

REPORT OF THE 4th BOARD MEETING

The 4th meeting of the Governing Board (the “Board”) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) was held from 13-14 June 2016 in Brussels, Belgium. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in **Annex 1**, and the attendance list in **Annex 2** to this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, introducing herself and the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser. She thanked the EU for hosting the Board meeting in the premises of the European External Action Service (EEAS). The Chair stressed the importance of the meeting for GCERF, at which the Board would be discussing thematic priorities, focus regions and populations for pre-allocations to existing and new beneficiary countries. The other issues to discuss included financial matters, defining results, involvement of the private sector, and Board engagement.

1.2 The Chair welcomed the Board members and requested each of them to introduce themselves. The Chair also welcomed the Chair of the Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) and several observers in attendance.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 As the first order of business, the Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Mr Fulco Van Deventer from the Civil Society constituency kindly agreed to act in such capacity and the Chair thanked him on behalf of the Board.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.01: Mr Fulco Van Deventer of the Civil Society constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 4th Board meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.04/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval. The Board Member from the European Union (EU) requested to add a discussion on private sector engagement and the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (the “AFM”) to the agenda, which the Chair agreed to include during the resource mobilisation session.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.02: The agenda for the 4th Board meeting (BM.04/DOC.01), as amended at the 4th Board meeting, is approved.

Confirmation of Board Members

2.5 The Chair stated that there had been some changes to Board membership since the last face-to-face Board meeting in December 2015. Pursuant to Swiss law, the Board is required to acknowledge these changes in writing.

2.6 She welcomed new Board members, summarised the changes, and the Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.03: The Board notes the following changes in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 3rd Board meeting:

- a. **United States of America and the Netherlands:** Mr Justin Siberell replaces Ambassador Tina Kaidanow as the Board Member;
- b. **Kosovo:** Mr Edon Myftari is the Board Member for this new constituency; and
- c. **Switzerland:** Ambassador Thomas Greminger replaces Ambassador Stephan Husy as the Board Member.

Approval of Report of Meeting via Conference Call (28 April 2016)

2.7 The Chair referred to the Report of the Board Meeting via Conference Call that took place on 28 April 2016 (BM.04/DOC.02). The Report was sent out in advance of this meeting allowing time for comments, and none had been received. The report was now being presented for approval. The Executive Director assured the Board that all the action points requested by the Board had been addressed following the meeting, including producing a note clarifying management costs and adding a session on 'results' to the agenda of this meeting. The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.04: The Board approves the Report of the Board Meeting via Conference Call (28 April 2016) attached as Annex 1 to BM.04/DOC.02.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director to present his report (BM.04/DOC.03).

3.2 Dr Koser welcomed the Board members and thanked them, the EU for hosting the meeting, the Chair, and the Secretariat team for their hard work.

3.3 The Executive Director provided an update on GCERF's achievements and successes since the last meeting on 28 April 2016 via conference call, and stated that the organisation could be modestly proud of what has been achieved in just 18 months.

3.4 During his presentation, the Executive Director outlined four critical themes for the Board meeting:

- **Momentum:** The first grant agreement with a Principal Recipient in Nigeria had been signed on 8 June 2016 in Abuja. The Secretariat expected all 12 grant agreements with Principal Recipients would be signed by the end of August. In addition to being vibrant participants in the Core Funding Model (“CFM”), the established Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”) have clearly added value and have the potential to serve the wider preventing violent extremism (“PVE”) community as key contributors to the development of national PVE strategies as called for in the recent United Nations (“UN”) Action Plan to Prevent Violent Extremism. GCERF is the only global organisation working in PVE today, and it is at the forefront of developing the thinking of the PVE sector broadly, including on public–private partnerships. In addition, GCERF had its first financial audit from the external auditor; the Ethics Committee has raised no issues; and GCERF has attracted a high-calibre Secretariat.
- **Crisis:** GCERF is undergoing a serious financial challenge, to which the Board had been alerted earlier in the year. The operating costs of the Secretariat over the medium period are not covered despite generous start-up contributions from donors. The situation is critical, affecting GCERF’s work in terms of recruiting and retaining key staff members and monitoring and evaluation (“M&E”) of its programmes. The financial situation also has a reputational risk, as the expectations of CSMS, Principal Recipients and Sub-Recipients in beneficiary countries, which have expended a significant amount of political capital to work with GCERF, are not being met. Arguably, GCERF’s success is symbolic of the credibility of the global community’s commitment to PVE.
- **Performance:** The best way to deal with crisis is to perform, and the Secretariat is currently working on an M&E framework in order to demonstrate results and a longer-term strategy. It also continues to try to mobilise funds as well as refining the funding model and fulfilling its mandate of being a public–private partnership.
- **Responsibility:** The Executive Director referred to the Secretariat’s responsibilities as described in the Bylaws, which were being fulfilled. The Executive Director was concerned about the lack of Board engagement. In particular, he asked the donors on the Board to assist in identifying a sustainable and long-term source of funding for GCERF, including exploring both development and security funds within their own governments, as well as identifying new potential donor governments and facilitating their introduction to GCERF. He stressed that the private sector cannot realistically be expected to become a significant source of funding in the short term, and governments, therefore, remain the key source for at least the next few years. To the beneficiary countries, he noted the Secretariat’s proposal to invest in one new country and reinvest in one of the current countries, leaving the needs of other countries for reinvestment to a time when new funds become available. He also asked the beneficiary countries to help GCERF ensure its grants are successful in order to attract more funds. He stressed that the Board has a very large responsibility for the success of GCERF.

Discussion

3.5 Board members thanked the Executive Director and the Secretariat for their professionalism, commitment, and effort, and they expressed appreciation to the Chair for her personal engagement. They highlighted the importance of the first grants being signed.

3.6 The Board member from the United States noted the impressive story of the development of GCERF and mentioned that the current funding crisis risked overshadowing the excellent work that has been done. There is a lot to think about in terms of strategies to raise funds, operations, and strategic direction, where the Board has responsibility. This was echoed by the Board member from Switzerland who agreed that responding to the funding challenge was a particular responsibility of the Board and not of the Secretariat alone. He asked whether it is reasonable to expand operational activities given the current financial constraints and pressure on staffing levels. The Executive Director responded that it is strategically important to expand, although judiciously. A recommendation on current funding priorities had been proposed to the Board.

3.7 The Board Member from Australia asked if any research has been done on the amount of money spent on PVE worldwide and the proportion that GCERF is attracting. Australia and other governments spend a lot of money on PVE in some form, and it is important to understand whether GCERF is “missing out” or whether there is insufficient money being put forward globally for PVE. The Executive Director said that he was not aware of any research that compiles this information, and in many countries, the budgets are not clearly defined, PVE funding comes from different sources, and is often likely to be spent on national efforts. GCERF has raised about USD 25 million in 18 months but needs more to fulfil its mandate and realise the initial target of USD 200 million over 10 years. He also pointed out that as a global fund, GCERF has different financing requirements from other institutions also established by the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF).

3.8 The Board member from Qatar expressed hope that GCERF would succeed, as it is the first fund to work with both private and public sectors on addressing the local drivers of violent extremism and strengthening community resilience. In this regard, he asked whether GCERF is coordinating with the UN in light of the Secretary General’s Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism that mentions a new fund for PVE. The Executive Director noted that the UN is an observer to GCERF Board meetings (although not present at this one), and shared his impression that the proposed new fund was unlikely to be launched in the next few years. The Board member from Qatar also asked why GCERF had not started working with Myanmar despite it having been approved by the Board as a beneficiary country at the last face-to-face meeting. The Executive Director advised that key contacts had been established in Myanmar to set up a CSM during a visit in February 2016. There are signs that the new government is willing to work with GCERF, and the Secretariat anticipates Myanmar will be included in the 2017 annual grant-making cycle. The Board member from Qatar welcomed the intention to continue working with Myanmar, and noted the importance of distributing funds to reflect the global nature of the PVE challenge.

3.9 The Board member from the EU explained that for the EU there are two strands of activity in the PVE field: bilateral programmes and multilateral programmes for which GCERF is a very important partner. The EU strongly supports the work of the three GCTF-inspired organisations of which GCERF is one, and this is stated in all the relevant policy declarations from the EU Council.

The situation is now more complex due to quite drastic changes and discussions inside the EU, and there is a renewed need to work with partners to address the issue of violent extremism. PVE work in the Middle East and North Africa remains a priority for the EU, and the Board member asked whether contacts have been made with countries in the region and how GCERF could engage with them. Developments in the Middle East are worrisome with the potential to impact on the EU, which the EU would like to address through GCERF. The Executive Director agreed that engaging in this region is critical, and that GCERF maintains regular contact with Jordan, Tunisia, and Lebanon, trying to engage all three countries, while recognising capacity constraints.

3.10 The Board member representing Civil Society noted the very dynamic nature of preventing/countering violent extremism (“P/CVE”) and urged GCERF to be flexible, as one cannot always wait for a deeper analysis before acting. He noted that in response to the UN Action Plan on PVE more organisations are expressing an interest in working on this issue, which risks growing competition for GCERF. The Alternate Board member from Bangladesh asked about GCERF’s niche in this field and its comparative advantage. He then emphasised the importance of maintaining momentum from the perspective of beneficiary countries, and asked about next steps for the Wave 1 countries. He pointed out that if nothing is happening on the ground, it will be difficult to sustain momentum. The Executive Director noted that GCERF’s added value was its position as the only global fund on PVE, and expansion would be important for realising its potential. GCERF should become the principal source of funding for community-level PVE. Its focus on prevention and trying to reach local communities remains unique. He stated that governments in beneficiary countries had expended significant political capital working with GCERF, the Chairs of the CSMs had worked hard, and expectations were high. Now GCERF has to show that there is some prospect of a reward otherwise it will be at risk of losing credibility.

3.11 The Alternate Board member from the Canada/United Kingdom constituency pointed out that it is important to look at trends in the development and security sectors and current perceptions on how to make an impact in the area of PVE. She welcomed the fact that the Development Assistance Committee (“DAC”) of the OECD had clarified that funding for PVE projects can be categorised as development assistance. Extracting lessons learned for the broader international PVE community to build a collective understanding would be important. The Executive Director confirmed that GCERF has approached Canada to explore cooperation in the area of research, including defining the local drivers of radicalisation.

3.12 The Board member from Mali spoke about the fight against violent extremism as a collective challenge, and invited the donor countries to continue supporting GCERF. She emphasised that the decision made at the meeting via conference call in April to fund the programmes in the Wave 1 countries is now bringing concrete substance to the idea of GCERF, and we should be proud that the first grants are being signed. Considering the size and scope of the challenge, she reiterated her full support to GCERF, and invited GCERF to consolidate the actions that have started in the first three beneficiary countries and replicate these in the new countries that have been selected by the Board.

3.13 The representative from Japan observed that this is a good learning experience for his country, which intends to become a constructive member of one of the Board’s donor constituencies. He also indicated that he would like to learn about how GCERF can contribute to achieving Japan’s national priorities to prevent violent extremism around the world.

3.14 Responding to the mention of the UN Plan of Action on PVE, the Chair noted that new funding mechanisms are often proposed in these sorts of documents, and it should not be taken for granted that any new fund will actually be constituted. She recalled the GCERF briefing at UN Headquarters in New York in December 2015, jointly organised by the Permanent Missions of Qatar, Switzerland, and Bangladesh, and suggested that it may be advisable to organise another briefing, in particular for the UN Development Group. The UN-Swiss PVE Conference in Geneva had also been an opportunity to update the international community on GCERF's activities.

3.15 The Alternate Board member from Switzerland said that there is no indication for the moment on whether PVE or the UN PVE Plan of Action will be part of the UN General Assembly's resolution on updating its counter-terrorism strategy. He advised the Board that Switzerland had submitted a concrete proposal to include GCERF in the resolution. The Board member from Qatar welcomed this idea, expressed eagerness to work jointly with Switzerland to have the language adopted, and supported the idea of another briefing for the UN. He also expressed some concerns that there are countries that contribute to the UN rather than organisations like GCERF, and reaffirmed Qatar's position that GCERF is the best international vehicle to support local community efforts to prevent violent extremism. He recommended speaking to the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (UN CTED), the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee (UN CTT), and the UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (UN CTITF) to coordinate efforts and start constructive dialogue that may help overcome any overlap between any potential funds.

