

REPORT OF THE 6th BOARD MEETING

The 6th meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 26-28 June 2017 in London, United Kingdom (UK). The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in Annex 1, and the attendance list in Annex 2 of this report.

The first day of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of strategy, and was held in two sessions: the first, with members of the Strategy Reference Group (SRG) and the second, with all Board Members to discuss GCERF's strategy to engage communities and address the drivers of violent extremism (2017-2020), (the Strategy). This was a successful session to build further consensus and understanding around the proposed Strategy before it was formally presented to the Board.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, acknowledging the useful discussions during the pre-Board session, and thanking Google Inc. for hosting the meeting in their offices and M&C Saatchi for hosting the reception the evening before. She noted that, on display outside the conference room, were posters with photos and stories of programmes that GCERF is supporting.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Ms Sue Breeze, Board Member from the Canada/United Kingdom (UK) constituency kindly agreed to take on the role.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.01: Ms Sue Breeze of the Canada & United Kingdom constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 6th Board meeting.

2.2 The Chair noted that the GCERF Ethics Committee is seeking additional volunteer members. The committee is required to have at least three, and up to five members. Given the resignation of Mr Anton du Plessis of the Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee at least one volunteer is required to take his place.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.06/DOC.01: Draft Agenda) distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.02: The agenda for the 6th Board meeting (BM.06/DOC.01) is approved.

Changes to constituencies

2.5 The Chair reminded the Board that modifications regarding Board Members and Alternate Board Members can be made within constituencies and this information should be shared with the Secretariat as it is required to file this information with the Swiss authorities. She further added that it is incumbent on the Board Member to consult with other constituents within their constituencies.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.03: The Board notes the following changes in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 5th Board meeting:

- a. **Australia, Japan and New Zealand**: Mr Shingo Miyamoto replaces Ambassador Paul Foley as the Board Member;
- b. **Private Sector**: Ms Jessica Long replaces Mr Timothy Docking as the Board Member;
- c. **Foundations**: Mr Matthew Lawrence replaces Ms Angela Salt as the Board Member;
- d. **Kosovo**: Ms Besa Kabashi-Maraj has resigned and the seat is currently vacant; and
- e. In the constituency with the **European Union, France** will join as Alternate Board Member. The European Union remains as the Board Member permanently.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The Chair invited the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser, to present the Report of the Executive Director (BM.06/DOC.02).

3.1 The Executive Director welcomed Board Members, thanked them, the Chair and the Secretariat. He explained that the format of the Board papers was slightly different from previous meetings with the addition of a 'key points' section, and that the Board Meeting would be focused around discussion rather than lengthy presentations.

3.2 The Executive Director highlighted that three years ago GCERF was just a concept and now it has already moved through the pilot phase, and is gaining momentum despite the challenges around the PVE agenda more broadly. There is now a strong basis for taking GCERF forward, including a strategy that is about to be approved and the right composition of staff in the Secretariat.

3.3 GCERF is now delivering results, demonstrating agility, accountable to the highest standards, and realising potential. GCERF has already committed over USD 10 million to projects

in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria; of which USD 1.3 million that has been disbursed to date is already reaching around 85,000 people, including 6,000 influencers such as community and religious leaders and government officials. In addition, important qualitative results have also been achieved, including that Principal Recipients (PRs) have gained access and built trust to work in local communities and engage community members—which demonstrates the value of GCERF’s neutrality in building confidence and accessing hard-to-reach community members.

3.4 The Executive Director further highlighted three examples of GCERF’s increasing agility: the review of the Country Support Mechanisms (CSM), launching of the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM), and the redirecting of funds from an oversaturated part of Kosovo to meet needs in other areas.

3.5 Finally, the Executive Director alerted the Board that GCERF is working to develop partnerships through preparing to sign MOUs with Hedayah and with the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED).

