

REPORT OF THE 5TH BOARD MEETING

The 5th meeting of the Governing Board (the “Board”) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 13-14 December 2016 in Geneva, Switzerland. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in Annex 1, and the attendance list in Annex 2 of this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, introducing herself and the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser. She thanked Switzerland for being able to host the Board Meeting in the premises of the *Centre International des Conférences de Genève* (CICG). She noted that since the last meeting in June 2016, some highlights of GCERF activities to be presented in greater detail throughout the meeting included the signing of grant agreements with Round 1 grantees, and the beginning stages of implementation of GCERF-funded activities; and invited the Board to watch a short video outlining some of these achievements.

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 a number of observers.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Mr Maqsoud Kruse from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks 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.05/DEC.01: Mr Maqsoud Kruse of the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 5th Board Meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.05/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.02: The agenda for the 5th Board Meeting (BM.05/DOC.01) is approved.

Confirmation of Board Members

2.5 The Chair stated that there had been some changes to Board membership since the last Board Meeting in June 2016. Pursuant to Swiss law, the Board is required to acknowledge these changes in writing.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.03: The Board notes the following changes in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 4th Board meeting:

- a. **Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Ambassador Paul Foley replaces Ambassador Miles Armitage as the Board Member;
- b. **European Union:** Mr Olivier Luyckx replaces Mr Adriaan Van der Meer as the Board Member; and
- c. **Kosovo:** Ms Besa Kabashi-Ramaj replaces Mr Edon Myftari as the Board Member.

Approval of Report of 4th Board Meeting (13-14 June 2016)

2.7 The Chair referred to the Report of the 4th Board Meeting that took place on 13-14 June 2016 in Brussels, Belgium. The Report was sent out in advance of this meeting allowing time for comments, and none were received.

2.8 The Board took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.04: The Board approves the Report of the 4th Board Meeting held from 13-14 June 2016 in Brussels, Belgium, attached as Annex 1 to BM.05/DOC.02.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director to present his report (BM.05/DOC.03).

3.2 The Executive Director welcomed the Board Members and thanked them, the Chair, and the Secretariat team for their hard work.

3.3 The Executive Director noted that this meeting brought to an end GCERF's two year pilot phase, and summarised achievements during this phase.

3.4 First, GCERF has proved the concept on which it was founded; namely that the focus for preventing violent extremism should be at the local level; that there is a funding gap at this local level; and that the most effective way to fill this gap is through a multilateral funding mechanism to complement and bolster the impact of existing funding. He reminded the Board that in other contexts multilateral funding mechanisms have been found to have a number of advantages,

including: galvanising funding for a global challenge, sharing risk, increased access as a result of independence and impartiality, achieving economies of scale, mobilising resources from diverse sources, coordination, global reach, knowledge transfer and technical expertise, and innovation. Across all of these, GCERF has begun to demonstrate its added value.

3.5 Second, GCERF can begin to point to some initial results. Establishing a new institution is one, and the Executive Director reminded the Board that GCERF is the only global fund established without a host institution. GCERF had at the time of the Board meeting mobilised about USD 36 million from 12 government donors plus the EU. Considerable confidence has been built among the first five beneficiary countries. The Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”) established by GCERF are already serving a wider purpose than GCERF’s alone in supporting national responses to violent extremism; whilst the IRP and Board itself also represent unique platforms on PVE. The first grants have been signed, disbursing about USD 15 million, and reaching 12 Principal Recipients (“PRs”), 52 Sub Recipients (“SRs”) and over half a million direct beneficiaries. GCERF is already generating original data through the baseline studies being undertaken by each PR.

3.6 Finally, the Executive Director alerted the Board of ongoing uncertain financial viability for GCERF; and that funding was not yet being allocated to GCERF in an appropriate quantity or quality to allow it to realise its full potential as a multilateral funding mechanism.

Discussion

3.7 The Board Member from the Civil Society constituency thanked the Secretariat for the impressive accomplishments over the two years. He acknowledged the importance of local communities, however reminded that the role of national policy is also key. He also emphasised the importance of partnerships for GCERF. He requested clarification on the statistics presented for women (making up 41% of the total populations reached by GCERF in Round 1), noting that women make up over 50% of the world population, to which the Executive Director responded that women and girls form part of the numbers reached within the categories of youth and vulnerable groups as well, therefore making the overall percentage significantly higher.

3.8 The Board Member from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency highlighted the importance of the upcoming strategy and adaptations to the funding model to address the alerts. Additionally, he requested the Board consider the operational funding shortfalls for GCERF, acknowledging the impressive work of the existing Secretariat staff, but noting its insufficiency.

3.9 There was discussion among Board Members, in particular between the Alternate Board Member of the Netherlands/United States of America constituency and the Board Member of the Switzerland constituency, on whether GCERF should focus exclusively on preventing violent extremism (PVE) or also countering violent extremism (CVE). The Alternate Board Member of the Netherlands/United States of America constituency noted that GCERF had shifted to the terminology PVE over the last year, and encouraged more consistent use of P/CVE; in contrast the Board Member from Switzerland encouraged GCERF to focus on PVE in particular to facilitate engagement with the development sector. The representative from Bangladesh reminded the room that Bangladesh’s engagement with GCERF has been from a prevention perspective.

3.10 The Executive Director informed the Board that one of the implications of considerable earmarked funding is that the Board's decision-making role becomes less critical as decisions on allocating funding have already been made. On the sources of Government funding, he noted that approximately half of GCERF's funding to date had come from development sources; but from only three donors.

3.11 The Board Member from the Canada/United Kingdom constituency was encouraged by the statistics on initial performance and encouraged their wider dissemination. The Executive Director noted that a reporting schedule had been circulated to in country donor representatives and CSMs. He further informed the Board that the Chief Operating Officer ("COO") as well as other Operations staff regularly visit all of GCERF's beneficiary countries, and reach out to donor representatives where possible to provide them with an update on the grant-making process.

3.12 The Alternate Board Member from the Mali/Kenya constituency, acknowledged several visits by the Secretariat to Kenya, including by a consultant focusing on private sector engagement. He reiterated Kenya's interest in mobilising the private sector. The Executive Director reiterated GCERF's willingness to work with Kenya on implementing public-private partnerships with support from the European Commission.

3.13 The representative from France informed the Board of France's increased engagement with and contribution to GCERF in 2016, because of their growing confidence in the GCERF model.

3.14 The Board Member from Qatar highlighted GCERF's impartiality and the credibility gained over the last two years as critical, as bilateral efforts are sometimes not possible in the countries in which GCERF is working. On the UN-mandated National Action Plans on PVE, he urged all countries to finalise and expedite their plans to help GCERF become more effective and strategic. The Board Member reminded the Board that PVE is long-term, and therefore GCERF's objectives should be reflective of this.