4. CORE FUNDING MECHANISM

Update on Operations

4.1 The Chief Operating Officer presented the update on CFM operations (BM.04/DOC.04) and started by thanking the beneficiary countries for the CSMs' work before providing an update on the first round of funding of the Core Funding Mechanism in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria. He then proceeded to provide an overview of developments in relation to Kenya, Kosovo, and Myanmar, and concerning the recently conducted Country Needs Assessments ("CNAs").

Pre-allocation of funding

4.2 The Executive Director introduced the paper on country funding pre-allocation (BM.04/DOC.05) stating that it did not reflect the amount of money that GCERF had hoped to secure by this time. This means that the Board now has to take tough decisions and prioritise. He suggested that it might not be worth investing in certain countries until adequate funding has been secured, because of related management costs. He reiterated the commitment to reinvesting in Wave 1 countries and providing funding to the new countries. The Executive Director reminded the Board that it had previously agreed to allocate the Wave 1 funding across Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria equally. That did not have to be the approach for this pre-allocation; the Board can decide how to allocate the money appropriately. The paper contained analysis and recommendations to help facilitate a Board decision.

4.1 The paper outlined the recommendations on pre-allocation of funds for a three-year period commencing in 2017, including specific recommendations on: (i) the maximum potential funding that may be granted to each country; and (ii) the geographical, demographic, and thematic focus of funding in each country. The Executive Director explained that the multi-stakeholder CSMs made these recommendations for the next round of funding based on the CNAs and their national consultations. There are some interesting findings from these consultations regarding the drivers of radicalisation, which indicates the added value of GCERF's process in generating this sort of data. He then invited Humera Khan, Chair of the IRP, to present its recommendations in more detail.

4.2 The Chair of the IRP thanked the Board and the EU for hosting the meeting, and the CSMs and the Secretariat for their work. She highlighted that establishing the CSM public-private partnership platform should be considered a success and was unlike anything happening in the PVE community currently. The CSM is a good mechanism to develop national action plans because it includes multiple stakeholders, including civil society.

4.3 She stated that the IRP appreciated meeting with the CSMs and consulting on their PVE priorities. Although GCERF's mandate is to focus on prevention, some CSMs had discussed issues beyond prevention, including the need for intervention, rehabilitation, and re-entry, and there is a need for the Board to be explicit whether they will fund activities beyond just prevention. Dealing with these issues in some of these countries is increasingly important and GCERF may become an appropriate mechanism. There is currently a movement toward CVE mainstreaming, and it is likely that CVE-relevant work will attract increased funding.

4.4 The Chair of the IRP clarified that the prioritisation for funding suggested by the IRP does not imply the IRP's endorsement of national counter terrorism strategies or tactics. She expressed concerns about aspects of human rights and the rule of law across all countries. This issue was discussed in depth by the IRP members, and their recommendation is that GCERF funding should not be used for any programme that can stifle political diversity under the guise of PVE.

4.5 The CNAs had been completed by an external contractor, which was good for ensuring neutrality. Nonetheless, the IRP wanted to ensure that the CSMs' voice is heard. It is important to ensure that civil society is included in PVE work; otherwise, GCERF will not be credible.

4.6 The Chair stated that given the limited amount of funding currently available, the IRP believed that it was important for GCERF to focus by reducing the geographical scope and focus drivers in each country in order to avoid spreading itself too thinly. This should ensure that the funds are able to achieve their intended impact.

4.7 The Chair of the Board recalled that ultimately funding allocations are a Board decision, but it is important to have input from the IRP, CSMs (on the ground), and the Secretariat.

4.8 The Executive Director reiterated that there was about USD 2 million remaining from the initial USD 5 million allocated to the first round of grants in Mali; and proposed that this should now be used to launch a second round of grants there. Otherwise, there was currently about USD 3.67 million available. In order to demonstrate momentum and a mix of reinvesting in existing countries but also expanding to new countries, it was proposed that USD 2.5 million of these funds

be invested in a first round of grant making in Kosovo, and the remainder in Kenya once a full USD 5 million became available.

4.9 Kosovo is a relatively small country where USD 2.5 million would make a difference, can be managed, and would be focused on the PVE challenge. Kenya needs at least USD 5 million given its size, operating costs, and the scale of the challenge; investing a lesser amount may not be credible. As such, the Board was being asked to approve a pre-allocation of USD 5 million to Kenya when such funds become available. Further investment in Bangladesh and Nigeria will take place once further funds become available, at which time the Secretariat will revert to the Board requesting a funding allocation decision.

Discussion

4.10 The representative from Kenya thanked the Board for a warm welcome and stated that Kenya has expressed interest in and followed GCERF from the very beginning of its creation. The Kenyan Minister of Interior is in charge of the GCERF dossier, and updates on all matters discussed at the Board meeting will be relayed at the highest-level back to capital. He confirmed that it is very important for Kenya to commence working with GCERF as the country is on the frontline of violent extremism. Kenya is asking for support to supplement the prevention efforts already being made by the Kenyan government. Kenya welcomes any support from GCERF at the grassroots level, and it suggested initially working with 12 out of 47 counties to develop better models that can be filtered back into the other 35. Kenya has done this in the HIV/AIDS area, focusing on the most vulnerable first, and this approach is now bearing fruit. GCERF's funding is going to make a difference, and it is important to deliver it as quickly as possible.

4.11 The Board member from Kosovo thanked the Secretariat and the IRP for support of its CSM and other processes, and expressed hope that the collaboration will continue. He confirmed that the funding would be of tremendous benefit to the country's existing and ongoing processes. Last year, Kosovo approved its national CVE strategy, and it has been implementing different programmes on the ground with the broad involvement of multiple stakeholders. There are already some positive trends on the ground; for example, there have been no recent cases of Kosovo citizens leaving to join ISIS. GCERF's support comes at a perfect time and feeds into existing ideas that can be turned into programmes and implemented by civil society. He mentioned that the office of the Prime Minister hosts a coordinating mechanism to make sure that on-the-ground efforts are in line with national PVE policies.

4.12 The representative from Bangladesh affirmed that the CSM does good work and the overall value of the exercise and the projects. After the first round, Bangladesh is eagerly awaiting the signing of the first grants, and expectations are very high. He expressed concerns about the limited funding for a second round of investment and the proposed reduction in geographic scope and drivers. He expressed hope that more funding will be forthcoming, and asked the Chair of the IRP to explain why Bangladesh was not ranked by the IRP as an immediate priority for reinvestment.

4.13 The representative from Nigeria thanked the Secretariat for its engagement over the past 18 months and the Board members for their support and funding. She stated that Nigeria is very much looking forward to signing the grants and implementing projects. Nigeria hopes that in the

next round of funding the Board will concentrate on the areas identified by the CSM where impact would be most felt, in the northeast in particular.

4.14 The Chair of the Board remarked that the recommendations on priority in Nigeria are not final and would have to be reviewed by the Board when the funds are available. A decision on Nigeria's second round of funding was not being sought at this time.

Discussion

4.15 The Board member from Civil Society thanked the Kenya CSM for its analysis and understanding of radicalisation and PVE. He raised concerns that Borno and Yobe states were not recommended by the IRP as focus states in Nigeria. He noted that Boko Haram is no longer occupying the area, and it would be a lost opportunity not to fund programmes in an area where the risk of radicalisation remains significant. He noted that the international community is starting to work in the northeast on various projects including development, water, agriculture, and returnees.

4.20 The Board member from the United Kingdom ("UK") noted that the CFM is working much better as a result of ongoing refinements, and she appreciated the analysis in the CNAs. She asked for an explanation of why the recommendations of the Nigerian CSM were not taken into account; a question reiterated by the Alternate Board member from the same constituency. The security situation in the northeast is far less restrictive than it was before and a number of non-governmental organisations are already operating and doing humanitarian and development work in the area. The Board member from Switzerland stated that it would be absolutely fundamental for GCERF to work in the northeast of Nigeria to remain relevant. The information available indicates that it is possible to work in these states with regard to security concerns.

4.16 The Board member from Mali wondered about the scale of ambition for this year given the challenges so far, and asked whether the focus should not be on consolidating the first round and getting past the current challenges first.

4.17 The Board member from Switzerland expressed support for maintaining momentum, and agreed with the pre-allocation recommendation, provided the Secretariat remains extremely careful in maintaining the necessary capacity properly to oversee the operations. He strongly backed the notion that political diversity in the countries is fundamental and should not be stifled in PVE work. Human rights and the rule of law should not only be upheld but also promoted by what GCERF funds. He agreed that it is important to reduce the geographical scope and tighten the focus on drivers, in order to have an impact. Regarding the question of whether GCERF should be funding intervention and rehabilitation/re-entry programmes, from the Swiss side, the resources are committed to PVE and the prevention aspect is fundamental. All development actors would voice the same opinion, particularly now that there is clear language from the DAC on what it understands as prevention.

4.18 The Board member from Australia asked for clarification on the proposed allocations including where the funding for the outstanding USD 4 million would come from and at what stage money is needed. He then asked for clarification on the need for additional money on top of the USD 4 million in order for Bangladesh and Nigeria to participate in second rounds. He recalled

that at the beginning of GCERF's work, CVE was the focus, as the term PVE funding had not yet been coined, although prevention was always the objective. He indicated that distinctions between them should not become a distraction; it is the interventions that are important.

4.19 The Board member from the United States asked for explanation on the IRP's priority rankings in relation to future funding. He inquired whether the authors of the CNAs took into account other existing studies. He also asked about how the differences between recommendations by the CSMs and the IRP were resolved, for example in the case of Nigeria, where he supported reviewing the current recommendation, as the northeast seems to be the area where resources need to be concentrated. With respect to the fundraising requirements for an additional USD 4 million, there is a need for a clear understanding of timelines so the Board can work towards them.

4.20 The Board member from Mali confirmed that the carry-over of funds from the first allocation round was the result of the disqualification of some potential Principal Recipients. She stated that it is very important that Bamako should be covered by the second round. She also stated that the IRP's recommendations broadly support those of the Malian CSM.

4.21 The Board member from the Private Sector inquired about the experience of conducting the national consultation in Nigeria through an online questionnaire, and whether there are any lessons to learn. He also noted that the distinction between CVE and PVE is important and the Board has to consider this seriously, as it discusses strategy and building bridges with the development community.

4.22 The Board member from the EU thanked the Secretariat for substantially improving the CNAs. He mentioned that the EU's pledge of EUR 1 million is still available, and a final decision on the allocation of this funding will be taken after the Board meeting. Coordinating with EU bilateral initiatives will be important.

4.23 The Chair of the IRP answered several questions addressed to the IRP by country:

- Mali: The IRP had recommended new funding in Bamako in line with the priorities expressed by the CSM, while the other two areas recommended were in order to maintain continuity of funding from the previous round.
- Bangladesh: The proposed reduction in scope and drivers is a response to limited funding. The locations chosen were the priorities the CSM had identified. The IRP felt that it was important not just to focus on the youth, but also to include religious institutions. The IRP was also concerned about ensuring that GCERF funding goes towards drivers of violent extremism and not political violence. Violent extremism is a form of political violence, but not all political violence is violent extremism.
- Kenya: Limited funding also explained why the IRP had recommended reducing the focus for funding from the 12 areas recommended by the CSM to just 5, where it felt GCERF funding could have an immediate impact.

- Nigeria: The Chair of the IRP disagreed with Board members' views that security was not an issue in the northeast simply because humanitarian organisations were operating there. She stated the northeast is a place where military action is still taking place. Disarming the militia will be a challenge in the coming years, and disarmament, demobilisation, and rehabilitation work will become extremely important. There is indeed a huge need in the northeast, but a small amount of GCERF funding will not make a difference. There is a need to focus on counter-terrorism and development needs there, but the area is not safe for PVE operators. Therefore, the IRP recommended that the focus of the programmes should not be the northeast, but in adjacent areas so that violent extremism does not spread.