Discussion

3.6 The Alternate Board Member for the Netherlands/the United States of America (USA) stated he was impressed with how GCERF has taken off, including by its growing agility. He mentioned the UN Secretary General’s Plan of Action on PVE and asked about the proposed UN PVE fund and more broadly the relationship between the UN and GCERF. In response, the Executive Director stated that he understands the UN PVE fund will not eventuate and believes that GCERF is positioned to be the global fund for PVE. He also explained that the Secretariat is pragmatically looking at how GCERF can engage with the UN both at HQ and in-country.

3.7 The Board Member for the European Union (EU), announced the EU’s intention to contribute EUR 3 million this year. He also noted that we must ensure GCERF goes where it is needed and where we can add value; and this may not necessarily be in the easiest places—GCERF may need to engage where extremism is already present.

3.8 The Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency stated that GCERF is a key instrument in helping beneficiaries achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). She also noted the importance of taking into account PVE National Action Plans (NAPs) when developing monitoring and evaluation tools. The Executive Director thanked her for emphasizing SDGs and NAPs, and reiterated that GCERF does development work with security outcomes and it has the potential to play a critical role in implementing NAPs.

3.9 The Board Member for the Bangladesh constituency discussed one of the countries we are approved to work in (it was implied that he was speaking about Myanmar) and noted, based on consideration of reports of persecution and human right violations, it is important that GCERF can comfortably decide when is the right time to work in a country. The Board Member for the the Netherlands/USA stated that many Board Members would like to work on PVE in Myanmar but few have the capacity to do so unless through GCERF. The Board Member for Switzerland noted the need for caution in considering operations in Myanmar. The Executive Director noted that the government had changed since the Board approved Myanmar as a country of operation. Given this he recently travelled to Myanmar to address reservations about whether to engage; to ascertain

if there was a gap that GCERF could usefully fill; and to see if an MOU with the Minister of Border Affairs (MoBA) would be an effective entry point to operations. He noted that everyone he spoke with during the visit said now was the time to engage and the recommendation was to work not only in Rakhine but in other parts of the country too, and that establishing an MOU with the MoBA would permit this as it works in most states.

3.10 Several Board Members raised questions around expansion, and also on what GCERF could bring to the saturated PVE space in Tunisia. The Executive Director stated the intention for GCERF is to have ‘footholds’ in the major affected regions of the world and then expand regionally from there. On Tunisia, the Executive Director acknowledged the coordination challenges and the need for a thorough assessment, but stated he had been advised by the government and donors and civil society in Tunisia that there is a niche for GCERF working at the very local level.

3.11 The Board Member for the the Netherlands/USA further stated that the Board needs to play a role in helping the Secretariat achieve the goals that the Board has laid out for it. He asked what, given the weak funding situation, GCERF is not able to do. Responding to the this the Executive Director said there is no money for reinvestment in existing countries of operation or to launch in new countries, as well as serious shortfalls within the Secretariat for example for a proper IT system.

3.12 The Board Member for Switzerland expressed that GCERF has taken time to develop a solid methodology and from a development aid agency point of view the work is really solid and inspires confidence. Regarding results, he said we will only know in a couple of years if GCERF has achieved its intended outcomes and we have to be realistic in telling donors that results take time.

4. PERFORMANCE AND OPERATIONS UPDATE

4.1 The Chair invited the Chief Operating Officer (COO) to present an overview of operations.

Portfolio Progress Report / Operations Update

4.2 The COO presented key points on developments in GCERF’s operations including that: (i) disbursements are now being made in Bangladesh, Nigeria and Mali and implementation is well under way as detailed in the report; (ii) the stories presented in the posters on display describe initial programme activities rather than the outcomes which will be achieved over time; (iii) results will be framed around the four ‘pathways to change’ identified in the strategy; (iv) focusing on any activity in isolation may not reveal its PVE specificity which is only really achieved through a combination of interventions within each PR’s programme.