3.15 The Board Member from Switzerland applauded GCERF for establishing solid foundations for future work. He reiterated that results would be helpful for resource mobilisation, and reminded the Board that proving results are long term and will take time to prove. He noted the importance of GCERF gaining access to development funding and suggested using the following tools to engage: (i) building on existing development methods, such as results-based management; (ii) continuing to build trust with in country donor representatives by facilitating their access to the CSMs and continuing to share information; and (iii) using GCERF's technical expertise to support the development of National PVE Action Plans, and to ensure they have a focus on reaching local communities.

3.16 The Chair, Board Members, and the Executive Director, thanked the Board Member of the Australia/Japan/New Zealand constituency for bringing their colleague responsible for development policy approaches to P/CVE to participate at the Board meeting, and urged other Board Members to do the same. The Executive Director informed the Board of a funding proposal recently submitted to the United Arab Emirates, and thanked the United States of America and

United Kingdom for facilitating access. He reminded the Board that their role is not necessarily just as donors or representatives of their respective constituencies, but also to improve access to new partners and funding streams.

3.17 Board Members encouraged the Secretariat to develop a more systematic and aggressive communications strategy in particular to facilitate resource mobilisation. The Executive Director agreed that communications materials would be necessary to raise the profile of GCERF's work, however noted that GCERF may not have the funds necessary for these expenses immediately. The Alternate Board Member from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks encouraged marketing materials to include representation and voices from the field. The Executive Director agreed, however reminded the Board of operational security concerns and maintaining the concept of "Do No Harm".

3.18 The Board Member from Foundations welcomed a discussion with the Secretariat on work that the Tony Blair Faith Foundation is doing in this area.

3.19 The representative from Mali expressed satisfaction in their engagement with GCERF and encouraged that, at the appropriate time, established CSMs in GCERF's beneficiary countries be afforded greater responsibility in the grant making processes. He noted that this request was based on lessons learned during the Mali CSM's engagement with GCERF over the last two years. The Executive Director thanked all the CSMs for their proactive engagement and noted that adaptations to the funding model to be presented at this Board Meeting reflected this feedback.

4. GCERF'S STRATEGY

4.1 The Chair reminded the Board that at the 4th Board Meeting in June 2016, the Board requested the Secretariat develop a proposal for a GCERF strategy; and the establishment of a Board strategy reference group.

4.2 The Chair and Executive Director reminded the Board that the presentation of GCERF's strategy would be only the framework upon which the Board would empower the Secretariat to further develop and strengthen a full strategy, to be presented to the Board for their approval in June 2017.

4.3 The Executive Director explained the Secretariat's activities in developing a strategy: (i) following a competitive recruitment process, hiring of Dalberg Global Development Advisors as consultants for developing the strategy; (ii) individual phone calls and a conference call with the Board strategy reference group; and (iii) input from various members of the Secretariat.

Vision, Mission, Mandate

4.4 The Executive Director presented the draft vision, noting the following key terms and providing background on their selection: 'world'; 'local communities'; 'promote'; 'resilient'; 'violent extremism'; and 'flourish'.

4.5 The Executive Director presented the draft mission, noting the following key terms and providing background on their selection: ‘multi-stakeholder’; ‘local communities’; ‘conditions conducive to’; and ‘undermining development’.

Discussion

4.6 Overall, Board Members endorsed the direction in which the mission and vision were being developed, however raised questions about some specific language and requested the Secretariat and consultants work closely with the Board strategy reference group to further refine the mission and vision. The Board requested that the Secretariat develop a fuller strategy, including these elements, and present it to the Board at the June 2017 Board Meeting.

4.7 Board Members requested that the vision provide a positive focus on the end result for the communities that GCERF will reach that should eventually become more stable, secure, inclusive, and therefore more resilient to violent extremism. The representative from the Private Sector constituency noted that this would entice the private sector. The Board Member from Switzerland recommended drawing inspiration from the language found in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16. Board Members also requested that the mission highlight why GCERF is unique, for example in its ability to fill a funding gap, to be independent, innovative, and to operate at the nexus of security and development sectors.

4.8 There was discussion among Board Members about the inclusion of “development” in the proposed GCERF mission. The Board Member from Civil Society noted that promoting development is not necessarily a direct contributor to preventing violent extremism, and cited a Mercy Corps report that showed that populations with a higher rate of education were actually more prone to joining violent extremist groups. He suggested focusing on the underlying conditions conducive to violent extremism and how reducing those can further development goals instead.

4.9 Board Members expressed some concerns on the language of the vision regarding “promote tolerance”. They noted that “tolerance” does not necessarily mean a community will be resilient to violent extremism, and suggested including language around community based “social cohesion” instead. The Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency noted that this would have an implication in terms of GCERF’s programming and activities. There were also suggestions to re-write and deepen understanding of the concept “flourish”.

4.10 The Alternate Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency additionally expressed disappointment that the Board approved at the 4th Board Meeting in June 2016 a proposal for a strategy to be presented at the 5th Board Meeting, which had not yet been realised. The Executive Director apologised that the process had taken longer than envisaged, and re-affirmed that a full strategy would be presented at the Board Meeting in June 2017.

4.11 The Board Member for Civil Society recommended replacing “best placed” when justifying the focus on local communities , as it seemed to indicate instrumentalising these

communities, and suggested instead language on communities being ‘most affected’ by violent extremism.

Key Operating Principles and Definitions

4.12 The consultant from Dalberg presented the following items in draft form: (i) proposed definitions for the following key terms: ‘preventing violent extremism’, ‘violent extremism’, ‘local communities’, and ‘resilience’; and (ii) proposed operating principles drawn from international best practices and discussion with the Secretariat and strategy reference group.

Discussion

4.13 The Board Member from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency wondered why it was necessary to have specific definitions. The Executive Director responded by acknowledging the challenge of defining key terms, however felt that clear definitions would guide GCERF’s grant making and resource mobilisation processes, and help GCERF demonstrate results. GCERF would need to make clear that any definitions developed are for these internal purposes, rather than intended as international statements.

4.14 The Board Member from the Australia/New Zealand/Japan constituency requested inclusion in the operating principles of collaboration, partnership, local community ownership, and avoiding duplication of work being done by others on PVE.

4.15 Board Members from Civil Society and Switzerland suggested elaborating the principle of “Do No Harm” to include explicit and specific reference to GCERF’s work in the PVE space as it compares to, for example, conflict transformation, and including a reference to conflict sensitive programme management. The Board Member from Civil Society recommended strengthening the principle of “Innovation” to reflect how GCERF can incubate new ideas, take risks, and then cascade success to other organisations and donors. He suggested adding language to the principles about GCERF being time-bound.

4.16 The Board Member from Qatar recommended shortening the mission statement. He requested that when thinking about the definition of violent extremism, the Secretariat reconsider the wording “non-state actors” as that is limiting and does not encompass the totality of the problem. Without established and approved definitions, he expressed concerns about being able to endorse a mission and vision.