4.24 The Executive Director expressed special thanks to the CSMs for constructive engagement in a difficult discussion, and thanked the IRP for their work. He mentioned that the draft decision does not include the focus areas in Nigeria and Bangladesh at the moment, and these can be revisited when the funds become available.

4.25 The Executive Director agreed that scaling up is an immensely important challenge as GCERF begins to sign grants for programmes in different communities. GCERF looks to the CSMs to help with that, as the CSMs are its representatives on the ground. Getting feedback from Principal Recipients and understanding lessons learned is very important for both GCERF and the larger PVE community.

4.26 The Executive Director informed the Board that it would be asked to recommend and agree to start a strategic planning process. He shared his personal perspective that the focus should be on PVE, especially if GCERF wants to access development funding.

4.27 The Executive Director stressed that a Board decision now on Kenya will help with resource mobilisation, as donors are interested in investing in Kenya. He was confident about filling the funding shortfall to start work in Kenya soon.

4.28 The intention was that the Board would make a pre-allocation decision on Myanmar, Nigeria, and Bangladesh in June 2017, if the requisite amount of funds were raised. The Chief Operating Officer added that within Nigeria and Bangladesh, there is approximately 8% underspend on the available funding ceiling in the grants that are under negotiation. Grant agreements have not been finalised, and that 8% is being set aside to manage exchange rate fluctuations that may affect the overall portfolio. This is also an opportunity for reinvestment for well-performing grants.

4.29 The Board member from Qatar stated no objection to the proposed decision and felt that the IRP's recommendations should be maintained. GCERF should make sure that all the applications are compatible with the IRP's recommendations, in particular with regard to human rights and the rule of law.

4.30 Speaking about the methodology of the CNAs, the Executive Director reaffirmed that RUSI did review existing data including the Global Terrorism Index and noted that the institute that compiles the index is part of the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency. The CSMs used the CNAs as the basis for their national consultations. He thanked the EU for the discussions on the

CNAs that led to the revision of the process. The new method was an attempt to strike the right balance between external expertise and national ownership, and the CNA process, which had certainly improved from last year, will be further revised and refined.

4.31 The Board member from the United States added that CNAs are very well done, as they tend to take a national view of the drivers to which the CSMs can add regional specificity. As a further step in refining the CNAs, it would be helpful for the external contractor to provide its view on the regions and locations where funding would be best spent. The Executive Director agreed that the terms of reference for the next CNAs should be revised accordingly.

4.32 The Board member from Nigeria declared that there is a minimum conducive environment in the northeast if the humanitarian assistance is already on the ground. She stated that PVE efforts would complement humanitarian assistance there. With respect to the national consultations through an online survey, she explained that it was done in this manner due to the limited funds and timeframe allowed for the exercise. The next time this process would not necessarily be repeated.

4.33 The Chair of the Board thanked the Board members for a constructive discussion and assured them that any additional funding decision for Nigeria and Bangladesh will come back to the Board.

4.34 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. welcomes the work of the Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”) in Bangladesh, Kenya, Kosovo, Mali, and Nigeria, and notes the commitment of each of them to proceed with the process of the Core Funding Mechanism;
- b. thanks the Independent Review Panel for their recommendations on the allocation of funds to Bangladesh, Kenya, Kosovo, Mali, and Nigeria;
- c. approves the pre-allocation of up to USD 2.5 million to Kosovo for grant-making purposes under the Core Funding Mechanism for a three-year period commencing in 2017, and with the demographic, geographical, and thematic focus of funding identified by the IRP in BM.04/DOC.05 Annex 6 (3);
- d. approves the pre-allocation of up to USD 5 million to Kenya for grant-making purposes under the Core Funding Mechanism for a three-year period commencing in 2017, and with the demographic, geographical, and thematic focus of funding identified by the IRP in BM.04/DOC.05 Annex 6 (2), effective at such time as USD 5 million becomes available for grant-making purposes;
- e. approves the allocation of up to USD 2 million to Mali for grant-making purposes under the Core Funding Mechanism for a three-year period commencing in 2017, and with the demographic, geographical, and thematic focus of funding identified by the IRP in BM.04/DOC.05 Annex 6 (4);

- f. requests the Secretariat to execute the decision of the Board taking into account the country specific caveats identified by the IRP in BM.04/DOC.05 Annex 6;
- g. requests and encourages the CSMs of Kenya and Kosovo, the IRP and the Secretariat to collaborate to ensure that that the applications of Potential Principal Recipients are clearly defined, and reflect the highest priorities and most critical gaps in preventing violent extremism; and
- h. requests the Secretariat to inform the Board after the USD 7.5 million for Kosovo and Kenya have been secured, and when subsequent increments of USD 2.5 million have been secured with recommendations for further investment.

4.35 The representative from Kenya thanked the Board for the decision, and asked for clarification on whether operations can only begin next January after the Board's approval in December. He made a request that given the USD 1.1 million available and in view of lead times that go into these processes, consideration should be given to beginning operations straight away. He confirmed the readiness of Kenya to start working soon, and accepted the reduction of the geographical scope of activities. He stated that the County of Lamu is a priority.

4.36 The Executive Director responded that in the opinion of the Secretariat, it is not advisable to start the process in Kenya with the USD 1.1 million available and expressed hope of securing USD 5 million in the next few months.

4.37 The Board member from the EU asked for an overview at the next face-to-face Board meeting after all grants are signed. The Board member from the UK inquired about the process for Nigeria. The Executive Director replied that the discussion would be revived when the requisite funds are contributed to support another round in Nigeria. The process would include the presentation of the considerations of the CSM, IRP, and Secretariat, and the Board will make a final decision on how much to allocate and what drivers/populations/locations to focus on.

CFM: Refinements

4.38 The Chief Operating Officer presented proposed further refinements to the CFM (BM.04/DOC.06) which would improve operational performance drawing on experiences and feedback during its first year of implementation. Proposed areas of refinements included the addition of an enabling environment assessment, selection of potential Principal Recipients by the Secretariat and CSMs without IRP input, and financial examination of Principal Recipients.

Discussion

4.39 The Board member from the United States was not clear which changes were being suggested; and said that it would be helpful to highlight specific changes in the text for future sessions. The Chief Operating Officer explained where the proposed changes were in the document, and noted that these will be made clearer in future meeting documents.

4.40 The Board member from the Private Sector asked whether GCERF is looking for local auditors in each of these countries, or trying to bring in one of the “big four” to audit all the countries.

4.41 The Chief Financial Officer responded that the large Tier 2 firms are well represented and usually more cost effective in these countries.

4.42 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.06: The Board approves, and requests the Secretariat to work alongside beneficiary countries to implement, the refinements to the Core Funding Mechanism presented in BM.04/DOC.06.

5. GCERF ‘STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS’

5.1 The Executive Director introduced Dr Bruce Jenks as the presenter for this session. Dr Jenks, a consultant whom GCERF has engaged in a modest but important way, will help to inform the strategy that the Board will develop over the coming months. He had conducted a number of interviews and used his networks and experience to consider:

- Value proposition: In what ways does GCERF add value to current PVE initiatives?
- Funding: Where are there sustainable sources of funding for GCERF and other PVE efforts? Security? Development? Private sector? A combination?
- Mechanism: Does the GCERF funding mechanism match the mandate? Does it make sense to stakeholders around the world?

5.2 The Chair of the Board reminded the Board that this was an information item rather than an action item on the agenda.

5.3 Dr Jenks started by thanking the Executive Director and his colleagues and praising a dynamic and energetic Secretariat. He explained that his work is in an early stage and many Board members had not yet been approached. He was presenting some very initial reflections:

Broad value proposition of programmes relating to P/CVE

5.4 The value proposition of PVE programmes is not highly contested and there are increasing levels of engagement with PVE. It is worth reminding ourselves that there is no problem at this broad level and there seems to be a positive trajectory.

5.5 However, there are two challenges within this broad description: 1) On the security side, the bulk of the resources are still allocated to ‘hard’ security. On the development side, there is a lot of ambiguity surrounding risks, reputation, association, and other similar concerns. A healthy direction would be for both sides to converge. 2) The current challenge is a classic challenge related to financing prevention, which is the most difficult type of funding to get. It is cost effective

in the long-run, but politically it remains difficult to justify spending money on something that may or may not happen.

5.6 Dr Jenks indicated that there is a strong argument for a multilateral instrument in this field. At the same time, it would be a big mistake to assume that a rise in overall funding for this area will lead to a fully functioning multilateral institution, unless a high-level decision is made to prioritise the multilateral over the bilateral. He observed that the Board must address a value-added proposition for the multilateral instrument.

5.7 Dr Jenks then questioned the extent to which the PVE agenda is tried and tested, asking whether it is demonstrating results and whether people are confident that it can be measured. There is no way around the need for any institution to demonstrate the difference it is making, and there is no reason why donors should give money without some assurance. Some things are easy to measure while others are difficult, and measuring systemic attitudinal change in a year is impossible. The Secretariat needs to figure out a creative way to demonstrate results because there has to be some way to explain to a donor why this is a worthwhile investment.

5.8 It is equally important to know what is being measured and whether GCERF should be looking at anything in particular. The CSM has no direct experience in this regard, but it is seen as something of intrinsic value for larger policy impact, capacity building, etc. It would be powerful to highlight that the process has been established, and has already had a broad impact. Dr Jenks asked both the Board and the Secretariat to reflect on creative ways of constructing a narrative that donors will understand.

5.9 GCERF scores very highly on the broad impact of the Fund. But Dr Jenks warned that it is not possible to move the institution forward because the Secretariat does not have the funds to implement certain things even though the Board keeps insisting on results. It is a serious, but solvable issue that depends on GCERF's strategy and its value-added proposition.

5.10 Dr Jenks highlighted that it is important to recognise that the PVE space has changed and has become more contested, which represents either a threat or an opportunity. It is a new area which has become very important around the world. An important component in moving towards its strategy would be to consider partnering with some of the big players that are becoming interested in order to demonstrate relevance. Therefore, it is critical to create strong alliances with such organisations as the United Nations ("UN"), World Bank, and with different types of NGOs in the various countries. GCERF should become known as a partnership organisation; it can only gain strength from carving out a space within that niche.

5.11 Another observation is a line recurring in all his discussions about a clearly recognised global agenda that always requires local solutions. In this context a significant element of the decision made in capitals whether or not to fund GCERF depends on whether an Ambassador in that country has heard of GCERF or not. It would be useful to have high profile access at the country level on a continuing basis. Different donors have proposed seconding staff locally to GCERF to do such work. It is important to think about how to keep the GCERF brand alive in the local context and how to get feedback to the capitals from the local actors on the ground.

5.12 Dr Jenks was puzzled that the GCERF model is based on the Global Health Fund model, which has a different funding scale and its own problems. Moreover, the Global Health Fund is working in a field that is highly measurable.

5.13 Dr Jenks concluded his presentation by stating that these are all hypothetical assumptions, and invited responses and remarks from the Board. The report will be produced soon, and it will integrate the discussions during the Board meeting. Based on his extensive experience working with Boards, he reinforced that it is essential for management and the Board to work hand in hand on the funding. Board members should be seeking to facilitate engagement between top management and senior levels in the capitals.

5.14 It is very important to have three or four “champions” who, for political reasons, can provide leadership, including sufficient funding in order to have a base for the operations. Champions provide the cover for governments that might find it more difficult to support GCERF. It is important to work on the local aspect and develop strong partnerships. The need to solve the tension on the measurement side with some creative understandings from both sides is critical. In his final remarks, Dr Jenks highlighted that GCERF had an historical opportunity because the PVE agenda is becoming increasingly important. There are two options: either the multilateral instrument will be seen as part of the overall solution or it will drop out because of a lack of relevance. It would be tragic, especially in this field of activity, for the multilateral system to become irrelevant due to a depletion of resources.

Discussion

5.15 The Chair thanked Dr Jenks for his presentation and assessment of the situation, and opened the discussion session by looking at various issues.