Discussion

4.3 Several Board Members queried why the number of people reported as being reached by activities in Nigeria was low compared to other countries. The COO explained that this was due to: (i) the relatively late signing of grants in Nigeria in comparison to other countries; (ii) the time taken by the Nigerian PRs to fulfil special grant conditions and conduct fiduciary assessments of Sub-Recipients (SRs); (iii) the time taken to conduct, finalise and have approved baseline need assessments; and (iv) the exclusion in PRs’ workplans and therefore reporting of essential pre-

programme activities, such as negotiating access to communities and gaining community acceptance from formal and informal community leaders.

4.4 In reference to GCERF's baseline surveys that revealed that between 5-15 percent of those sampled have some sympathy to violent extremism, the Board Member for the Canada/UK constituency queried what questions were asked to measure sympathy to violent extremism, given that GCERF does not have a definition of violent extremism. The COO responded that each PR conducted semi-structured interviews to assess the views and perspectives of the sample group using country specific and context sensitive terminology and language. In each instance, the survey questions as a whole were designed to indirectly ascertain and validate interviewee's sympathy to violent extremism. The Board Member was interested to see the baseline survey, and a commitment was made to share an analysis of these.

4.5 A number of Board Members also asked about the role of the new Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) adviser. The M&E adviser was invited to speak. He welcomed the keen interest from the Board and Secretariat in M&E. He explained that the key focus is working with PRs and SRs to develop their M&E capacity and achieve quality reporting. He also noted a number of other considerations in developing GCERF's M&E systems, including: (i) working to conceptualise resilience so it can be measured; (ii) using existing standards, for example, OECD DAC standards on innovation; and (iii) developing a M&E handbook specific to GCERF. Related to this, the representative from France reiterated the high expectations around M&E and said, in terms of approaching ministries, it would be very useful to receive separate reports on PRs and SRs performance.

4.6 The Board Member for Civil Society mentioned that given the extensive activities underway it would be good to have a fact sheet by country which outlines key statistics. The COO said that the Secretariat is working to improve and keep updated its factsheets which will be made available to the Board.

4.7 The Chair noted that she had just received a letter from the Government of Tunisia requesting that they become a GCERF beneficiary country.

CSM Review

4.8 The Chair invite the Executive Director to present on the Country Support Mechanism (CSM) review.

4.9 The Executive Director explained that the CSMs are fundamental to GCERF's Core Funding Mechanism (CFM). They are multi-stakeholder committees, involving government agencies, civil society, the private sector and key donors. CSMs are self-governing and the Secretariat provides guidance. The Secretariat works through CSMs on needs assessments and throughout implementation. Building on feedback received on CSM performance, the Secretariat is carrying out a thorough review of the CSMs. He asked the Board what are their aspirations for the CSMs; and, what are the challenges they had experienced in relation to the CSMs?

Discussion

4.10 The Board Member for the Netherlands/USA stressed the importance of CSMs and noted that they are innovative focal points for national PVE efforts. He reported that the US had engaged with local missions in GCERF beneficiary countries and a number of concerns were raised, including: (i) infrequent meetings; (ii) high turnover of members leading to lack of understanding; (iii) lack of communication; and (iv) overzealous treatment of civil society. The Executive Director encouraged everyone to speak with the Secretariat when they hear concerns from their embassies in beneficiary countries in order to aid the Secretariat in quickly resolving any problems. The Board Member for Netherlands/USA further suggested having a locally hired person to work part-time and help coordinate the activities of the CSM, and raised the possibility of developing an exchange/training activity to ensure consistency across the CSM network. The latter idea was welcomed by the Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency. She also noted the need for better communication among donors in country as it is not possible to have every donor country on the CSM.

4.11 The Board Member for Switzerland welcomed the review and said it is only normal that CSMs experience challenges and it is not surprising that areas for improvement had been identified.

4.12 There was discussion among Board Members about the composition of CSMs; including, the balance among donors, government and civil society; and the need for involvement of national security actors. The Board Member for Australia/Japan/New Zealand constituency noted that, while Japan is not on all the CSMs, they maintain contact with them and highlighted the usefulness of having access to the mechanism on the ground.