Theory of Change and Implications

4.17 The Dalberg consultant presented the draft theory of change, including focus on:

- Goals: reduce number of people joining, or being influenced by violent extremist groups; increase number of resilient communities; increase integration of communities in national and international decision making processes.

- Long-term outcomes: communities have more alternatives; national and regional responses are better coordinated; national action plans are effectively implemented; local, national, and global decision makers are better informed and aligned.
- Short-term outcomes: better PVE programmes; more local organisations contributing to PVE; increased collaboration between PVE stakeholders; increased knowledge around PVE.
- Activities: fund PVE initiatives; connect and share lessons learned with PVE stakeholders; innovate, learn, research.

Discussion

4.18 The Alternate Board Member from Foundations suggested including emphasis on why communities are vulnerable to violent extremism into the theory of change. Additionally, he noted that the short-term and long-term outcomes proposed were based on assumptions, and noted that for community resilience, GCERF would need an analysis of why communities are not resilient before formulating a theory of change. He noted that better articulating this would help GCERF to mobilise resources.

4.19 The representative from the Private Sector recommended simplifying the theory of change and limiting the examples so that they are measurable. Additionally, she recommended adding specific language on proof of concept and GCERF's multi-stakeholder approach.

4.20 Board Members expressed concerns with the proposed theory of change language around producing research in the PVE field. They cautioned against GCERF encroaching on other organisations' territory, and recommended GCERF produce lessons learned and good practices from the field to feed into the development of broader PVE research produced by Policy, Think, and Do Tanks. The Executive Director agreed, reiterating that GCERF would consider how strategically to partner with strong, existing research institutions to contribute to the wider community of practice.

4.21 Board Members recommended elaborating the theory of change to include details on the Board's function, role, responsibility, and accountability to delineate more clearly what the role of the Secretariat is vis-à-vis the Board. The Board Member from Civil Society recommending adding "providing/supporting an enabling environment that enables a community's resilience building" to the long-term outcomes proposed in the theory of change.

4.22 A representative from Australia/New Zealand/Japan constituency emphasised the objectives should be clear, realistic and measurable, and each individual grant's monitoring and evaluation needs to be linked to the short and long term outcomes, noting there is a leap between the activities and whether they will achieve these outcomes. She requested adding language around 'scalability' and 'sustainability' which is a key part of any theory of change, in particular for GCERF to be able to demonstrate how the sum will be greater than its parts. She also noted the relevance of conflict prevention and peace-building programmes' monitoring and evaluation frameworks given they also have to address attribution and contribution, and proving the counter-factual.

4.23 Board Members agreed that GCERF should draw on pre-existing methods and resources for monitoring and evaluation, for example from conflict transformation. The Alternate Board Member from the European Union requested that entry '1A' in the draft Theory of Change be clarified to add "community-level" to the activities proposed. Additionally, whilst many of the theory of change boxes refer to better coordination in PVE efforts, he cautioned that GCERF should focus on its core activities of delivery of grants to local community organisations rather than exploring new areas of activities.

4.24 The representative from France suggested adding a reference on "monitoring and evaluation" to the proposed actions in '1A'.

Potential Strategy

4.25 The Executive Director reiterated that at the 6th Board Meeting in June 2017, GCERF will present the strategy. The Dalberg consultant presented an overview of what this strategy might comprise: (i) mission and vision; (ii) activities and timelines for GCERF's operations, including implementing the mission and achieving the vision, and what types of programmes GCERF should be funding, which partners, what regions, etc.; (iii) resources and capabilities, including what is the budget, what support and actions are required from the Board Members, competences of staff members, where should GCERF be located; (iv) organisational structure and governance, including how to organise the Secretariat; and (v) key performance indicators and how to track whether GCERF is achieving its results.

Discussion

4.26 The Board Member from Foundations recommended that the Board undertake a general discussion on what GCERF is, the direction of the strategy, and then delegate further work to the strategy reference group and the Secretariat to further elaborate the strategy prior to presentation to the Board.

4.27 The Board requested that the strategy reference group, Secretariat, and consultants briefly present to the Board at the June 2017 meeting an outline of the process through which the strategy was developed. Per requests from the Board, the Chair requested that the Secretariat finalise the draft strategy and circulate it to the Board for their comments by mid-May 2017, at least 6 weeks ahead of the June 2017 Board Meeting.

4.28 The Board took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. takes note of the draft Vision, Mission, theory of change, operating principles and key definitions presented in BM.05/DOC.04;
- b. requests the Secretariat to make revisions to these documents based on feedback received from the Board with a special emphasis on GCERF's added value;

- c. requests the Strategic Reference Group to guide the Secretariat in the development of the strategic plan; and
- d. requests the draft version of the strategic plan be available for Board review no later than 15 May 2017 and a proposed final version be presented to the Board for approval at its June 2017 meeting.

5. ADAPTATIONS TO THE FUNDING MODEL

5.1 The Chair introduced the background to the adaptations to the funding model which sought to make it more efficient and effective. The Executive Director reiterated that the adaptations proposed had been developed in consultation with, and endorsed by, various national stakeholders, including CSMs.

Country and Regional Strategies

5.2 The Chief Operating Officer (“COO”) presented the first proposed adaptation to the funding model (BM.05/DOC.05) on the adoption of country and regional strategies. The COO outlined that the purpose of developing country strategies was to ensure that GCERF funding effectively contributes to the implementation of National P/CVE Strategies, is contextualised to current conditions; and builds upon existing efforts in each country. It was proposed that the development of regional strategies begin with an initial focus on the Horn of Africa/East Africa and West Africa/Sahel. Both country and regional strategies would be developed in consultation with the relevant CSMs before presentation to the Board for approval.

Discussion

5.3 Board Members largely expressed support for GCERF adopting country and regional approaches in order to allow GCERF funding to: (i) be more effective; (ii) be more targeted; and (iii) better contribute to the implementation of National P/CVE Strategies.

5.4 There was discussion among Board Members about the priority between country and regional strategies, with the Board Member for Switzerland noting that a regional approach was less urgent as GCERF’s focus should be on deepening, not broadening its engagement. In contrast, the representative from Kosovo noted that, in her experience, the Balkans region as a whole was late in responding to the threat of violent extremism and therefore commended a regional approach from the outset. She further informed the Board that, based on lessons learned in Kosovo, a lack of coordination and information sharing at a regional level creates room for duplication and an inability to respond quickly to the ever-evolving threats of violent extremism.

5.5 Some Board Members expressed confusion about the role that GCERF’s country and regional strategies would have in relation to National P/CVE Strategies/Action Plans already under development. They cautioned against duplication. The Alternate Board Member for Foundations informed the Secretariat of the ‘National Action Plans Taskforce’ being led by the United Kingdom in collaboration with Hedayah. The COO clarified that the proposed strategies

aimed at ensuring that GCERF funding more effectively reaches local communities, and in this way contributes to the implementation of National P/CVE Strategies.