5.16 The Board member from the United Kingdom reminded the group about the original purpose and added-value of GCERF, which was to fill a gap and fund communities that countries could not bilaterally. It may be necessary to assess whether the current selection of countries is the right one and address the sensitivities of other countries that initially were interested but then pulled out. GCERF should address how it can persuade the countries in which it is interested to join. Although it is difficult to show results and prove impact, it is important to continue trying to find solid measures. The UK is planning to second a specialist on M&E to GCERF. She added that it is critical to take into account the feedback from people on the ground; their opinions affect the way GCERF is seen globally, and it also influences funding opportunities.

5.17 The Board member from the Foundations constituency observed that one of the problems is the bureaucracy that governments, which are accountable for the funds they have invested, have understandably put in place. In terms of a strategic discussion, she suggested stressing the point of working together and doing things that cannot be done separately.

5.18 The Board member from the Civil Society constituency argued that local solutions can be achieved only in partnership with lots of different actors. While a CSM is an achievement in itself, it is important to have different players tackle the issues locally and be explicit about desirable outcomes. GCERF needs to narrow down and focus on what the organisation wants to achieve.

5.19 The Board member from Switzerland agreed with the presenter that it is difficult to convince a development agency to invest in GCERF operations before any results are available in the next 2–3 years. He spoke about the need to develop a narrative that convinces actors from security/development to invest despite the uncertainty about whether the expected results will be achieved. Clearly there is a need for more top-down support in terms of political commitment: GCERF receives significant attention in Switzerland and Federal Councillor Didier Burkhalter, the Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, believes its mission is important. Nevertheless, GCERF needs more “champions” especially at times when development departments are under huge pressure to deal with migration and humanitarian aid. He stressed that if there is no clear political call from the top about allocating resources to GCERF, then an agency chief will not do so.

5.20 He also agreed with the need to push from the bottom-up at the same time: Feedback from the Embassies matters; and a report from field offices to the capital about GCERF’s good work on the ground changes the perception at headquarters about its relevance.

5.21 The Board member from the Private Sector constituency asked if it was possible to start generating results now using the data GCERF is collecting already. It would be good to share these data points with an experienced and creative data expert who can help develop a story/narrative. He compared it to the private sector where it is difficult to engage a potential partner without a story to tell and without metrics to back it up.

5.22 The Board member from the United States stressed a need to address VE at the community level although it is difficult. Governments have large aid agencies that have programmes reaching down to the community-level, but the Fund can provide an opportunity that avoids large bureaucracy and fulfils its purpose. With the tools it has available, GCERF can help establish and develop the expertise, knowledge and internal controls to benefit the broader community. GCERF’s ability to explain what it is learning during this process is becoming increasingly relevant, and raising its profile is critical.

5.23 A constituency member from Australia encouraged GCERF to define what it is hoping to establish and measure rather than just looking at tangible deliverables. Australia will try to support GCERF’s work on M&E. She stressed the importance of diversification when promoting GCERF’s brand and increasing visibility. She also inquired about partnerships, including platforms that have been formed as a result of Sustainable Development Goals (“SDGs), particularly Goals 16/17, as well as possible cooperation with the World Bank, which could bring in other issues.

5.24 The Board member from Japan stated that the ability to go down to the community level to implement projects in a particular country varies depending on the context. In some countries, but not all, the connection and engagement at the community level is good. In partnering with the Fund, Japan strives to conduct PVE activities at the community level, which is a strong point of GCERF. Recognising the impressive work and engagement with the CSMs, he asked about the possibility for the CSMs to become more engaged locally with the Board.

5.25 The Board member from the EU invited Dr Jenks, whilst in Brussels, to meet colleagues including Counter-Terrorism coordinators, representatives of the European External Action Service (“EEAS”), the EU Commission, and the EU member states. He reiterated that GCERF has the support of the highest authorities inside the EU, which is reflected in the European Council

conclusions on counter-terrorism after the Charlie Hebdo events.¹ GCERF's model is attractive because of the community-level approach and as a public-private partnership, and the EU will discuss it in detail along with some proposals later during the meeting.

5.26 Clearly, there is a change in thinking influenced by developments in/outside the EU that calls for promoting an integrated approach to address the root causes of migration, poverty, and other challenges rather than stand-alone activities on PVE. Dealing with root causes of employment, education, and health issues, and providing opportunities using a comprehensive and complementary approach is the right way to solve these issues. He agreed with previous statements about the importance of staying in touch with local representatives working on the ground and explaining to them what GCERF does. He concluded that the Fund can be very complementary to what is being done on a bilateral basis, expressed a willingness to commit funds, and indicated a need to show results.

5.27 The Executive Director specifically addressed questions about cooperation on the ground explaining that the CSMs which are self-managing small committees always try to engage with local donors, and have guidelines to include all stakeholders. Recognising the importance of bottom-up links, GCERF is trying its best to achieve this by attempting to coordinate CSM meetings with donor communities, meet and engage with them as much as possible, although resources are limited. He agreed in the longer term GCERF will need to have an in-country presence to liaise with actors on the ground and be in touch with the latest developments.

5.28 Dr Jenks underscored that raising GCERF at the highest political levels is critical and welcomed the strong political statements from the Board members, Switzerland and the EU in particular. Recognising a serious financial challenge, he suggested a two-prong strategy containing concrete steps to be taken in the next 6 months that would build into a longer-term perspective. He noted the need to be very rigorous/precise on the positioning proposition and the political process that GCERF follows.

5.29 The Board member from Switzerland reiterated that is essential to engage local Embassies, as their feedback is necessary for raising GCERF's profile to trigger bilateral geographic resources eventually. In the Swiss Development Agency, for example, there is significant funding at the country level.

5.30 This was echoed by Dr Jenks who added that the most powerful and eloquent statement for support would be a statement from national actors saying GCERF actually matters and makes a difference. The voice of the beneficiary really has to be heard, and the CSM plus regular trips to countries should make it possible.

5.31 The Chair of the Board stated that the Secretariat is much more engaged now at the country level and is reaching out, making connections, and engaging national actors. The CSMs are really beginning to have an impact. She underlined that as GCERF pitches to development funders,

¹ Council conclusions on counter-terrorism, 9 February 2015, at <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2015/02/150209-council-conclusions-counter-terrorism>

the Sustainable Development Goals (“SDGs”) and SDG 16 framework in particular along with recent changes in the Development Assistance Committee (“DAC”) approach to PVE should help win the argument.

6. DEVELOPING THE GCERF STRATEGY

6.1 The Executive Director highlighted the particular importance of this session because strategy-driven strengths and priorities are essential for sharpening the focus and maintaining the added value of the organisation. The Fund’s priority is to put in place a strategy process that will help GCERF successfully establish itself, set priorities, and raise funds. He suggested appointing a Strategic Planning Committee to clarify GCERF’s future direction and focus, establish priorities, and reaffirm theories of change.

6.2 The Executive Director emphasised the role of the Board in providing links with the outside environment and creating partnerships with the UN and other organisations. GCERF counts on its Board members to help establish such partnerships. The role of the Board is to lead an organisation through a difficult period, which is currently the case, and to focus on policy challenges and not programme implementation and administrative details, which should be left for the Secretariat. He asked the Board to appoint a Strategic Planning Committee or a less formal Working Group. He stressed that it is critical that the whole Board participate in the decision-making, approve the final plan, and most importantly, be committed in implementing it and owning the process.

6.3 It is very important to have a shared understanding of the process of developing a strategy and involve as many stakeholders as possible in order to develop an actionable strategic plan. If such a committee were to be approved and established by the Board, then the objective would be to draft a strategy to propose to the Board for the next meeting in December 2016. This group would identify critical strategic issues, help with developing a strategic vision, mission, and strategic goal statements, and then develop objectives for each goal. There will be a consultant accompanying this group during the process, and the Secretariat will play a fundamental role throughout by preparing drafts, listing options, and providing administrative support.

Discussion

6.4 The Board member from the EU shared his vision of GCERF as an implementing agency of the Global Counter-Terrorism Forum (“GCTF”). In future, he would like to see closer synergies between the two. The EU is keen to make the work of GCTF more results-oriented. He supported the creation of a Strategic Working Group, rather than a formal committee.

6.5 The Board member from Canada supported the idea of a strategy plan to help focus the Board’s work. Although flexible about its structure, she indicated that if a committee were formed, it would be important to make sure that all Board members and constituencies including missions, embassies, and headquarters, are engaged and consulted to generate support.

6.6 The constituency member from the Netherlands representing the Board member fully agreed with the EU to explore ways to collaborate with the GCTF. He expressed confidence that he has the Moroccan Co-chair’s full support when saying that GCERF is a key partner for the GCTF

in delivering its strategic objectives for strengthening the global CT/CVE architecture, reinforcing/refining its toolkits (research, learning), and delivering results at the local and community levels.

6.7 The Board member from the Foundations Constituency suggested an alternative option to a Committee type set-up by establishing a group led by the Executive Director.

6.8 The Board member from Kenya expressed support for the idea of developing a strategic plan and encouraged the involvement of as many stakeholders as possible.

6.9 The Board member from Switzerland supported the development of a strategy without over-formalising the process. Probably it is better to create an open-ended working group rather than establishing a strategy committee. Although some stakeholders need to be represented, the group should be kept as open as possible allowing participation of those interested in contributing.

6.10 The Board member from the United States agreed with the idea of developing a strategic plan. He felt the Board should be involved in the process but did not wish to prescribe the format. A strategic plan will help crystallise and define GCERF's value proposition and strengths, which will help the Board to articulate its goals clearly, as it seeks funding for the Fund.

6.11 The Board member from Australia supported the idea of developing a clear and simple strategy and vision. It is a challenging exercise, and the best process is to have a range of views on the issue, and remain open minded and pragmatic. The process should be manageable and practical with no one signing away any of their rights by having particular Board members represent them. If the Board decides to go for a reference/working group, then those members will be representing the Board and not just their own country or constituency with an obvious obligation to consult and communicate the views of others. It would be best coordinated by the Chair of the Board. He confirmed that the Australia and New Zealand's constituency is ready to engage in the process.

6.12 The Board member from Qatar agreed with earlier statements that expressed a need for a strategy to guide the Board and synergise efforts. He indicated flexibility regarding the format.

6.13 The Chair of the Board reminded the Board that strategy is policy and the Board needs to be involved in the process. She stressed that developing a strategy is the Board's responsibility, and agreed that a reference group would make sense. A strategy will be presented to the Board, and the Board will eventually have to approve it and take full ownership of the strategy. She put forward the decision for adoption. Organisational ownership is a necessity; therefore, the proposal is to create a reference group if the Board agrees, that will present the Strategic Plan at the next meeting. The group would be chaired by her, and she invited volunteers for the group.

6.14 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.09: The Board:

- a. decides to develop a strategic plan for the period of 2016/7-2020, facilitated by the Secretariat working with a reference group of the Board representing its multi-stakeholder nature;
- b. requests the Chair of the Board to solicit the interest of Board members to participate in the reference group; and
- c. requests the Chair of the Board and the Executive Director to report back on progress on the next face-to-face meeting of the Board.

The final strategic plan shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS

7.1 The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) presented several financial matters requiring two decisions: a) approval of the 2015 financial statements, and b) selection of an external auditor.

7.2 The financial statements were audited by an auditor, a firm selected by the Board in 2014. The auditor used international auditing standards to audit GCERF, and produced an “unmodified opinion” as presented in the Board paper (BM.04/DOC.09). The auditor did not provide a management letter because there was nothing that required attention from the Board or Management. A slightly different version that complied with the standards acceptable to the Swiss Federal Supervisory Authority was audited by the auditor who also issued an “unmodified” opinion on it.

7.3 Speaking about the statement of financial position, the CFO mentioned that the cash position of GCERF was not an immediate concern, as only one of GCERF donors had not yet made a payment as of the end of 2015. Net assets or the reserves of GCERF are now fully committed to the CFM. It may be useful for the Board to consider establishing a certain threshold for reserves to be able to address risks that cannot be insured against; or respond to new opportunities. GCERF’s funding structure right now is more similar to that of a project implementer than a Fund.