4.13 The Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency stated that the CSM is a very important part of GCERF's work, and more responsibility needs to be given to CSMs not just in terms of design but also as regards implementation and M&E.

4.14 The representative of Nigeria as well as the Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency noted that early in the establishment of CSMs the members were not clear on processes. The representative of Nigeria said that now, as understanding increases, they expect that CSM functioning will improve. It was further stated that the CSMs are currently self-funded, and it will be necessary to find a way to sustain them.

4.15 The Board Member for the Canada/UK constituency asked if the CSM review was going to consider the link between the CSM and the Independent Review Panel (IRP), and queried why the IRP had not met in the last year. The Executive Director explained that the IRP are not at the Board meeting because their inputs and guidance is now solicited and provided earlier in the grant making process to already enhance the quality of national applications presented to the Board.

4.16 The Executive Director said that feedback on CSMs was being noted and that throughout the review process the Secretariat will be in touch further, including with representatives of Board Members in the field.

5. OPERATIONALISING ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM (AFM)

5.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director to present on the AFM.

5.2 The Executive Director briefly introduced the AFM model noting that it is designed to provide direct small grants in a more rapid fashion to local NGOs to respond to new challenges or opportunities. AFM funding would be allocated for approved regions and activities and be steered by country specific five-person panels. He also made the point that it is expected that the AFM should assist resource mobilisation efforts.

Decision

5.3 The Board Member for Australia/Japan/New Zealand commented that the expectation would be that the AFM would be subject to the same due diligence as the CFM. The Executive Director responded that the AFM would operate under the same standards and added that the projects that the AFM supports would need to be aligned with other GCERF funded projects.

5.4 Speaking on behalf of Japan, the Board Member for Australia/Japan/New Zealand queried the language in the AFM paper: 'support more risky and sensitive initiatives', and sought clarification as to whether 'more risky' referred to risk of programmatic failure in terms of results or if it meant security risks. He noted that if it was the latter then it would be more challenging for Japan to support this. He also requested that pragmatic solutions be sought to mitigate the potential security risks that may exist associated with the implementation of the AFM. The COO confirmed that the reference to risk relates to programmatic risks, such as providing funding to small community based groups. He added that for AFM funding, the understanding of risk would be dependent on the risk tolerance of the particular donor. The Executive Director noted that Japan will be on the AFM panel in Bangladesh and would therefore have oversight of risk.

5.5 With reference to the risk language, the Board Member for the EU stated that the EU is happy with this formulation, it was not read as the type of risk that might expose EU citizens to increased security threats. He further stated that overall the AFM is welcomed as it allows countries to enter into completely new kinds of programming.

5.6 The Alternate Board Member for Bangladesh pointed out that because of rapidly changing contexts there will be more need for funding through the AFM thus making it paramount that it works well, and the government of Bangladesh is fully committed to supporting it.

5.7 The Alternate Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency expressed strong support for the AFM and raised a question about why the private sector was not more pronounced in the AFM. The Executive Director noted that in Kenya the AFM would be used to leverage private sector money and one fifth of the AFM panel would be from private sector.

5.8 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.04: The Board authorises the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) to operate in all Board approved countries of operation as per BM.02/DOC.07, and notes the launch of the AFM in Bangladesh and Kenya.

6. THE KOSOVO NATIONAL APPLICATION

6.1 The Chair stated that due to recent government changes there was not a Board Member from Kosovo to comment on the application as usual. The IRP has reviewed the application and has made its recommendation.

6.2 The Executive Director noted that this is the only funding decision at this Board meeting and said that approval is sought to proceed with signing grant agreements with one Principal Recipient and one 'direct grantee'. He added that the IRP had recommended the funding of the National Application.

Discussion

6.3 The Board Member for the EU said that the EU delegation in Kosovo has asked to provide information to the CSM on the high number of existing initiatives to make sure the CSM has an informed picture when it comes to identifying initiatives to support. The Executive Director said the Secretariat will help to coordinate this.

