another Board member noted the importance of maintaining focus on the mandate as well as all the administrative issues.

14.7 The Board took the following two decisions together:

BM.01/DEC.09: The Board:

- a. recognizes the need to facilitate the earliest possible autonomous functioning of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) and operationalization of its funding mechanism;
- b. notes with gratitude the contributions of the Swiss Government, the United States Government and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (“GCSP”) in establishing interim arrangements to assist in the establishment of the GCERF and its Secretariat;
- c. acknowledges the willingness of GCSP to continue to provide human resources and other administrative services to GCERF until such time as the Headquarters Agreement between the GCERF and the Swiss Federal Council is in force; and
- d. authorizes the Executive Director (to be appointed) to:
 - i. execute the Headquarters Agreement with the Swiss Federal Council granting GCERF privileges and immunities in Switzerland;
 - ii. oversee the establishment of the Secretariat, including the transfer from GCSP to GCERF of the GCERF project team employment contracts, the office rental contract and other service agreements; and
 - iii. present to the Board for its approval as soon as possible human resources, financial and administrative policies for the GCERF.

BM.01/DEC.10: The Board approves an operating expenses budget for GCERF of up to USD 2,335,790 for the period of 1 January to 31 December 2015, as presented in Part 2 of BM.01/DOC.07.

Discussion: Operating Expenses Budget for the AFM

14.8 One Board member questioned the need for setting a funding target for AFM to initiate its launch. It was clarified that the basic start-up costs for the AFM were needed to cover its launch. If the identified funding target is not secured for the AFM, the operating expenses as a percentage of that amount would be higher.

14.9 One Board member noted that the approved budget was based on funds that have been pledged but not secured. Another from the Foundations constituency noted that it is imperative to include pledges in a budget – because the actual payment of contributions may be assured but delayed, and yet the organisation must continue to operate.

14.10 The Executive Director noted that the Secretariat will make every effort to raise funds and will live within its means. If funds do not arrive as pledged, the Secretariat will adjust its activities accordingly.

14.11 After a few minor amendments to the language, the Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.11: The Board:

- a. notes that dedicated resources will be required to implement the proposed Accelerated Funding Mechanism (“AFM”), including for operating expenses related directly to the AFM, as set out in Part 2 of BM.01/DOC.07;
- b. directs the Executive Director (to be appointed) to launch the AFM and to seek to secure no less than USD 3.5 million for the AFM and to inform the Board as soon as such funds are secured; and
- c. approves, effective subject to paragraph b. above, an operating expenses budget for the AFM of up to USD 708,982 for the period of 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2015, as presented in Part 3 of BM.01/DOC.07.

15. CONFIRMATION OF AUDITOR

15.1 The Senior Legal and Policy Officer advised that upon the establishment of GCERF as a Swiss entity, an auditor needed to be appointed. For efficiency purposes, the decision was made to appoint the same auditor as the GCSP, namely PricewaterhouseCoopers (“PWC”).

15.2 PWC had provided two engagement letters: one for a statutory audit required under Swiss law and one for a full audit, which was attached as Annex 3 to BM.1/DOC.02. The Secretariat is committed to subjecting the engagement to competition in the future, once its procurement policy is in place. The date of 31 March 2016 was chosen to allow the 2015 audit to be undertaken and the report to be delivered.

15.3 Two Board members noted the need for the audit to follow international auditing standards, which was acknowledged.

15.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.12: The Board:

- a. confirms the appointment of PricewaterhouseCoopers (“PWC”) as Auditor until 31 March 2016; and
- b. authorizes the Executive Director (to be appointed) to sign the engagement letter with PWC attached as Annex 3 to BM.01/DOC.02.

16. APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND CHAIR

16.1 The Board met in executive session to discuss the appointment of the Executive Director (chaired by the Chair), and the appointment of the Chair (chaired by the Board member for Switzerland).

16.2 Following such sessions, the Board announced the following decisions in plenary:

BM.01/DEC.13: The Board appoints Dr Khalid Koser as Executive Director for a term of three (3) years commencing immediately and terminating 17 November 2017.

BM.01/DEC.14: The Board appoints Ms Carol Bellamy as its Chair for a term of three (3) years, commencing immediately and terminating 17 November 2017.