7.4 The financial statements provide a useful yet limited view of the finances of GCERF. Financial planning plays a key role in financial management at GCERF. Currently 30% of the funding is restricted, which has significant limitations not only for investing in particular countries, but also for specific grantees.

7.5 The Chief Financial Officer expressed gratitude to the GCSP for its support for almost a year, and stressed that in-kind contributions are critical for a young organisation; she thanked Switzerland and the USA for providing staff and office space. The importance of receiving unrestricted funds was emphasised again as it allows the Board to have the freedom to invest in line with its strategic intent.

7.6 The Chair of the Board informed the Board that although the auditor had been invited to attend the Board meeting, the auditors indicated that their general practice was to speak with a member of the governance structure who would then report back. She quoted the email from the

the auditor's Partner who asked to be put in contact with the Chair of the Board specifying this is a general practice used for non-governmental organisation ("NGO") audits.

7.7 She confirmed that the Secretariat facilitated discussions with the partner. She repeated to the Board what the auditors said including their assessment of financial statements covering 15 months, and the use of the IFRS internationally recognised standards. The auditor produced two reports; one for the Swiss Federal Supervisory Authority. The auditor performed a full audit, and it had many questions for the Secretariat during the process that were all answered. The Chief Financial Officer in return also had lot of questions for them, which the auditor covered. The auditors reminded the Chair of the Board that the Secretariat is responsible for the statements, which have to be approved by the Board. The auditors reported no difficulties in dealing with management, and produced an unqualified opinion.

7.8 The Chair of the Board concluded her report about the conversation with the auditors by reading a final paragraph of their letter stating: "In our opinion, the financial statements for the year ended 31 December 2015 give a true and fair view of the financial position, the results of operations and the cash flows in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and comply with the Swiss law". She confirmed that her conversation lasted about 30 minutes, and she was the only one on the phone with the auditor's partner.

Discussion

7.9 Considering the current negative interest environment in banking in Geneva, the Board member from Bangladesh asked about safety of idle funds that have been invested by GCERF as indicated in paragraph 4.10 (BM.04/DOC.09). The Chief Financial Officer answered that GCERF is operating in all three currencies – CHF, EUR, USD – but that investments were currently in USD only given negative interest rates currently in effect for CHF and EUR balances. The investment is very safe and the return is very low (USD 90 a month). GCERF will invest whatever it can safely as indicated in the Financial Management Policy.

7.10 The Board member from the Foundations constituency asked about insurance and liability, and whether GCERF has Directors and Officers Liability Insurance ("D&O"). The Chief Financial Officer confirmed that Board Members are covered by D&O.

7.11 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.07: The Board approves GCERF's audited financial statements for 2015.

8. AUDITOR PERFORMANCE

8.1 The Chief Financial Officer stated that the auditor's performance was good, but it was still suboptimal. Although the team is used to working with NGOs and in international Geneva, it still lacked an understanding of the standards GCERF requires of its auditors. However small, GCERF would like to hold itself up to the highest standards. The Secretariat felt that the approach taken by the current auditors was to make sure that GCERF was satisfying requirements rather than truly adding value. The Chief Financial Officer requested the Board to issue a request for

proposals for external auditors so GCERF may select an auditor that would be able to deliver that added value. This could be another firm or even a different team within the auditor's firm.

Discussion

8.2 The Board member from the Private Sector constituency asked for more details on how an auditor adds value and why GCERF chose this auditor in the first place. The Chief Financial Officer explained that her understanding was that GCSP has been dealing with the auditor for quite some time and based on the good services provided to GCSP, this auditor was chosen. Adding value is about challenging the organisation in a positive way.

8.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.08: The Board requests the Secretariat to issue a request for proposals for external audit services and to present its analysis of the proposals received to inform the Board's appointment of an external auditor at or prior to its next face-to-face meeting.

9. RESULTS

9.1 The Executive Director launched a discussion on how the Board defines results, even at this early stage. He wanted to exchange views with the Board on what results look like and how they differ among different stakeholders, what is being measured, and how results are shown. He also wanted to discuss learning processes, the early stages of M&E, and performance.

9.2 He outlined the three challenges in demonstrating impact:

- It is not easy to distinguish what can be controlled from what can be influenced, and while inputs, number of grants issued, activities, outputs (numbers) can be controlled, the outcomes and impacts cannot; at best, they can only be influenced by GCERF. Reflecting on outcomes for GCERF, he mentioned providing alternatives to violent extremism, but it is difficult to demonstrate that the youth/women involved in these activities are necessarily making different choices. GCERF can only demonstrate impact by building community resilience against violent extremism. The issue in this case is understanding control versus contribution.
- The second challenge is causality or attributing certain outcomes or impacts to a specific project. It is nearly impossible to show that income-generating activities alone create community resilience, for example. The GCERF programme design responds to this challenge through a version of outcome mapping.
- Finally, GCERF is trying to work on prevention, but it is hard to prove the counterfactual – that you have prevented someone from doing something. By definition, preventive works entails long-term commitments, and the impact is usually difficult to capture and isolate from other intervening factors.

9.3 There is a distinction between corporate and portfolio performance, i.e. grants performance versus performance of GCERF as a whole, including financial performance. There are different layers of performance to be measured as well as a hierarchy of results starting from individual grants to consortia and country-level grants, and then from the regional level to the corporate level. The fundamental principle here is to demonstrate value for money across all layers, and key performance indicators (“KPIs”) should incorporate this.

9.4 GCERF is prioritising results in various ways including ongoing advanced discussions with the United Kingdom on M&E as well as regular contact with the US Agency for International Development (“USAID”), which has offered short-term expert consultation through its Office of Transition Initiatives (“OTI”). The Fund has also submitted a proposal to Canada to support the M&E framework and develop capacity among grantees. The Executive Director thanked the Board members for these various contributions.

9.5 The Chief Operating Officer asked for the Board’s input on whether the hierarchy of results, indicated in BM.04/DOC.08 on page 5, seemed appropriate and relevant. Speaking about the hierarchy of results in detail, he indicated the three levels of measurement at the organisational level:

- Impact level: What are the results and what are the investment decisions? What has been achieved at the end of a country funding cycle after 7 years? What are successes and improvements?
- Outcomes level: What are the indicators of performance against key indicators that GCERF identifies for the organisation? For example, what percentage of funding within the grant cycle actually reaches sub-recipients in the funding model under each grant as opposed to the Secretariat operating expenses?
- Output level: This is a frequent and ongoing basis of assessment that looks at how GCERF is performing and progressing in key areas. Recently the Board members asked about this, and one of the output level examples could be grants signed.

9.6 On grants area–portfolio level performance, there are several levels of measurement including:

- Regional: Multiple countries in a region that may or may not be getting support; and
- Country level: Individual consortium grant level indications within the framework of individual grants.

9.7 He then provided more details about the format of reporting and assured the Board that it will receive an annual report indicating performance on a country level. It will be complemented with lessons learned and good practice from specific pieces of research that will take place on an ongoing basis.

9.8 Both the Chair of the Board and the Executive Director asked the Board members for their input and guidance on their vision of results and expectations for GCERF to achieve and demonstrate them.

Discussion

9.9 The Board member from Canada highlighted the two main strands of interest from the country's perspective in addition to M&E in a traditional sense as getting value for funds invested and finding out what is working. A greater interest lies in building up a community of learning and knowledge in the P/CVE sphere. She stressed that GCERF's added value is as an opportunity to experiment, try different approaches, accept a degree of risk, and extract lessons that security donors from Canada do not otherwise have access to. This is an innovative model presenting a unique opportunity for learning.

9.10 Recognising these are early days to try to extract lessons, she nevertheless underlined it is exactly the time to get started so that GCERF can start assessing whether interventions are working at the very beginning, adopt comparative approaches and have exchanges with other organisations. It is very important to share lessons with the broader community, and within GCERF there should be a collection of different points of view, for example on private sector versus governmental approaches.

9.11 She informed the Board that Canada is looking at the proposal submitted by GCERF, and will be able to confirm whether or not it will be supported within a few weeks. She encouraged other donors to also invest in GCERF's learning potential.

9.12 The Board member from Australia emphasised that demonstrating results is very important for the future of GCERF in terms of its credibility. Ultimately Australia would like GCERF to be able to change people's lives, and to get there we need to work out how to measure and evaluate that. The degree of influence and whether or not it is related to a particular GCERF activity is always going to be speculative.

9.13 He underlined that GCERF should 'go hard' on M&E. M&E in CVE is a new field presenting an opportunity for GCERF to demonstrate expertise and to establish itself as an innovator. Australia can offer advice from a development perspective.

9.14 He also raised the issue of communicating results and asked about how GCERF communicates them to the community. What is needed is a narrative that looks at what GCERF has contributed in terms of transforming communities and people's lives. He admitted it is a challenge as there is no hard evidence but a narrative around the transformational dimension may be useful for promotional material. GCERF already has the CSM as a tangible result, and can make more of it by raising awareness and promoting its potential.

9.15 The Board member from the Private Sector constituency aligned with the previous comments, stressing that GCERF needs to show results quickly. In the future, it may not be the largest player, but it can stake its ground through innovative data collection. He appreciated Canada, the UK, and the US stepping up support, and spoke about a need to manage expectations. He mentioned a virtuous cycle where good data will help pull in more data and partners.

9.16 The Board member from Bangladesh felt that the M&E discussion had been very valuable, and welcomed the input from other Board members. He agreed that views may differ between beneficiaries and donors, and outlined the following several points from the perspective of a beneficiary country: It is the right time to have this discussion as it was not fully dealt with when GCERF was established; from a beneficiary country's perspective, what is critical is to try to define what a result looks like for each community; the CSM is well placed to provide input into the M&E process; and it needs to be consulted extensively.

9.17 The Board member from the United States thanked the governments of Canada and the UK for assisting GCERF in developing a strong M&E capability and process. He stressed that it is very important that the model is tailored to the purpose of the organisation, and does not simply subject GCERF to existing development models. GCERF is built on identifying and resourcing community based initiatives and innovative efforts at the community level; therefore, it will require a different kind of results framework than what has been applied elsewhere.

9.18 He found the suggestions made by the Board member from Bangladesh about involving some pre-discussion with the community interesting. Separate from what GCERF and the CSM work out, it would be interesting to consult with the community in an objective way about projects. Once the framework is established, it will be important to report results to the Board in a very clear and straightforward manner. Since this is a start-up with new activities, it is important to acknowledge that not everything will work, and GCERF needs to learn from what does not work. Results will be extremely valuable, and GCERF has to use this opportunity to define a strong results framework in order to measure the effectiveness of the organisation, tailor to scale and type of project, and report results. It is important to maintain the start-up spirit by being innovative.

9.19 The Board member from the Civil Society constituency also stressed the importance of a bottom-up approach. Radicalisation is a complex problem that no one properly understands, and the current assumption is that radicalisation processes are taking place at a local level. GCERF needs to be more specific about the change the organisation would like to achieve and to which it might contribute.

9.20 He emphasised that GCERF cannot directly achieve large-scale changes in the countries where it is working. Instead, there can be gradual changes in thinking leading to a larger change. GCERF needs to focus on specific and measurable changes, such as inclusivity. The CSM mechanism is already an achievement in this regard; this is where conflict transformation takes place, new analysis is being undertaken, and reconciliation takes shape.

9.21 The Board member from the Foundations constituency pointed out the complexity of the issue as the Board is dealing with multiple layers of measurement. Moreover, effectiveness for a funder has a different definition than it does for beneficiaries. Clearly, there are different perspectives, and the question for the Board is what GCERF's theory of change is. Regarding setting up an appropriate M&E framework, GCERF has to be clear about the purpose and take into account perspectives from different stakeholders.

9.22 The Chair of the Bangladesh CSM addressed the issue from the CSM's perspective. He said that when Bangladesh volunteered to be a pilot country, its objective was clear, as some communities were prone to radicalisation. The main challenge now is to define how we see positive change and how we measure it. The CSM would like to see tools that a beneficiary country feels confident would measure change in its society. He reiterated that, first, a framework needs to be developed by GCERF, that the Board can then discuss it in a more structured way.