6.4 A Canada/UK constituency member stated that Kosovo is a priority and a test case for how GCERF can work in a different context. He raised a question about why the Board is taking a decision regarding funding when GCERF has a deficit this year. The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) noted that when a decision is taken regarding allocating funding to a country the money is already committed and therefore the allocation for Kosovo has no connection with the current deficit.

6.5 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. welcomes the National Application submitted by the Kosovo Country Support Mechanism ("CSM") and the recommendations and feedback provided by the Independent Review Panel ("IRP") as detailed in BM.06/DOC.07;
- b. approves the National Application of the Kosovo CSM as presented in Annex 5 "Signed Kosovo National Application in full" of BM.06/DOC.07;
- c. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the finalisation of grant agreements with the selected Potential Principal Recipient ("PPR") and Potential Direct Grantee ("PDG") as described in Section 7 "Next Steps" in BM.06/DOC.07;
- d. authorises the Secretariat to enter into grant agreements with the selected PPR and PDG as identified in BM.06/DOC.07, for a total of not more than USD 1 million;
- e. requests that at the 7th Board Meeting to be held in December 2017, the Secretariat:(i) report back to the Board on the status of the commitment of funding in Kosovo, 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.

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS

2016 Financial Statements

7.1 The Chair invited the CFO to present on financial statements.

7.2 The CFO summarised financial matters, highlighting that: (i) the statement of financial position shows that approximately USD 10 million has been committed through the CFM and USD 1.3m has been disbursed against those commitments by the end of 2016; (ii) the cash position is good thanks to advance payments received from a number of donors; (iii) restricted income makes up 68% of GCERF income with unrestricted income at 29% and in-kind income about 3% (the higher the proportion of unrestricted contributions is, the more strategic and efficient the organisation can be); (iv) grant expenses represented 71% of total expenses versus 29% for other costs; and personnel and travel made up 70% of these other costs; and (v) that the fund level (reserve) is very low at USD 170,000 – which means that the organisation is unable to face any uninsured contingency.

7.3 The CFO added that the External Auditor was planning to issue an unqualified opinion on the 2016 financial statements. Two sets of financial statements were prepared and audited: the first are the financial statements presented to the Board that are prepared in accordance with the International Financial Reporting Standards for Small to Medium Enterprises (IFRS for SMEs) and in US Dollars, and the second, the statutory financial statements presented to the Supervisory Authority prepared in Swiss Francs (CHF). The Auditor provided one recommendation which will easily be implemented by the Secretariat. The CFO added that the Secretariat was generally satisfied with the services rendered by the Auditor except for a number of delays in submitting reports which we expect to be rectified.

Discussion

7.4 The Board Member for Bangladesh asked about potential projections of the proportion of restricted versus unrestricted funding.

7.5 The CFO explained that unrestricted funding is preferred; the full Board has authority over these types of funds and how they are spent. She added that if funds are restricted the specific requirements can be burdensome for both the Secretariat and grantees.

7.6 The Chair invited the BDO auditors to speak via video conference. Due to technical difficulties making it difficult to hear the auditors, the CFO explained that GCERF had received an unqualified assessment and noted that the financial system would be strengthened with a financial controller beginning work at the Secretariat in July 2017.

7.7 The Chair asked the Board if members of the Secretariat should leave the room to permit the Board to ask any questions of the Board. This was deemed not necessary.

7.8 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.06: The Board:

- a. approves the financial statements prepared in US Dollars and in accordance with IFRS for SMEs and the statutory financial statements presented in Swiss Francs (CHF); and
- b. confirms the appointment of BDO as GCERF's External Auditor for the 2017 financial year.