17. SIGNATORY AUTHORITY

17.1 The Chair noted that following the appointment of the Executive Director and the Chair, a decision needed to be recorded regarding the signing authority on behalf of GCERF. The founding Board member for Switzerland would be removed from the register as having signing authority, and the Chair and Executive Director would be added.

17.2 Board took the following decision:

BM.01/DEC.15: The Board:

- a. approves the signatory authority for GCERF on an individual basis of Dr Khalid Koser as Executive Director and Ms Carol Bellamy as Chair; and
- b. requests the removal from signatory authority of the founding Board member Ambassador Stephan Husy.

18. FINAL REMARKS

18.1 A Board member requested that the agenda for future meetings and dates be made available as soon as possible; and that a committee meeting be convened one day before the next Board meeting. The Chair reiterated the importance of the Board meeting face to face soon.

18.2 After the Chair thanked all participants, the meeting was adjourned.

Annex 1: AGENDA

Hôtel N'vY, Sausalito Room A+B, Rue de Richemont 18, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland

MONDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2014

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 - 09:15	Registration		
09:15 - 09:30	Welcoming remarks		Ambassador Stephan Husy, Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland
09:15 - 09:45	Legal Status of GCERF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of process followed in Switzerland to establish the GCERF • Elements of Statutes • Plans for privileges and immunities • Appointment of Chair for the meeting 	DOC.02	Ambassador Stephan Husy
09:45 - 10:00	Confirmation of initial Board members		Chair
10:00 - 10:15	Appointment of Rapporteur and Review and approval of agenda/objectives of the meeting	DOC.01	Chair
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee break		
10:30 - 11:30	Report of the Executive Director <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Interim Secretariat activities, expenditures and contributions 	DOC.03	Dr Khalid Koser, Executive Director, Interim Secretariat
11:30 - 12:30	Governance Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bylaws • Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest 	DOC.04 (Part 1 and Part 2)	Tal Sagorsky, Senior Legal and Policy Advisor, Interim Secretariat
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 - 15:30	Funding Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Funding Mechanism 	DOC.05	Dr Khalid Koser
15:30 - 15:45	Coffee break		
15:45 - 17:00	Funding Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerated Funding Mechanism 	DOC.05	Dr Khalid Koser
17:30 - 19:00	Reception		

Hôtel N'vY, Sausalito Room A+B, Rue de Richemont 18, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland

TUESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2014

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 - 10:30	Resource Mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundraising Plan 2015 • Policy on contributions 	DOC.06 (Part 1 and Part 2)	Dr Khalid Koser
10:30 - 10:45	Coffee break		
10:45 - 12:00	Establishment of the Secretariat and Operating Expenses Budget 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Secretariat and 2015 work plan • Operating expenses budget for 2015 • Operating expenses for Accelerated Funding Mechanism 	DOC.07	Dr Khalid Koser
12:00 - 12:10	Appointment of Auditor	DOC.02 (Annex 3)	Secretariat
12:10 - 12:30	Appointment of Executive Director (In Executive Session)		Chair
12:30 - 12:45	Appointment of Chair (In Executive Session)		Ambassador Stephan Husy
12:45 - 14:00	Lunch		TBD
14:00 - 15:00	AOB (if necessary)		

**Annex 2: 1st Board Meeting
Attendance List**

Last Name	First Name	Title	Country/Organization
Abdo	Nezar	Permanent Mission of Qatar to the United Nations in Geneva	Qatar
Adiraju	Sindhu	Intern, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations in Geneva	Australia
Ahmad	Iqbal	Director, Foreign Secretary Office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Bangladesh
Ahmad	Afaq	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations in Geneva	Pakistan
Albertario	Francesca	Policy Adviser, Humanitarian Affairs, Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations in Geneva	New Zealand
Al-Khayarin	Sultan	Third Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Qatar
Al-Qahtani	Ambassador Mutlaq	Director of International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Qatar
Alsada	Noor	Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Qatar to the United Nations in Geneva	Qatar
Barrett	Richard	Senior Vice President	The Soufan Group
Bellamy	Carol	Chair	Unites States of America
Boukili	Hassane	Minister Counselor, Permanent Mission of Morocco to the United Nations in Geneva	Morocco
Breeze	Sue	Head of Equalities & Non Discrimination Team Foreign & Commonwealth Office, Human Rights and Democracy Department	United Kingdom
Bulloch	Gib	Executive Director of Accenture Development Partnerships	Accenture
Ceulemans	André	Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Belgium
Cunningham	Amy	Community Engagement and Resilience Advisor	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Di Giammatteo	Valerio	Intern	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Diyachenko	Sergey V.	Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations in Geneva	Russian Federation
Dogan Grajover	Esra	Head of Department, Deputy Directorate General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Turkey