9.23 The Executive Director thanked the Board for its input and engagement in helping GCERF deliver what the Board wants it to deliver. He reflected on numerous points raised stressing that this was an ongoing discussion. He reiterated that GCERF in many of its processes, including M&E, is developing systems that serve a wider PVE community; therefore, it is fundamentally important to get this right.

9.24 He agreed communicating results in an imaginative and innovative way is fundamental. For example, one could imagine using anecdotes, stories, and videos – something that demonstrates that GCERF is beginning to affect behaviour. Undoubtedly, the organisation needs to think about communications piece, which will entail greater costs.

9.25 The Executive Director assured the Board that the grantees are a fundamental part of this process and an integral part of the M&E, so GCERF will continue learning from them and exchanging with them. He concluded with making three commitments: First, GCERF will share what is and is not working; second, GCERF will make sure it consults with all relevant stakeholders to get the results framework right; and third M&E is a top of priority for GCERF after signing grants.

9.26 The Chief Operating Officer confirmed that GCERF is already working on this issue and intends to establish communities of practice among grantees. The consortia model already has a community practice element as an integral part of its design including interaction of SRs with a PR, automatic exchange among groups, interactive engagement, capacity development, and exchanged learning. GCERF is also laying the foundation for that type of learning across consortia at a national level, and hopefully in time between countries.

9.27 GCERF is looking at how those lessons and experiences will be communicated, but it has to be cautious and bear in mind operational security and safety as organisations that it supports are on the front line of conflictual issues. He explained that the primary concern for the Secretariat is to ensure that grantees are not being put at risk for the promotion/publicity of GCERF; the organisation needs to strike a balance between those concerns. It is fundamental at the corporate level to have a strategy to guide this process including overall direction, desired outcomes, aspirations from a governance level and minimum expectations.

10. FUNDING SITUATION

10.1 The Chief Financial Officer gave a presentation on the current funding situation starting with a reminder of the specific economics of a fund. In particular, for a fund to be sustainable and successful the following is a prerequisite:

- The level of funding should be appropriate and sufficient so that the combined effect of its actions has some chance of providing an impact and the intended outcomes and economies of scale can be reached, keeping operating expenses fairly stable while grant funding can increase at a much higher pace.
- Funding should be predictable and long term so that all actors can work with a strategic long-term focus.
- Unrestricted funding allows the fund to be focused and strategic. A Fund is created in response to a need for collective action, and unrestricted funding allows the Board to allocate resources strategically and freely.

10.2 She compared the ideal situation to the current status of funding:

- At mid-year GCERF has only reached 13% of the target set out in December 2015;
- There is a funding gap for 2016 for the Secretariat's operating costs;
- Confirmed funding for new grant commitments is USD 1.6 million only;
- 30% of funding is restricted although GCERF has been able to manage the restrictions so far. Restrictions in terms of countries, even grantees, type of activities, and other things go against the nature of a fund and the organisation has to guard against that risk.

10.3 She thanked the Board members for valuable in-kind distributions, but this is not distributed in cash. 70% of cash funding has been allocated to the CFM, 1% to the AFM and the rest to start up and operating expenses. So far, USD 13.4 million has been committed to grants and USD 1.5 million was approved at this Board meeting to go to Kosovo.

10.4 The 2016 budget approved by the Board in December 2015 was USD 4.9 million. GCERF has been revising the budget and has reduced it to USD 4.7 million. The current gap is USD 900,000. Recently GCERF was informed by the US that an additional USD 300,000 may be accessible, thereby potentially reducing the gap to USD 600,000. Several contributions are currently under discussion (UK, EU, Canada, and Germany), which would further reduce the gap to about USD 300,000. The overall funding situation is very serious.

10.5 The Executive Director asked the Board to take the critical funding situation seriously saying that the Secretariat cannot function through to 2017. He conveyed a clear message about the significant gap in the Secretariat's costs, which is affecting staff retention, and the serious gaps in grant-making, which is resulting in GCERF being unable to fulfil the expectations of beneficiary countries.

Discussion

10.6 The Board member from the United States asked whether the situation will improve providing all commitments mentioned do come through. The Chief Financial Officer confirmed

that should all of the commitments currently under discussion be delivered, then the shortfall would reduce to about USD 300,000 for 2016. There is still of course the pending challenge of operating expenses for 2017. She also emphasised that the current shortfall was having a direct impact on GCERF's ability to fulfil its purpose, ranging from delaying the appointment of critical staff to introducing much-needed IT systems.

10.7 The Chief Financial Officer also clarified that GCERF keeps the share of unrestricted funding for operating costs at a maximum level of 15%. One of the factors leading to the shortfall for operating costs is that donor pledges taken into account in the allocation of funds to countries in July 2015 did not fully materialise and that unrestricted funds allocated to operating costs had to be reallocated to grant funding to maintain the commitments to grants. In addition, some restricted grants did not provide 15% for operating costs. She expressed gratitude for start-up money but on reflection these had been insufficient. The organisation is always trying to catch up because it had to displace funds from these start-up costs towards grants.

10.8 The main reasons for the difference between past expenses as shown in in the financial report and the 2016 budget are changes in staffing and travel. GCERF now has 15 staff members. Travel has increased once GCERF became operational putting mechanisms in place and working with potential principal recipients at country level.

10.9 The Board member from the United States summarised the support received from the USA: USD 1 million to GCSP for start-up costs; 500,000 USD through an expert secondee; and a USD 3 million grant now concluded and available to the organisation. In addition 25,000 USD was provided to help with organisation of the CSM-IRP consultations in September 2015. The US hopes to be able to make available a further 300,000 USD in 2016. In addition the Board member hoped that the 2016 contribution of USD 3 million would become an annual commitment. He urged other donor Board members to similarly commit to long-term support for GCERF.

10.10 The constituency member from the Netherlands representing the Alternate Board member indicated that currently the options are being assessed for renewing the country's contribution to GCERF on top of the 675,000 USD contributed at the end of last year. He clarified that, being under the instruction of a finance officer, this should not be taken as a formal pledge or commitment and discussions with the Secretariat have started.

10.11 The Executive Director told the Board members that the Chief Financial Officer was available to answer any questions they may have about the funding gap, and reminded them about the need to have a sustainable flow of money for this fund to achieve its aspirations.

11. RESOURCE MOBILISATION

11.1 The Executive Director moved onto the update on the Resource Mobilisation strategy, presented to the Board in December 2015, and containing three main objectives: to strengthen partnerships with existing donors; to diversify the donor base; and to strengthen the Secretariat's resource mobilisation capacity.

11.2 He then provided more details on each objective starting with strengthening the relationship with existing donors. He stated that GCERF has made an effort to keep in touch and

update the donors by organising annual trips to the capitals, maintaining regular contacts at headquarters and in the beneficiary countries. The Executive Director expressed gratitude and appreciation to some Board members who have been helpful in promoting GCERF, opening doors and extending invitations. Specifically, he thanked Federal Councillor Didier Burkhalter, Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, as a particular champion for GCERF. He affirmed that GCERF is looking for this level of engagement from all Board members, and asked the Board members for help ensuring that when their leaders are traveling and speaking about counter-terrorism or security, a few bullet points about GCERF are included in their speaking notes.

11.3 He summarised the next steps including working with the Board members to find ways to secure long-term commitments within their respective governments. He explicitly asked the Board members if they know about the main obstacles to giving more funds to GCERF; and how these could be overcome. Some of the reasons may be absence of available funding, discordant funding cycles, or lack of trust in PVE and GCERF's operations. He urged the Board to help GCERF meet other governmental agencies/departments that may have accessible funding.

11.4 Speaking about diversification of donors, the Executive Director acknowledged GCERF must continue to diversify beyond the founding donors. It is sensible to start with existing GCTF members not yet providing funding. The Board paper provided a detailed summary of meetings and contacts with these and other priority potential donors.

11.5 Experience suggests that when new donors find out that the existing donors are not giving money, it puts them off. A natural question is why should new donors believe in GCERF if the current ones do not. He asked the Board members to champion GCERF among potential new donors.

11.6 Another aspect of diversification is working on private sector engagement, and GCERF has commissioned a modest consultancy to explore this possibility. Thirty foundations had also been identified as a priority, and GCERF is planning to work with them in the future, including organising a few roundtables and visits over the summer. However, during the first few years the priority will always be working with governments.

11.7 When updating the Board about the third objective of developing the Secretariat's capacity, he mentioned that a comprehensive work plan had been developed for 2016 and that tools had been developed using Word and Excel for now, but this would not be sustainable, and appropriate systems would need to be set up to do it effectively. There is also a limited human resources capacity, even though raising money is an important part of the Secretariat's tasks.

11.8 The Executive Director further discussed addressing the global challenge of raising funds for PVE and reflected on an emerging paradox: Although VE is a rising challenge attracting increasing political interest, there is still no funding to match the ambition. Dr Jenks's analysis clearly indicated there is no natural and obvious source of funding for PVE. While there are large CT budgets focused on hard security, only a small proportion is usually allocated for PVE. The global community should be seeking some sort of grand bargain where every CT department would commit a percentage of its budget to PVE. At the same time many development agencies are suspicious of the PVE agenda, but the recent statement from the DAC would be helpful for

building bridges. Other actors such as foundations are not sure about their position on this issue because they are nervous about the CT agenda and human rights. The private sector is interested, but innovative ways are needed to include them.

11.9 He highlighted another paradox that despite the fact that there is no natural source of funding for PVE, GCERF was established to be that natural source of funding, and this funding is its mission. The quality and quantity of funding GCERF is currently receiving is not appropriate for a funding mechanism.

11.10 He concluded with the statement that it is fundamental that GCERF is accountable but should not be measured against a few grants that might fail, as systemic change is a long-term process. What GCERF is trying to achieve is build resilient communities and change people's lives. The Board needs to find a way to align GCERF's ambitions with appropriate funding. He mentioned that right after the Board meeting, GCERF will participate in a RUSI workshop in Brussels, which will be focused on the challenge of raising funds for PVE. GCERF will co-host a similar event the week after in Washington, D.C. together with Eric Rosand at the Brookings Institution on obstacles and opportunities for mobilising resources for PVE.

11.11 The Chair of the Board thanked the Executive Director for the presentation and opened the discussion by asking the Board members how GCERF can get to better-known funding sources in their respective governments and networks.

Discussion

11.12 The Board Member from Japan admitted that the biggest challenge in securing funds for GCERF was a lack of awareness and scepticism about GCERF's potential by the budget authorities. This scepticism is understandable because GCERF is a start-up in a new area that has not yet defined how to measure its results. The Japanese government decided to take a risk and provide funding, but it will be difficult to secure additional funding in the future. As one way to address this, he proposed that GCERF might present its activities to the G7 countries at their November meeting hosted by Japan in Hiroshima.

11.13 The Board member from the EU announced that a new contract for an additional EUR 1 million would be concluded shortly. He will also brief EU member states on GCERF's work including raising the funding issue. The EU would like to see more countries join from the Middle East/North Africa region which should in turn attract further EU funding.

11.14 The Board member from Switzerland spoke about the importance of maintaining interest in CT related funding lines, and liked the idea of securing a percentage of CT funding for the Fund. He had recently attended a meeting with the major foundations including the Oak Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and others that have started developing an interest in security-related issues. While cooperating with them would be a medium-term interesting prospect for GCERF, work on developing new government donors should be the priority.

11.15 He discussed why development agencies might not cooperate as rapidly as one would wish. He explained that aid agencies are under huge pressure with migration-related expenditures and the increasing demand to spend even more humanitarian aid on Syria and other areas.

11.16 He highlighted the importance of the revised reporting directives on peace and security by the DAC stressing that it is more than just a guideline that has changed; it is a way to conceptualise these issues. It will take some time before agencies digest it and take it on board in their long-term planning. GCERF has a good methodology and interesting idea, but once it starts to produce results it will be easier to attract funds. The M&E methodology of GCERF is clearly an asset as it is serious, and appeals to development agencies. He suggested focusing on the terminology PVE rather than CVE.