Current Financial Matters and Human Resources

7.9 The CFO continued with a brief overview of finance and HR matters, highlighting: (i) the allocation of funds to grants, including that total commitments are USD 37.771m with USD 23.154m committed towards grants, including USD 12.628m already formally committed for the CFM, USD 2.63m for the AFM and USD 7.895m to be committed including USD 5m for Kenya and USD 2.5m for Kosovo; (ii) that there is USD 395,000 yet to be pre-allocated—the Secretariat is proposing to allocate this amount to specific grant-related expenses especially performance oversight expenses as discussed at the previous Board meeting; (iii) that as a fund, it is important that we show economies of scale, however, with the size of the fund it is hard to show this; whether we manage USD 10m or USD30m the fixed cost to manage is very similar; (iv) that there is a funding gap for 2017 operational expenses of around USD 500,000; and (v) that the IT roadmap is now complete; the cost of an IT system which is customized to GCERF needs is approximately USD 800,000. The absence of funding for critical IT investment affects both the effectiveness and the efficiency of the organisation. She added that there has been a recent increase in restricted funding for operational costs, for example, for M&E, but as long as commitments to grants do not go up, the commitments to operating expenses will seem high.

Discussion

7.10 Several Board Members provided ideas to support the IT system, including engaging the private sector for in-kind contributions and an 'off-the shelf' IT product as an interim solution. On this, the CFO said that there is no IT system that you can buy 'off the shelf' without customisation that is suitable for grant management. The Executive Director said the Secretariat had been speaking to the private sector but was not very hopeful that GCERF will get an in-kind contribution to cover the costs of the IT system.

7.11 The Board Member for Australia/Japan/New Zealand constituency mentioned that it seemed as if GCERF was understaffed and asked if GCERF had difficulty retaining staff. The CFO responded that there is no problem retaining staff, however, for some positions, it is difficult to attract staff because the skills required are quite specific and the positions may not correspond to career tracks for people with the appropriate qualifications and experience, including the fact of moving to Geneva.

7.12 The Board Member for the Netherlands/US constituency asked if there could be a model for a percentage of funding to be allocated for grant related costs, for example, anyone who contributed to the CFM would understand that there is a percentage for grant related costs. The CFO responded that that would be appropriate.

8. UPDATE ON RESOURCE MOBILISATION

8.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director and Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer to give an update on resource mobilisation.

8.2 The Executive Director presented paper BM.06 DOC.10 on resource mobilisation (RM), in particular highlighting: (i) that one of the plans coming out of the recently developed Strategy will be on resource mobilisation; (ii) that in the current RM strategy the first priority was to strengthen contributions from current donors (the generous contributions received to date were recognized); (iii) the second priority in the current RM strategy was to diversify the donor base, starting with governments and also engaging foundations and the private sector; (iv) that the RM capacity in the Secretariat was weak with only one Senior Officer, one Junior Officer alongside the Executive Director and the Chair; and (v) that 64% of resources come from just four donors—Swiss, Qatar, Japan and the US—which arguably is a risky over-reliance.

Discussion

8.3 Several Board Members mentioned their support to RM efforts through bilateral conversations with other governments, including with non-GCTF countries. The Board Member for the Canada/UK constituency noted that Annex 3 to the paper would be a useful basis for speaking notes for meetings with potential donors.

8.4 The Chair noted that a number of Board Members have invited the Chair and the Executive Director to visit capitals and facilitated meetings with different branches of government. She suggested having events during these visits to highlight particular issues, for example, the new Strategy.

8.5 The Board Member for Switzerland raised the idea of targeting funds that are available to support activities in fragile settings given that fragility is at the top of aid agencies' agendas. Further to this, the Chair noted that part of our RM strategy should also be targeting humanitarian funds.

8.6 The Board Member for Netherlands/USA constituency said that GCERF should be able to rely on a couple of key partners to deliver consistent funding amounts on a yearly basis and rely on smaller donors to make up the difference.

9. GCERF'S STRATEGY TO ENGAGE COMMUNITIES AND ADDRESS THE DRIVERS OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM (2017-2020)

9.1 The Chair thanked everyone as a whole on a successful strategy development process and expressed that the BM.06/DOC.12: GCERF's Strategy to Engage Communities and Address the Driver of Violent Extremism (2017-20) (the Strategy) comes with the recommendation from the SRG that it should be approved. She commented that the work of the Strategy Reference Group (SRG) showed that we can break into smaller groups and moved ahead on particular issues.