5.6 The Board Member from Civil Society wondered what role GCERF could have in bringing civil society into the implementation of National Action Plans. He also recommended including cross-border civil society in the development of regional plans.

5.7 Board Members urged that any country or regional strategies be developed in coordination and consultation with in-country donor representatives, civil society, the private sector, and any other organisations working on P/CVE. The COO noted GCERF's commitment to wide consultations in the development of country strategies, and reiterated that the development of any country strategies would be in consultation with various national and international stakeholders.

5.8 Board Members expressed concern that the country and regional approach would be a strain on the Secretariat's limited staffing and resources and recommended separating the processes and staggering them over 2017. The Alternate Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency recommended flexibility in seeking Board approval to accommodate rapidly changing contexts.

5.9 The Board Member from the Canada/United Kingdom constituency sought clarification on whether the country strategies would be public.

5.10 The representative from the Kosovo constituency emphasised the importance of qualitative as well as quantitative data; and noted that achieving a locally-driven solution to the challenges of violent extremism may require less strict rules on finance and transparency.

5.11 The representative from the Private Sector constituency cautioned against utilising the term "strategy" in this context, preferring "strategic direction".

5.12 The Alternate Board Member from the Mali/Kenya constituency expressed concern over the role, membership and functioning of the CSM. He asked how money is disbursed to local organisations, and what the decision making processes and actors have been in that disbursement chain.

Diversification of funding streams, refinement of decision making processes, and evolution of CSMs and IRP

5.13 The COO presented the second proposed adaptation to the funding model (BM.05/DOC.05) on the diversification of funding streams, with specific focus on: (i) the different characteristics of different funding streams; (ii) the link to country and regional strategies; (iii) adaptation of the CFM and AFM; and (iv) the challenge of different performance measurement frameworks for different funding streams.

5.14 The COO presented the third proposed adaptation to the funding model (BM.05/DOC.05) on the refinements to decision making processes and devolution of grant approval to country

level. The COO noted the intent of these proposals was to optimise the efficacy, speed, and flexibility of GCERF processes, and to encourage national ownership and wide-stakeholder engagement. Specifically, the adaptations proposed included: (i) devolution of individual grant approval to a sub-committee of the CSM; (ii) devolution of potential grantee selection to the Secretariat; and (iii) in both instances, undertaken within the parameters of a Board-approved country strategy and established technical capacity requirements.

5.15 Finally, the COO presented the fourth proposed adaptation to the funding model (BM.05/DOC.05) on evolution of the CSMs and IRP, specifically: (i) evolution of the CSM to take a more active role in coordination and facilitation of implementation of National P/CVE Strategies/Action Plans, (ii) allocation of relevant IRP expertise to directly support CSMs; and (iii) the possibility for the Secretariat to provide surge capacity and temporary secondments to the CSMs.

5.16 Board Members expressed support for the overall purpose of the proposed adaptations, namely to improve the efficiency of GCERF's grant making.

5.17 Board Members expressed concern at the lack of representation of the international donor community on the CSMs, and risk that this would be reflected subsequently in the CSM Funding Committees; and whether the IRP would continue to have independence and neutrality and how it would continue to serve in an advisory role to the Board.

5.18 The Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency, expressed support for the impartial and honest feedback provided by the IRP on the National Applications, and raised concerns that this risks being lost in the adaptations to the funding model. The COO explained that the proposed adaptations were in fact intended to strengthen the IRP's role to advise the Board, not diminish it. Specifically, at the strategic level the IRP would be involved in providing advice on country and regional strategies; and at the operational level the IRP would bolster the CSMs.

5.19 The Chair of the IRP requested clarification on several points, including: (i) the role of impartiality and independence of the IRP, and what happens when there are disagreements between members of the CSM Funding Committee; and (ii) IRP members in-country role and how they would be supported. The Chair of the IRP also noted that the IRP was being under-utilised by the Board in their advisory roles; but equally warned against over-burdening IRP members who serve on a voluntary basis.

5.20 Board Members noted the importance of continued engagement by the Secretariat with their donor representatives in country. The Board Member from the Canada/United Kingdom constituency reiterated the purpose of consulting with in country counterparts during the pilot phase was to help strengthen and refine the funding model.

5.21 The Board Member from Switzerland noted that, in four out of five GCERF beneficiary countries, Switzerland's engagement and participation in the CSMs had not always been positive or encouraging. He recommended that the Secretariat further engage with the Swiss and other counterparts in country to build trust within the donor community.

5.22 The COO reminded the donor Board representatives that, as part of the due diligence and risk assessment process, donor representatives in country were contacted to participate in reference checks for any shortlisted grantees. He noted that there were different levels of donor engagement in GCERF's beneficiary countries, and committed that the Secretariat would seek to replicate those successful examples of effective engagement and coordination elsewhere. The COO encouraged the Board to engage with their in-country counterparts in order to ensure internal coordination and an agreed approach towards GCERF at a country level.

5.23 Several Board Members noted that the ability of the CSM Funding Committee to function would vary, given the differing levels of capacity between each country's CSM. This was noted as a potential risk and issue with the proposed adaptations to the funding model.

5.24 The Alternate Board Member from Switzerland wanted to clarify that the CSM Funding Committee would be a national committee and not a specific GCERF committee, and therefore would not be covered by GCERF's Ethics of Code. He proposed that the policy should be expanded to include these committees, and require that they also sign declarations of ethics and conflicts of interest forms, which was supported by the COO.

5.25 The Alternate Board Member from the European Union welcomed the diversification of funding streams, in particular piloting the approach with private sector engagement in Kenya. He mentioned various other funding streams for the European Union (UNICRI, Hedayah) and questioned how GCERF positions itself within the context of multilateral and bilateral funding already adopted in some of GCERF's beneficiary countries, such as Kenya. He noted that the grant between GCERF and the European Union would need to be re-examined and potentially re-negotiated in light of any adaptations to the GCERF grant decision making process.

5.26 The COO reminded of the opportunity for Board Members to join the CSMs, which might accommodate EU concerns. The Alternate Board Member from the European Union noted that given the nature and restrictions of European Union grants to GCERF, they would have to be part of every GCERF beneficiary country's CSM Funding Committee in order to support activities in the respective countries if the approval of grant applications would be devolved to the CSMs. The Board Member from United States of America/Netherlands constituency recommended that the Board continue to oversee the CSM selection of potential grantees.

5.27 A number of specific edits to the proposed decision language were proposed by various Board members, and reflected in the final decision.

5.28 Per the suggestion of the Board Member from the Australia/New Zealand/Japan constituency, it was agreed that the proposed model would be trialled in one beneficiary country (Kenya) to capture lessons learned and experiences before coming back to the Board for approval of expansion into other countries.