11.17 Switzerland provided a special allocation to GCERF, and it is not easy at the moment to go significantly further than this CHF 5 million contribution. The idea of having “champions” has potential whereby some Development Ministers and Ministers of Foreign Affairs could try to champion the PVE cause in general, and GCERF in particular. He expressed confidence in the medium term for GCERF despite its current financial situation. He added that he would try to cover the shortfall in operating expenses this year of USD 300,000.

11.18 The constituency member from New Zealand said the country is happy with how the fund is developing, and many colleagues see it as an innovative start-up and applaud the Secretariat’s professionalism and work. Currently New Zealand has a restricted funding situation with a number of budget lines being considerably cut from a foreign policy perspective. It is an ongoing challenge to find CT and especially PVE funding despite the issue being on the priority list. The ongoing focus on M&E will help to build a narrative that can be used to make the case for further funding and provide a snapshot of what has been done to date. Clearly, despite being a new fund, GCERF has some positive successes already. She expressed hope that innovation would attract attention and build a story about what GCERF is doing. She concluded by mentioning that New Zealand’s contribution to GCERF is currently being considered in Wellington, and the Fund will be informed in due course.

11.19 The Board member from Canada found the idea of allocating a percentage of CT funds to PVE interesting. She mentioned that development assistance is a very important source, and it makes a lot of sense given the nature of activities in which GCERF is engaged. It is also important to have high-profile champions, but at the same time, GCERF also needs some lower-key bureaucratic champions. She asked the Board members to share their experience in dealing with similar issues.

11.20 The Board member from the United States confirmed that GCERF funding comes from the CT Bureau with strict rules of adherence. The CT Bureau executes a fair amount of foreign assistance funding, principally for security assistance, which accounts for an overwhelming amount of the budget, and it is not the kind of funding that can be provided to GCERF. Contributions to GCERF have been prioritised and they will continue to be. He explained that allocations are made on an annual basis with Congress’s approval.

11.21 There may be other funds that can be unlocked within the US government, but further work needs to be done on this issue including on the relationship with USAID and OTI.

11.22 He echoed previous comments about tremendous demands upon economic support and humanitarian assistance funds given the migration crisis and stabilisation requirements in

numerous parts of the world that are underfunded. Although there is general pressure across the US government on those kinds of funds, it does not mean new opportunities cannot be found. The Resource Mobilisation strategy also requires the development of a donor country-by-country strategy. He expressed a readiness to continue working to ensure GCERF is talking to the right people and carrying on the discussion. He was confident that GCERF would overcome its current challenges and become a sustainable effort.

11.23 The Board member from Australia expressed the opinion that some donors had not been aware of the long-term requirements of a commitment to a global funding mechanism and were now struggling to justify further expenditure. In his view, the long-term future lies in accessing development funding. In this regard he pointed out the high significance of the revised DAC guidelines. The richest sources of funding in Australia will be in the country programmes; for Australia, this mainly means the Indo-Pacific region. He warned that although the prospects for development money are bright, it would intensify competition among the UN agencies and other NGOs for PVE money. GCERF should not get into a battle with different parts of the UN system but find collaborative ways to work with them, in particular in local contexts.

11.24 The Board member from Kenya expanded on the issue of helping to fundraise and build awareness of GCERF by exploring synergies with local ambassadors who can also play a role. For example, he recently contacted the capital to initiate a meeting in Nairobi at the end of July between GCERF and the local ambassadors from the US, Japan, the EU, Switzerland, Canada, the Netherlands, and other donor countries. He expressed interest in the AFM approach and requested a regional focus on the Horn of Africa, which is a critical area.

11.25 He drew a comparison with the Global Fund that now has more equal representation between donors and recipients. Kenya is both a recipient and a donor. He pointed out that a real global fund needs to be inclusive, and urged GCERF to seek champions among developing countries as well as donor countries.

11.26 The Executive Director agreed that the donor and beneficiary terms laid out in the GCERF Bylaws are becoming increasingly inappropriate, and stressed enormous commitment from beneficiary countries, for example through the CSMs who are fundamental partners. He suggested that beneficiary countries might more appropriately be described as partner countries.

11.27 He thanked the Board members for their commitment to and optimism for GCERF.

11.28 The Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer added that GCERF will keep working and engaging with existing and potential donors to implement the Resource Mobilisation strategy. She informed the Board that discussions with some foundations have now started.

11.29 She emphasised that there is no limitation in opening up to new countries, and as a new organisation GCERF is working systematically through its list of priority potential donors. It has to work on a country-by-country strategy. She pointed out that the M&E and actual operational results will be key components in the future to access new funding.

11.30 The Chair of the Board prioritised continuing to build a good relationship with the UN. The Executive Director reminded the Board that GCERF was established as a public-private

partnership, and at the beginning, the main focus has been on raising money with governments and working to get grants signed. Now is the time to think about how to engage the private sector, and GCERF is grateful to the EU for helping to launch this initiative. Although the private sector is not a large donor right now, it can contribute in other ways as discussed at a roundtable in Lagos that took place the previous week. The Secretariat has engaged Dr Sadaf S. Lakhani on a short-term consultancy to work on private sector engagement, and she was invited to share her initial findings.

11.31 Dr Lakhani mentioned that she learnt about GCERF in 2015 on the CVE task force at the World Bank where GCERF was identified as an entity which can channel resources, and it is uniquely positioned to work with communities that identify their own solutions. She suggested that there is a certain degree of scepticism towards the private sector as it is not a natural ally for P/CVE, but it can offer some opportunities and innovations on which GCERF can capitalise.

11.32 Dr Lakhani started by emphasising basic principles such as “Do No Harm” and the shared value concept. The latter had been developed by the private sector and development actors to identify a space of mutual interest. The business sector wants to ensure it can do its work in a secure environment and generate profits. She explained that the private sector is impacted directly and indirectly by violent extremism, e.g. the high cost of doing business, diversion of talent and human resources, capital flight, and disruption of value chains. Another issue is that foreign companies are part of the narrative used by violent extremist groups in justifying their actions.

11.33 Overall, the private sector is becoming more and more involved as a solutions provider both on a country level and globally, including in discussions on migration and the SDGs. She spoke about some innovative solutions that organisations are already providing, and thus that GCERF is not at the vanguard in pushing for private sector involvement; it is just building on the existing momentum and opportunity that is there to capitalise on private sector interest.

11.34 She presented some findings from Nigeria where she had a few discussions and bilateral meetings with the private sector including extractives, telecoms, logistics, and food and beverages. Despite an initial assumption about a reluctance to talk because these issues are so politically sensitive, the conversation in fact moved quickly from abstract concepts about affected businesses to concrete possible ways to engage, manage risks, and address the structural causes. She highlighted a key takeaway that GCERF needs to come up with a menu of options and tested methods the private sector can engage in.

11.35 Any project proposal from a company has to be followed up very quickly with technical advice and money, and it will be necessary to consider to what extent current processes within the Secretariat are appropriate. Part of GCERF’s added value for the private sector is providing a platform for engaging with recipient governments. Dr Lakhani noted that defining GCERF’s value proposition will be essential for attracting private sector support, as will be an appetite for risk-taking in the early stages.

11.36 The Board member from the Civil Society constituency raised the importance of due diligence on the types of company that GCERF may partner with, as well as the sources of funding for certain foundations. In his experience foundations are still weary of the P/CVE agenda. He identified a possible role for GCERF in using its processes to help lift growing restrictions on the

activities of civil society in more and more countries, and suggested that this type of approach might attract interest from foundations.

11.37 The Board member from the United States asked about engaging the private sector at the local level when reaching into communities. Certain sectors, like the consumer goods sector, work at the same level when managing the delivery of their products, usually through local distributors. There may be value in forging alliances with these distributor firms. This is an area where governmental representation with local knowledge could be approached.

11.38 The Board member from Canada looked forward to concrete proposals and a menu of options for engaging the private sector from the Secretariat.

11.39 The Executive Director thanked Dr Lakhani for the presentations and answered a few questions raised by the Board members. GCERF is starting to target about 30 foundations with a particular interest in issues of direct relevance to the GCERF mandate. He looked to the Board to help identify opportunities to engage with both foundations and the private sector.

12. FACILITATING BOARD ENGAGEMENT

12.1 The Chair of the Board suggested removing this session from the agenda as the Board had actually been far more engaged during this Board meeting than previously, thus allaying some of the concerns.

12.2 The Board member from Bangladesh asked why this session was included in the agenda in the first place. The Executive Director answered that the purpose had been to find out what needs to be done to engage the Board more actively. He remarked that initially there was a feeling that the Board was not engaged enough, but at this Board meeting that appeared to have changed. He reminded the Board that it has responsibilities, and the overall success or failure of GCERF largely depends on it.

12.3 The Board member from Australia understood that one of the other reasons for having the item on the agenda in the first place was to discuss the role of the Board. He felt that the Board should focus on key strategic goals and directions, not management. He informed the Board that he would be retiring from the Board due to new responsibilities, and wished the Board success in fulfilling its strategic direction mandate.

13. ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM

13.1 The Chair of the Board introduced the Board member from the EU who presented a 'non-paper' on the Accelerated Funding Mechanism. The 'non-paper' had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

13.2 The Board member from the EU reflected on the challenge of engaging the private sector in P/CVE despite the obvious business case and the value that the private sector can add. In his experience, concrete proposals are required to attract private sector support. In this spirit, he proposed that part of the EU contribution to GCERF for 2016 be committed to leverage matching funds from the private sector. This could be a pilot for GCERF and provide valuable experience in

engaging the private sector in P/CVE work. He suggested that the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) would be the appropriate vehicle to launch this initiative, and his proposal was thus also intended to reinvigorate this mechanism, in which he saw significant potential. A final purpose of the proposal was to encourage innovation in fund raising, and he suggested that the Secretariat might also consider crowd funding.

13.3 In terms of location, the Board member from the EU welcomed the initial findings from Nigeria presented by Dr Lakhani, and suggested that Nigeria might be an appropriate place to test the matching funds model. Looking forward it might also be used to work in countries where GCERF is not yet active, and in this regard the EU has a particular interest in the Middle East and North Africa.

Discussion

13.4 The Board member from the United States endorsed the proposal and thanked the EU for the creative idea. He mentioned that the proposal is attractive because it can be tested first on a limited scale. He asked whether there would any additional costs for the Secretariat and how these could be addressed. The Board member from the EU acknowledged that the process is likely to be quite labour intensive especially at the outset.

13.5 The Board member from the Private Sector said that he found the findings from Nigeria very exciting and that he was not surprised about the optimism and enthusiasm there. He appreciated the EU's ideas and willingness to fund this experiment. There is a potential for GCERF to be catalytic in area of private sector engagement in P/CVE, and in this way be part of a wider process to engage the private sector in contributing towards the SDGs.

13.6 The Board member from Switzerland thanked the EU for the exciting idea. He inquired about the costs and resources required and was keen not to distract attention from the CFM. There should be a proper due diligence process. He also supported starting with a limited geographical scope and expanding only cautiously.

13.7 The Executive Director thanked the EU Board member. He committed the Secretariat to considering the feasibility of the proposal and its fit for the AFM. The AFM had been intended to respond to contemporary challenges through a less bureaucratic and faster process to disburse grants in an expeditious way. He noted that engaging the private sector may require revision of the Board-approved AFM in due course.

13.8 The Board member from Kenya found this initiative an excellent idea, expressed a readiness to apply it in Kenya, and asked the Secretariat to be practical in supporting such ideas. Recognising risks and concerns, he also warned against becoming too cautious.

13.9 Dr Lakhani would soon be visiting Kenya and looked forward to scoping interest there, but confirmed that there were a number of companies in Nigeria that had already indicated a willingness to partner GCERF. She saw this as a pilot with the potential to lay the foundations for much more significant work in the future. She also noted the resource implications, not just in implementing the project, but also in capturing and disseminating lessons learned.

13.10 The Board member from Civil Society appreciated the proposal and asked about the legal definition of the corporations that would be engaged in this proposal. There are NGOs that behave as social entrepreneurs, but are not for profit – would they be eligible? The Board member from the EU expressed his personal preference to work with genuine private sector companies and not NGOs.