Last Name	First Name	Title	Country/Organization
Duddy	Ian	Counselor, Permanent Mission of the UK to the United Nations in Geneva	United Kingdom
El Hitmi	Sanae	Political Affairs Officer, United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force	United Nations
Fazzone	Amanda	Senior Community Engagement and Resilience Advisor	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Fitschen	Ambassador Thomas	Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in Geneva	European Union
Frank	Daniel	Deputy Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Switzerland
Freyer	Harald	Policy Adviser and Judicial Expert, European External Action Service	European Union
Gabrielsen	Beate	Senior Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway
Glasser,	Robert	Secretary General	CARE International, Geneva
Hague	Md. Shahidul	Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Bangladesh
Hofer-Carbonnier	Sylvie	Deputy Head, Section for Diplomatic and Consular Law, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Switzerland
Husy	Ambassador Stephan	Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Switzerland
Ivantsova	Vera	Attaché, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Russian Federation
Jendoubi	Wahiba	Programme Advisor	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Keenan	Charlotte	Chief Executive	Tony Blair Faith Foundation
Khan	Jehangir	Director, United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force	United Nations
Koser	Khalid	Executive Director	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Kruse	Maqsoud	Executive Director	Hedayah
Küchle	Axel	Counselor, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in Geneva	Germany
McConville	Ian	Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations in Geneva	Australia

Last Name	First Name	Title	Country/Organization
Meissner	Vittoria	Intern, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in Geneva	Germany
Miguel	Francisco	Deputy Director General for International Affairs, Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation	Spain
Millar	Alistair	Executive Director	Global Center on Cooperative Security
Mizumoto	Horri	Second Secretary, Embassy of Japan to Switzerland	Japan
Mokin	Daniil	Head of International Counter-Terrorism Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Russian Federation
Montag	Laura	Trainee, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations in Geneva	Germany
Mouelhi-Rondeau	Elsa	Second Secretary, Disarmament and Peace and Security, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations in Geneva	Canada
Orjiako	Ambassador Umunna	Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations in Geneva	Nigeria
Pierce	Ambassador Karen	Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the UK to the United Nations in Geneva	United Kingdom
Quinn	Ambassador John Paton	Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations in Geneva	Australia
Rahman	Muhammad Mahfuzur	Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Bangladesh
Rosand	Eric	Director, Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Department of State	United States of America
Sagorsky	Tal	Senior Legal and Policy Advisor	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Sanchez	Maria	EU Programme Manager	European Union
Schlaffer	Edit	Founder and Executive Director	Women Without Borders/ Sisters Against Violent Extremism
Singleton	Mark	Director	International Centre for Counter-Terrorism
Sudradjat	Herry	Director for Regional and Multilateral Cooperation National Counter Terrorism Agency	Indonesia

Last Name	First Name	Title	Country/Organization
Sullivan	David	Assistant Legal Adviser, Department of State	United States of America
Taouis	Salah Eddine	Counselor, Permanent Mission of Morocco to the United Nations in Geneva	Morocco
Thiam	Amadou Opa	Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Mali to the United Nations in Geneva	Mali
Thiam Diallo	Ambassador Aya	Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Mali to the United Nations in Geneva	Mali
van der Meer	Adriaan	Head of Unit, European Commission	European Union
van Deventer	Fulco	Vice-Director	Human Security Collective
Waage	Gry Karen	Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Norway
Wilcox	Oliver	Countering Violent Extremism Program Director, Department of State	United States of America
Wintermeier	Kristina	Intern	GCERF Interim Secretariat
Wood	Jonathan	Senior Operations Advisor	GCERF Interim Secretariat