5.29 The Board revised the proposed decision including Board feedback and comments, and took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.06: The Board:

- a. notes the proposed adaptations to the Funding Model as described in BM.05/DOC.05;
- b. approves the Secretariat in consultation with all relevant stakeholders to develop country strategies which may include proposals for the diversification of funding streams to be approved by the Board;
- c. agrees in principle with the potential benefits of refining decision-making processes and the modalities of the Country Support Mechanisms and the Independent Review Panel, and
- d. requests the Secretariat in the process of developing country strategies to consult on and explore the modalities and implications of the devolution of grant approval to a country level, prior to the presentation of these and the country strategies to the Board.

6. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

6.1 The Chair invited the Chair of the Ethics Committee and Alternate Board Member for Switzerland to provide the Board with an update on the activities of the Ethics Committee (BM.05/DOC.07).

Status Update

6.2 The Chair of the Ethics Committee reported that no conflict of interest had been found or reported since the 4th Board Meeting in June 2016. He thanked the Secretariat's Ethics Officer, Ms Carole Beilleau, for her contribution to the report.

7. GOVERNANCE

Review of Board Performance

7.1 As per the Bylaws, the Chair will send out a self-assessment survey for every Board Member and Alternate Board Member, and encouraged every member to complete it and self-reflect.

Review of Executive Director Performance

7.2 As per the Bylaws and in continuation of last year, the Chair will convene a number of Board Members to conduct a mandated review of the Executive Director's performance and will report back at the June 2017 meeting.

Review of Chair Performance

7.3 The Chair will organise the review of the performance of the Chair of the Governing Board for the June 2017 Board Meeting.

8. FINANCIAL MATTERS

Selection and Introduction of External Auditors

8.1 Representatives from BDO, the audit firm selected by the Board in November, presented how BDO intends to plan and conduct their audit of GCERF, with particular focus on: (i) introduction of the BDO team, key focal points for GCERF, and international and national presence; (ii) management responsibilities and the role of the Board; (iii) engagement objectives; (iv) overall audit strategy and planned scope; (v) primary area of focus, audit strategy, and potential key audit matters; (vi) the overall audit timeline; (vii) presentation of fees that are fixed for three years; (viii) independence and communication; and (ix) responding to GCERF's needs and BDO's commitments to meet those needs.

Review of the Funding Situation

8.2 The Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") presented an overview of the funding situation, highlighting: (i) that GCERF contributions received in 2016 amounted to approximately USD 15 million, with about 50 percent in restricted funding, and noting that about 75 percent of total contributions are confirmed; (ii) that to date funding for grant commitments amounts to USD 21.3 million, USD 10.7m having already been committed with new CFM commitments likely to reach USD 9.916m for Kenya, Kosovo and Mali and AFM commitments USD 0.4m; (iv) thanking the USA and Switzerland for their prompt reaction to the funding situation presented in June 2016 and additional contributions to the Secretariat's operating expenses; and (v) thanking Canada and the United Kingdom for their contributions towards the Secretariat's monitoring and evaluation function. The implications of the combination of restricted and unrestricted funding were also discussed.

8.3 The Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency, asked whether contributions made by governments included a certain percentage for operating costs. The CFO clarified that the policy on contributions specifies that 15 percent of unrestricted contributions may be used towards operating expenses.

Approval of 2017 Proposed Budget

8.4 The CFO presented the proposed budget for 2017, starting with presentation of the various workstreams on which the workplans and associated budgets were developed. The assumptions used in developing the budget, associated risks and the details of the expense budget in particular were presented to the Board.

8.5 This section was not discussed for lack of time.

8.6 The Board Member from Qatar, asked the Secretariat to elaborate on the classification of Secretariat expenses by function (operations, executive office, external relations, corporate services and common costs).

8.7 The Board Member for Australia/Japan/New Zealand asked about the intended trajectory to reach a situation where operating expenses would represent about 15-20 percent of grants. The Secretariat confirmed its understanding and concern over this issue as evidenced by the indicators in the Financial Management Framework around this question. While the Secretariat is in the process of stabilising its costs to manage the current funding mechanism, the addition of new funding mechanisms may increase them. The ratio is also naturally dependent on the size of the funding. The ratio will evolve for a number of years until all systems are developed and up and running. With a stable and sufficient level of funding, the ratio would be expected to level off over time.

8.8 The Alternate Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency asked about the status of the possible second round in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria. He also expressed concern that the case may not have sufficiently been made to double the number of staff in the Secretariat. The Executive Director explained that while the Secretariat was prepared to initiate a second round of funding in the pilot countries, no funding was yet available. He reminded of the commitment made to pilot countries of three rounds of funding. He also explained that the staff was not doubling, as 17 positions had been approved last year and this was being extended to 23 requested this year. He provided additional detailed information on the nature and purpose of the new positions.

8.9 Picking up on a point made during the Secretariat presentation, the Alternate Board Member for Foundations raised the issue of constituting financial reserves which in his experience could be 3 months for GCERF at this point but should aim at 6 months as recommended by the UK Charity Commission.

8.10 The Board Member for Policy, Think and Do Tanks remarked on the organisation of the information provided to the Board on the budget, asking for more strategic information in future. He reiterated the point about financial reserves and also discussed the issue of the ratio of operating costs to grants which he thinks should realistically aim for between 18 to 23 percent.

8.11 The Board Member for Canada/United Kingdom asked the Secretariat to remove the cost of meetings for the Strategy Reference Group, suggesting that participants should fund their own participation.

8.12 The Board Member for the European Union reminded the Board of the importance of incorporating resource mobilisation in the discussions on the strategy.

8.13 The Board Member for the Netherlands/United States of America thanked the Secretariat for its explanation of the increase in staff but also queried the consistency of those decisions with the fact that no new grants will be issued. He also asked for confirmation that the funding gap on operating costs would be bridged by additional funding based on the 15 percent allocation. The Secretariat explained the numerous activities that need to take place for effective grant management, especially when dealing with grantees that may not always be strong organisations. It also explained the increased emphasis that is expected to be placed on new areas such as Monitoring and Evaluation or Capacity Strengthening. The Secretariat also confirmed the Board Member's understanding that assuming a steady increase in resource mobilisation, the 15% contribution should suffice to cover all operating expenses.

8.14 A representative from Switzerland commended the Secretariat for presenting a realistic budget in such a transparent manner. She supported the view that grant management was an extremely labour intensive activity. She also asked for more information on staff roles and responsibilities to be shared in future budget documents.

8.15 The Alternate Board Member from the Canada/UK constituency requested addition to the decision language with specific reference to potential cost savings being identified and reported on. The Executive Director noted this, and reassured Board members that savings remain a priority for the Secretariat.

8.16 The Board approved the 2017 annual budget, noting the following: (i) that GCERF continues to budget and operate from a savings perspective; (ii) that hiring of staff should be graduated over 2017, and (iii) noting the Board's reluctance to approve any further increases in operating expenses in 2017, in particular with regards to staff. The Board took the following decision:

BM.05/DEC.07: The Board:

- a. approves the 2017 budget as follows:
 - Revenue: USD 21.488m
 - Expenses, including grant commitments and operational expenses: USD 28.130m; and
- b. notes that the proposed 2017 budget is only partially funded, and calls on donors to ensure that new resources are secured.