13.11 The Board member from Mali supported the initiative and remarked that partnerships in the field are essential for raising sufficient resources to have an impact on the ground. Private companies are in a position to be a part of such a funding mechanism, and this is entirely in line with the approach in reaching the SDG goals where partnerships are strongly encouraged. She mentioned that it is especially appropriate in the PVE field where youth employment is a huge opportunity.

13.12 The constituency member from Nigeria thanked Dr Lakhani for the findings and aligned herself with the comments already made. She confirmed that a lot of people from the private sector in Nigeria are willing to cooperate, and engaging them seems logical. Nigeria believes that by bringing in the private sector, which has roots in the local communities, it will be easier to reach people, thus fulfilling the core objective of GCERF. She pointed to the need to have real and workable proposals.

13.13 The Board member from Bangladesh reiterated the need to rework the AFM, and found the EU proposal very encouraging and interesting in this respect. It was very well prepared but some areas seem to require more thought. Bangladesh is absolutely in favour of looking at any option that would help making GCERF visible on the ground. He stressed the high importance of not diverting resources from the CFM for funding such initiatives.

13.14 The Chair of the Board thanked the Board for this productive and innovative discussion around resource mobilisation in general and private sector engagement in particular, appreciated the work in progress, and concluded this session.

14. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

14.1 The Chair of the Board invited the Chair of the Ethics Committee, Dr Daniel Frank, Alternate Board member for Switzerland, to provide the Board with an update on its activities (BM.04/DOC.13).

14.2 The Chair of the Ethics Committee reminded the Board that the Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest was adopted at the 2nd Board meeting, and it requires the disclosure by Covered Individuals of conflicts of interest, including the completion of the Declaration of Interest form on an annual basis.

14.3 At the request of the Ethics Committee, the Ethics Officer distributed early in the 2016 calendar year requests to Covered Individuals (including Board members and Alternate Board members, Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) members, Ethics Committee members, and professional Secretariat members) to file new declarations of interest. As reported to the Ethics Committee at the time, all Covered Individuals filed a form within the two-week deadline, other than two IRP members who resigned from the IRP shortly thereafter.

14.4 The Chair of the Ethics Committee reported that the completed forms were reviewed by the Ethics Officer who advised that there are at present no situations in which an actual or potential conflict of interest exists. He thanked the Ethics Officer for her assistance.

14.5 He assured the Board that the Ethics Committee will continue to monitor the situation in view of the first round of grants, and reminded the Board Members of the ongoing requirement to disclose situations where an actual or potential conflict of interest exists.

14.6 He requested the Chair of the Board to renew an appeal for constituencies which have not yet been represented in the Ethics Committee to propose candidates for its membership.

14.7 The Chair of the Board indicated that the Ethics Committee can be up to five members and currently is missing one, because people have resigned and moved to other positions. She mentioned that a note would be sent out to the Board asking it to propose candidates for the Committee, which currently consists of two members that represent governments. She encouraged a non-governmental representative to become a member of the Ethics Committee stressing it is important to be transparent and be aware of potential conflicts in managing them.

15. ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES 2015

15.1 The Executive Director reminded the Board that the legal status of GCERF is as a Swiss foundation, which has to submit an annual report about its activities to the Swiss Federal Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

15.2 This report, which had been distributed to the Board (BM.04/DOC.14), is not intended for publicity and it contains the minimum of information required by the Supervisory Authority. He asked the Board members to approve the report.

15.3 The Board took the following decision:

BM.04/DEC.10: The Board takes note of the Annual Report of Activities for 2015 contained in Annex 1 to BM.04/DOC.14 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

16. CONCLUDING REMARKS

16.1 The Executive Director thanked the EU for hosting this meeting and the warm hospitality, and the Board members for their presence, participation, and engagement. He also thanked the presenters, the Chair of the Board for her continuous support, and the Secretariat for their hard work. He was pleased with the format for the Board meeting. GCERF had introduced an induction session for new Board members, and their feedback would be appreciated. The papers prepared for this meeting balanced practicalities and conceptual issues, which allowed the Board to not only hold the Fund accountable but also have higher-level strategic discussions. He remarked that a frank and open exchange during the meeting demonstrated that the Board is becoming more and more engaged. He used this opportunity to note a positive working relationship between the Secretariat and Board.

16.2 The Executive Director concluded his remarks by reflecting on the four themes he introduced for this meeting:

- Momentum: The Board decisions have allowed GCERF to maintain momentum by reinvesting in countries, signing grant agreements, continuing to expand, and preparing proposals on private sector engagement;
- Crisis: The Board is now aware of the current challenge, funding gaps, and a need to find more sustainable funding. He thanked the Board for its positive engagement in addressing this issue, and helping identify solutions;
- Performance: There was a clear consensus at this meeting of the importance of demonstrating even preliminary results. Launching the M&E initiative will be important in this regard, as will defining GCERF's strategy and intended outcomes
- Responsibility: The success of GCERF is a shared responsibility, and the Executive Director was grateful for a far more engaged meeting than previously.

16.3 The Chair of the Board joined the Executive Director in thanking the EU for its hospitality. She expressed appreciation to the Secretariat noting that although it is a small team, it is committed to efficiency, professionalism, and quality.

16.4 She thanked the Board for their commitment, and engagement. She in particular thanked the Board members from Australia and the EU for whom it is was the last Board meeting they will attend. She emphasised their important role in getting GCERF to where it is today.

16.5 The Chair adjourned the meeting.

ANNEX 1: BM.04/DOC.01: AGENDA

SUNDAY 12 JUNE 2016

Location – The Hotel, Boulevard de Waterloo 38, 1000 Brussels

Time	Event
17:00 - 19:00	Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome) Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team
19:30	Opening Dinner hosted by the European Union (EU) Keynote Speaker: Mr Gilles de Kerchove, EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator

MONDAY 13 JUNE 2016

Location –European External Action Service (EEAS), 9A Rond Point Schuman, 1000 Brussels

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
08:30 - 09:00	Registration <u>Please arrive early due to tight security procedures</u>		
09:00 - 09:15	Welcoming Remarks		Board Chair
09:15 - 09:30	Preliminary Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members • Approval of Report of Meeting via Conference Call on 28 April 2016 	DOC.01 DOC.02 (for decision)	Board Chair
09:30 - 10:15	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.03 (for information)	Executive Director
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee break		
10:30 - 12:30	Core Funding Mechanism (CFM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on operations • Pre-allocation of funding • CFM refinements 	DOC.04 (for information) DOC. 05 (for decision) DOC.06 (for decision and information)	Executive Director/ Chief Operating Officer/ Independent Review Panel Chair
12:30 - 13:45	Buffet Lunch		
13:45 - 15:15	GCERF 'Stakeholder Analysis' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of purpose and format • Preliminary findings • Next steps 		Executive Director
15:15 - 15:30	Coffee break		
15:30 - 17:00	Developing the GCERF Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining strategic intent • Proposed strategic planning process 	DOC.07 (for decision)	Executive Director

TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2016

Location –European External Action Service (EEAS), 9A Rond Point Schuman, 1000 Brussels

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
08:30 - 10:00	Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results to date • Managing and measuring corporate, portfolio and grant performance • Monitoring and evaluation 	DOC.08 (for information)	Executive Director
10:00 - 10:15	Coffee break		
10:15 - 11:30	Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Financial Statements • Auditor performance • Funding situation 	DOC.09 (for decision) DOC.10 (for decision) DOC.11 (for information)	Chief Financial Officer
11:30 - 12:30	Resource Mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on resource mobilisation • Governments • Private sector and foundations 	DOC.12 (for information and input)	Executive Director/ Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer
12:30 - 13:30	Buffet Lunch		
13:30 – 14:30	Facilitating Board Engagement		Board Chair / Executive Director
14:30 – 14:40	Report of the Ethics Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status Update 	DOC.13 (for information)	Chair of Ethics Committee
14:40 - 15:00	2015 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority/Any other business	DOC.14 (for decision)	Executive Director/ Board Chair
15:00 - 15:15	Coffee break / End of the meeting		
15:15 – 16:00	Executive Session – Board Members only		Board Chair

ANNEX 2: ATTENDANCE LIST

4th GCERF Board Meeting
13-14 June 2016
Brussels, Belgium

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia and New Zealand

Board Member: H.E. Mr Miles Armitage, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism and Assistant Secretary, Counter-Terrorism Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

Constituency Members: Ms Victoria Coakley, Director Fragility & Conflict, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

Mr Simon Hayter, Assistant Director Counter-Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

Ms Georgina Sargison, First Secretary & NATO Political Liaison, New Zealand Mission to the European Union and NATO, Brussels

Bangladesh

Board Member: Mr Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Director General (United Nations), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka on behalf of H.E. Mr Md. Shahidul Haque, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

Alternate Board Member: H.E. M. Shameem Ahsan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: Ms Sue Breeze, Head, Stable World Team (Freedom of Religion/Post-Holocaust), Human Rights and Democracy Department, Foreign & Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

Alternate Board Member: Ms Nell Stewart, Director, Capacity Building Program Division, Non-Proliferation and Security Threat Reduction Bureau, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

European Union

Board Member: Mr Adriaan van der Meer, Head of Unit, Stability, Security, Development and Nuclear Safety, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

Alternate Board Member: Mr Jesper Steen Pedersen, Head of Sector, Global and Transregional Threats, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

Constituency Members:

Mr Harald Freyer, Policy Advisor and Judicial Expert, Counter-Terrorism Division, European External Action Service (EEAS), Brussels

Ms Maria Sanchez, Programme Manager, Global and Transregional Threats, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

Mr Anders Trelborg, Programme Manager, Global and Transregional Threats, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

France

Ms Cécile Abeloos, Counsellor for Counter - Terrorism Issues, Permanent Mission of France to the European Union, Brussels

Ms Luce Bautreit, Trainee, Permanent Mission of France to the European Union, Brussels

Foundations

Board Member: Ms Angela Salt, Chief Executive, Tony Blair Faith Foundation, London

Japan

Mr Shingo Miyamoto, Director of International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

Kenya

H.E. Dr Stephen Ndungu Karau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

Kosovo

Board Member: Mr Edon Myftari, Political Advisor, National Security Policy, Office of the Prime Minister, Government of the Republic of Kosovo, Pristina

Mali

Board Member: H.E. Ms Aya Thiam-Diallo, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Nigeria

Board Member: Ms Taiwo Mise, Second Secretary, International Organizations Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Abuja on behalf of Ambassador Nonye Udo, Director, Second United Nations Division, International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja

Private Sector

Board Member: Dr Timothy Docking, Leader, Global Post and Emerging Markets Funding Group, IBM, Washington, D.C.

Qatar

Board Member: H.E. Dr Mutlaq Al-Qahtani, Ambassador, Director of International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

Switzerland

Board Member: H.E. Mr Thomas Greminger, Ambassador, Deputy Director General, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland Bern

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

United States of America and the Netherlands

Board Member: Mr Justin Siberell, Acting Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: Mr Wink Joosten, Counterterrorism and National Security Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague on behalf of Ambassador Piet de Klerk, Special Counterterrorism Envoy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Constituency Members: Ms Laila M. Hasan, Policy Advisor, Office of Countering Violent Extremism, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Mr Michael Ortiz, Deputy Coordinator for Countering Violent Extremism, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Ms Alexandria Thoman, Staff Assistant to the Acting Coordinator, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

PRESENTERS

Dr Bruce Jenks, Adjunct Professor, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs, New York

Ms Humera Khan, Executive Director, Muflehun, and Chair of GCERF Independent Review Panel (IRP), Washington, D.C.

Dr Sadaf S. Lakhani, Senior Governance and Fragility Advisor, TrustWorks Global, Washington, D.C.

OBSERVERS

Egypt

Ms Shaymaa Badawi, Counsellor, Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the European Union, Brussels

Indonesia

Dr Petrus R. Golose, Deputy Head for International Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

Mr Wandu Syamsu, Chief of Sub-directorate for Multilateral Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

GCERF Secretariat