9. NATIONAL APPLICATIONS: FUNDING DECISIONS

9.1 The Chair invited the Chief Operating Officer ("COO") to present an overview of the national applications and funding decisions proposed to the Board.

9.2 The COO presented BM.05/DOC.13 on National Applications: Funding Decisions. In particular, he provided information on: (i) background of the Board approvals with regards to Round 2 funding in Mali; (ii) an overview of the launch of a second round of funding in Mali in the period June – November 2016; (iii) Consortium Proposals from AMSS, ENDA, and SECO-ONG, their main focus population groups and proposed initiatives; (iv) summary of comments and feedback from the Mali CSM and the IRP; and (v) outline of next steps.

Report of the IRP

9.3 The Chair of the IRP, Ms Humera Khan, presented a consolidated summary of the IRP's comments on the Round 2 Mali National Application. She expressed broad support from the IRP for the three proposed applications, however noted that there were some concerns from the IRP that need to be addressed in order for the programmes to achieve their objectives. In particular, she noted the following caveats: (i) that the Secretariat work with grantees to ensure there is no duplication of work between organisations; (ii) that organisations undertaking training or awareness raising focused specifically on PVE, and not conflict prevention or resolution 're-packaged' as PVE; and (iii) that all three organisations develop baselines and end-lines to effectively monitor their programmes, in order to contribute to develop good practices and lessons learned.

Discussion

9.4 Board Members emphasised the need to ensure that GCERF funding focuses on PVE. The COO took note and reiterated the introduction of a GCERF Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning ("MEAL") Framework in order to strengthen the PVE-specificity of existing and potential grantees (to be put into place in early 2017), in addition to launching of communities of practice among current grantees in each country in which GCERF operates.

9.5 The representative from France expressed France's support for continued GCERF focus on Mali as a beneficiary country, and welcomed the Mali National P/CVE Strategy that is still under development. She looked forward to seeing how GCERF complements the implementation of their strategy. She informed the Board that France's in-country representatives had provided positive feedback on the grantees and proposals shortlisted by GCERF.

9.6 The Board Member from Foundations noted that ideology should be a key concern and that she would have liked to see consideration of the ideological drivers of extremism, in the Mali proposals. She offered that relevant Secretariat staff working on country programmes, could meet with the Tony Blair Faith Foundation to learn more about similar programming that is taking place in other contexts, if they are interested.

9.7 The Board Member from Civil Society expressed support for the strength of the proposals and endorsed their relevance with regards to the situation in Mali. He noted that with regards to AMSS, donors have in the past been concerned with continuing funding to them given their rapid

expansion and growth. He recommended the CSM and Secretariat work with AMSS on their organisational development to avoid being unable to deliver their initiatives.

9.8 The Alternate Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency expressed support for the second round of funding in Mali given its ongoing challenges. He requested further information on the composition of the Mali CSM, which he understood has two representatives from the donor community as members. The COO responded that while GCERF engagement with donor representatives from international donor countries has been strengthened and systematised in 2016, the membership and participation of representatives of the international donor community on the CSM was determined by the CSM Chair and CSM, not the Secretariat.

9.9 A representative from Switzerland expressed support for a second round of funding in Mali and that GCERF's focus has been on deepening its reach, rather than expanding. She relayed comments from Switzerland's in-country representatives, noting the following points: (i) the need for greater donor representation on CSMs; and (ii) that whilst in country representatives may not always wish to participate formally in the CSM, they would want to receive information. She also noted that GCERF programmes should be PVE-specific, substantive, and impact-focused.

9.10 The representative from the Mali/Kenya constituency provided some comments on behalf of the Mali CSM, which included: (i) reiterating that the need for GCERF interventions in Mali is ongoing and thanking the various GCERF stakeholders for their engagement and work; (ii) that the National Application has been developed in coordination with the potential grantees, CSM, Secretariat, and recommendations from the IRP; (iii) noted the relevance and alignment of the applications with the Mali National P/CVE Strategy under development and noted that both rounds of funding will take place within this framework; (iv) that the Government of Mali is in the process of developing its National P/CVE Strategy with support from the UN and specifically a UN Secretariat to help monitor implementation.

9.11 The Board approved BM.05/DEC.08 on National Applications: Funding Decisions, revised to take into account comments from the Board:

BM.05/DEC.08: The Board:

- a. welcomes the National Application submitted by the Mali Country Support Mechanisms ("CSMs") and the recommendations and feedback provided by the Independent Review Panel ("IRP") as detailed in BM.05/DOC.13;
- b. approves the National Application of the Mali CSM as presented in Annex 2 "Mali National Application – Second Round of Funding" of BM.05/DOC.13;
- c. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the finalisation of grant agreements with the selected Potential Principal Recipients ("PPRs") as described in Section 8 "Next Steps" in BM.05/DOC.13;

- d. authorises the Secretariat to enter into grant agreements with the selected PPRs identified in BM.05/DOC.13, for a total of not more than USD 2 million;
- e. requests that at the 6th Board Meeting to be held in 2017, the Secretariat: (i) report back to the Board on the status of the commitment of funding in Mali, including any substantive changes in the proposed use of funding as a result of the conclusion of grant agreements; and (ii) provide recommendations on the use of any remaining balances from the allocated funds.

10. STATUS UPDATE ON OPERATIONS

10.1 The Chair invited the Chief Operating Officer (“COO”) to present.

Wave 1 Rounds 1 and 2: Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria and Wave 2 Round 1: Kenya and Kosovo

10.2 The COO presented BM.05/DOC.12 status update on the activities of the Core Funding Mechanism (“CFM”). In particular, he summarised for the Board the following key Operations achievements: (i) the signing of 12 grant agreements, disbursements, grant management and implementation of special conditions for Round 1 grantees in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria; (ii) the development and launch of a Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (“MEAL”) Framework and initiative; (iii) the launch of a second round of funding in Mali, however noting the continued lack of funding for a second round in Bangladesh and Nigeria; (iv) the funding secured for launch of CFM activities in Kenya and Kosovo, with grant making beginning in Kenya, the establishment of the CSM, and the launch of Calls for Expressions of Interest and preliminary shortlist of potential grantees under the CFM in Kosovo; and (v) the elaboration of options for GCERF engagement in Myanmar with the support of a commissioned consultant.

Myanmar

10.3 The consultant for Myanmar presented his findings and draft report on options for GCERF engagement in Myanmar. In particular, he noted: (i) conclusions from interviews and surveys highlight the growing threat of community-level violent extremism in Myanmar and the growing need for GCERF engagement there; (ii) the funding gap that exists at a local level among communities, however noting there is a renewed interest and commitment from the government to support them; and (iii) a number of options for how GCERF can engage with the Government of Myanmar.

Discussion

10.4 Board Members encouraged GCERF engagement in Myanmar and urged the Secretariat to continue and accelerate its activities, given the interest and support from the Government of Myanmar as suggested by the consultant, and GCERF’s unique ability to reach local communities that are vulnerable to the effects of violent extremism.

10.5 The Alternate Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency recalled his earlier question on the Board identifying geographic, thematic, and demographic foci for a second round of funding in Bangladesh and Nigeria. The COO reminded the Board that at the 4th Board Meeting in June 2016, the Board decided to delay renewed engagement for a second round of funding in Bangladesh or Nigeria due to the lack of available funding. He reminded the Board of their decision to wait until there was additional secured funding for second rounds of funding in both countries before Needs Assessments were commissioned and a new decision on foci presented to the Board.

10.6 The Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency posited whether Rakhine state was defined as a combat zone, and therefore if GCERF signed a Memorandum of Understanding (“MoU”) with the relevant Government Ministries, whether it would be able to work in that region. The consultant from Myanmar clarified that the Government of Myanmar has agreed to treat Rakhine State as a non-conflict zone.

10.7 The Board Member from the Australia/Japan/New Zealand constituency registered strong support for the renewed engagement with Myanmar and the hope that it would become a recipient of GCERF funding, consistent with the broadening of GCERF’s geographic focus to also cover Southeast Asia.

11. RESOURCE MOBILISATION

Update on Resource Mobilisation

11.1 The Executive Director presented BM.05/DOC.14 update on resource mobilisation, in particular highlighting that the team had: (i) raised approximately USD 16 million in 2016 should the current pledges be realised; (ii) strengthened partnerships with existing and new donors, with particular focus on further funding from existing donors and assessing alternative funding streams; (iii) focused on diversification of funding, in particular with GCTF and DAC countries that were not yet GCERF donors; foundations; and the private sector; and (iv) that there were challenges to the Secretariat’s capacity, given the modest number of staff responsible for resource mobilisation, the need to develop an IT plan, and regularly review and update external communications.

Private Sector Engagement Plan

11.2 A Senior Adviser from the Secretariat presented the private sector engagement plan and provided the Board with an update on GCERF activities in engaging the private sector. In terms of GCERF’s current engagement and for background, she reminded the Board of: (i) Accenture, Goldman Sachs, IBM, and Fifth Tribe representation as the private sector constituency of the Board; (ii) varied private sector representation on the CSMs (for example, Microsoft on the Nigeria CSM, a regional Chamber of Commerce on the Bangladesh CSM, business alliances on the Kosovo CSM); (iii) the 2017 launch of the co-financing public-private partnership pilot programme in Kenya; (iv) continued in-kind contributions from various private sector corporations (Accenture, IBM, KPMG in the past, and commitments in 2017 from Accenture to

host a GCERF meeting in Davos, Google to host the June 2017 Board Meeting in London, and Microsoft to provide resources to GCERF grantees); and (v) GCERF as a 'thought leader' in harnessing enterprise to support PVE.

11.3 She presented the findings of the external scoping consultancy, including the need to (i) make a business case, (ii) identify GCERF's added-value, (iii) focus on industry- and country-specific efforts, and (iv) develop a 'menu of options' for engagement of the private sector; and noting risks and challenges.

11.4 She presented the following objectives for the Secretariat throughout 2017 and 2018 on private sector engagement: (i) compile lessons learned from the EU-funded public-private partnership in Kenya and share those with the wider community; (ii) further grow the Board constituency and CSM participation; (iii) develop specific 'menus of options'; (iv) develop models and/or pipelines for companies directly to support GCERF's grantees; (v) identify national and international corporate champions; and (vi) attract further in-kind contributions to support the Secretariat's immediate needs.

11.5 Finally, she identified the following ways in which the Governing Board can better contribute to furthering GCERF's private sector engagement: (i) facilitate introduction to corporate partners; and (ii) identify priority partners and industries in GCERF beneficiary countries.

Discussion

11.6 The representative from the Private Sector made the following comments: (i) that whilst the business case is clear in terms of the interest in PVE to the private sector, the business case has not been clearly made on how and why the private sector can intervene, and she recommended engaging the private sector in development of the case; (ii) recommended separating and delineating the different ways that the private sector can engage, for example contributions to GCERF as an organisation and to its beneficiaries; (iii) recommended engaging with the development sectors of GCERF donors that have existing private sector relationships; and (iv) use existing examples such as the White House's convening on the refugee crisis whose communications and in kind commitments were very meaningful. Finally, she urged that GCERF be open to adopting blended and innovative financing, such as social impact bonds, once the organisation matures, as this would facilitate access to larger pools of money.

11.7 The representative from the Australia/New Zealand/Japan constituency reiterated Japan's commitment and contribution to GCERF. He also welcomed further engagement with Japan's in-country representatives and participation on the CSM.

11.8 The Board Member from the United States of America/Netherlands constituency posed the following two questions: (i) on the public-private partnership pilot programme in Kenya, seeks clarification on how this would be routed through the CSM and how the Secretariat will locate private sector partners on the ground; and (ii) how the country strategies will identify a funding goal to implement those strategies, and then utilise a prospectus on how to raise funds on that country basis (noting that unrestricted and global funding remains the primary goal of

resource mobilisation). He encouraged this as a method and tool to assist the Board in raising funds. The COO clarified that the public-private partnership from the EU is funded through the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (“AFM”), worked through a funding sub-committee of the Board and on a rolling grants approval. The Executive Director clarified that the country strategies would identify the different relevant funding streams.

11.9 Board Members encouraged each other to leverage any opportunity to showcase and promote GCERF’s activities, in particular among senior members of their Government.

11.10 Board Members encouraged the Secretariat to explore ways to further engage with the UN (in particular UN CTITF, UN CTC, etc.), noting its absence as an observer at the Board Meeting, and encouraged the Secretariat to explore how to leverage the funding the UN receives.

11.11 The Alternate Board Member from the European Union encouraged further contributions to the AFM and the public-private partnership.

11.12 The representative from the Australia/New Zealand/Japan constituency offered the Secretariat be introduced to private sector engagement and innovation hubs within the Australian Government. A Senior Adviser from the Secretariat thanked the Board Member from Australia for this, and extended appreciation for the generous financial contributions made by her colleagues (including High Commissioner to Nigeria, Mr Paul Lehmann) at the Australian High Commission in Nigeria in June; the gift covered the expenses of a lunch event in Lagos for nearly fifty members of the private sector.

12. CONCLUDING REMARKS

12.1 The Executive Director thanked the Board Members for their presence, participation, and engagement. He reflected on some of the challenges and successes of the Board Meeting, and welcomed the frank and open exchanges during the meeting as a sign of increased Board engagement and ownership over GCERF and its processes. He thanked the Secretariat and observers for their participation in the meeting, and in particular welcomed further conversations from any observers who had outstanding questions or thoughts on how to partner with GCERF.

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

12.3 The Chair adjourned the meeting.

ANNEX 1

BM.05/DOC.01: AGENDA

MONDAY 12 DECEMBER 2016

Location – Conference Room 18, International Conference Centre (CICG), 17 Rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva

Time	Event
15:00 - 17:00	Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome) Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Member of Ethics Committee
17:00 – 18:30	Donors' Meeting Board Chair / Executive Director

TUESDAY 13 DECEMBER 2016

Location – Conference Room 18, International Conference Centre (CICG), 17 Rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
08:30 - 09:00	Registration		
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 the 4th Board Meeting on 13-14 June 2016 	DOC.01 DOC.02 (for decision)	Board Chair
09:30 - 10:30	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.03 (for information)	Executive Director
10:30 - 10:45	Coffee break		
10:45 - 12:45	GCERF's Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision / Mission / Mandate • Key Operating Principles • Implications 	DOC.04 (for decision)	Executive Director
12:45 - 14:00	Buffet Lunch		
14:00 - 15:30	Adaptations to the Funding Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation and piloting of working modalities • Diversification of funding streams • Refinement of decision making processes • Evolution of CSMs and IRP 	DOC.05 (for decision)	Executive Director / Chief Operating Officer
15:30 - 15:45	Coffee break		
15:45 - 16:45	Country and Regional Plans for Grant-Making in 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional and Country Strategies • Country strategy led fund allocation • Devolution of grant approval to country level • Country Plans for 2017 • 	DOC.06 (for information)	Executive Director/ Chief Operating Officer
16:45 - 17:00	Report of the Ethics Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status Update 	DOC.07 (for information)	Chair of Ethics Committee
17:00-18:00	Welcome Reception		

WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2016

Location – Conference Room 18, International Conference Centre (CICG), 17 Rue de Varembé, 1202 Geneva

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
8:30 - 10:00	Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the funding situation • Approval of 2017 proposed budget • Selection of external auditors • Review of financial management performance framework 	DOC.08 (for information) DOC.09 (for decision) DOC.10 (for information) DOC.11 (for information)	Chief Financial Officer
10:00-10:15	Coffee Break		
10:15- 12:00	Status Update on Operations National Applications: Funding Decisions	DOC.12 (for information) DOC.13 (for decision)	Chief Operating Officer / Chair of the IRP
12:00 – 13:00	Buffet Lunch		
13:00 - 14:00	Resource Mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Resource Mobilisation • Private Sector Engagement Plan 	DOC.14 (for information)	Executive Director/Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer
14:00 - 14:15	Any Other Business		Executive Director/ Board Chair
14:15	End of the meeting		
14:15 - 15:30	Strategy Reference Group		Members only



ANNEX 2
5th GCERF Board Meeting
13-14 December 2016
Geneva, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

Board Member: Mr David Nethery, Assistant Secretary Counter-Terrorism Branch, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra on behalf of H.E. Mr Paul Foley, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

Alternate Board Member: Ms Alexandra Reuhman, Policy Adviser, Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations Office in Geneva on behalf of H.E. Mr Carl Worker, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand

Constituency Members:

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

Ms Victoria Coakley, Director Fragility and Conflict, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, Canberra

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

Bangladesh

Board Member: Mr Md. Nazrul Islam, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office in Geneva on behalf of H.E. Mr

Md. Shahidul Haque, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: Ms Sue Breeze, 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: Mr Jamie Bell, Director, Capacity-Building Programs to Counter Terrorism and Transnational Crime, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

European Union

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

Constituency Member:

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

Foundations

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr Alistair Millar, Executive Director, Global Center on Cooperative Security, New York

France

Mr Thomas Wagner, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Ms Clarisse Gérardin, Counsellor for Human Rights, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Kosovo

Board Member: Ms Besa Kabashi-Ramaj, Security Advisor, Office of the Prime Minister, Government of the Republic of Kosovo, Pristina

Constituency Member: Dr Shqipe Mjekiqi, Senior Political Advisor to the Minister of Internal Affairs, Government of the Republic of Kosovo, Pristina

Mali and Kenya

Board Member: Mr Amadou Opa Thiam, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations in Geneva on behalf of H.E. Ms Aya Thiam-Diallo, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

Constituency Members:

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

Policy, Think, and Do Tanks

Board Member: Mr Maqsoud Kruse, Executive Director, Hedayah, Abu Dhabi

Alternate Board Member: Mr Anton du Plessis, Executive Director, Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria

Private Sector

Constituency Member: Ms Jessica Long, Managing Director, Strategy and Sustainability, North America Lead, Accenture, Washington, D.C.

Qatar

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

Constituency Member: Ms Noor Al-Sada, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the State of Qatar to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Switzerland

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

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

Constituency Members:

Mr Derek Müller, Head of South Asia and Conflict & Human Rights Division, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Ms Barbara Affolter Gómez, Conflict & Human Rights, Conflict & Human Rights and South Asia Division, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Ms Céline Glutz, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

United States of America and the Netherlands

Board Member: H.E. Mr Justin Siberell, Ambassador and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Mr Piet de Klerk, Ambassador and Special Counterterrorism Envoy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Constituency Members:

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

Ms Olga Kalashnikova, Global Programs Manager, Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT), U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

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

PRESENTERS

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

Mr Sam Lampert, Associate Partner, Dalberg Global Development Advisors

Dr Kyaw Yin Hlaing, Centre for Diversity and National Harmony, Yangon

OBSERVERS

Austria

Ms Charline van der Beek, Attaché, Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Belgium

Mr Karl Dhaene, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations Office and specialized institutions in Geneva

Egypt

H.E. Mr Amr Ramadan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Ayman Ammar, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Finland

Mr Renne Klinge, Minister and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Germany

Mr Axel Küchle, Counsellor (Humanitarian Affairs, IHL), Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Ms Alma Laiadhi, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Indonesia

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

Mr Andy Prasetyo, Deputy Director of Regional Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

Italy

Mr Valerio Negro, Head of Desk, Directorate General for Political Affairs and Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Rome

Norway

Ms Malgorzata Hauge, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Russia

Mr Andrey Kalinin, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Spain

H.E. Mr Marcos Vega, Ambassador at Large for International Cooperation against Terrorism and Organized Crime, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain, Madrid

Intergovernmental Organisations

League of the Arab States (LAS)

H.E. Mr Sameh AboulEnein, Ambassador and Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Organisation of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC)

H.E. Ms Aissata Kane, Ambassador and Chargé d'affaires a.i., Permanent Delegation of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Halim Grabus, Counsellor, Permanent Delegation of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation to the United Nations in Geneva

Mercy Corps

Ms Selena Victor, Director of Policy and Advocacy, Mercy Corps in Europe, London

GCERF Secretariat