9.2 The Executive Director thanked Ms Bellamy for chairing the SRG, the SRG for stewarding the strategy development process and consultants from Dalberg Global Development Advisors for their hard work.

9.3 Referring to the meeting with the SRG immediately prior to the official Board Meeting, the Executive Director said many of the key issues regarding the Strategy had been discussed, including that: (i) this strategy helps to define results and can be used as an advocacy tool; (ii) it is a statement of ambition while being realistic, it outlines judicious expansion noting there is considerable work to be done on resource mobilisation; (iii) it is a living document and the same principle of agility would be applied to it as to other aspects of the organisation; and (iv) that it is a high level strategy from which will come an implementation plan comprising, for example: corporate management, resource mobilisation, portfolio growth, partnerships and communication plans.

9.4 The Executive Director highlighted some of the key considerations in developing the Strategy, including: (i) that GCERF remains a multi-stakeholder global fund (MGF) rather than becoming another type of institution; (ii) that the focus continues to be on PVE and on filling a funding gap at the community level; (iii) that learning and adaptability are key principles in the organisation—including, that GCERF has begun to generate data, and can be part of a global effort to better understand the drivers of violent extremism and the sources of community resilience.

Discussion

9.5 The Board Member for Bangladesh raised a question about the consequences of a lack of funding on the implementation of the strategy. The Executive Director acknowledged the risk if funds are not raised but noted that the Strategy allows GCERF to clearly understand what its objectives are and how these can be achieved, and, alongside the fact that results are beginning to be demonstrated, the Strategy should support fundraising efforts.

9.6 The Alternate Board Member for the Kenya/Mali constituency asked a question about who is accumulating understanding of the global picture of violent extremism. The Executive Director responded by highlighting that the Board is a unique gathering of various perspectives and thus has a key role in building this understanding, and while GCERF is not a think tank, it needs to be part of informing this global picture in its own way.

9.7 Several Board Members voiced their support of the Strategy, including the Board Member for the Netherlands/US who stated that the Strategy reflected the consensus view of the SRG, and noted the ambitious but realistic nature of the Strategy, it was paramount that we buy into the strategy and commit to continuing to work hard on RM.

9.8 The Board Member for Qatar stated that the main challenge is RM, and highlighted the need to develop creative ways to build partnerships with the private sector and the need for strong strategic communications. He further stated that Qatar will continue to increase its support and hopes that more GCTF countries will join. On communication, The Executive Director noted that we are supporting many initiatives but to date lack the capacity and funds to effectively communicate these.

9.9 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.07: The Board approves GCERF's Strategy to Engage Communities and Address the Drivers of Violent Extremism (2017-20), and commits to supporting its implementation.

10. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

10.1 The Chair invited the Chair of the Ethics Committee and Alternate Board Member for Switzerland to provide the report of the Ethics Committee.

Status Update

10.2 The Chair of the Ethics Committee noted that there are no ethics matters to report since the 5th Board Meeting in December 2016.

10.3 The Chair of the Ethics Committee raised one matter related to the lack of conflict of interest policies for the CSMs and PRs. The Ethics Committee covers the work of the Secretariat and the Board, but does not extend to CSMs.

10.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.08: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of **Mr Anton du Plessis** of the Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee, and thanks him for his service;
- b. approves re-appointment of **Mr Daniel Frank**, Alternate Board Member for Switzerland, as the Chair of the Ethics Committee for the period from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2019 in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee;
- c. approves re-appointment of **Ms Noor Ibrahim Al-Sada** of the Qatar constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee for a new term for the period from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2019 in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee; and
- d. requests the Chair to consult with Board Members interested in joining the Ethics Committee, and present a recommendation on the Committee's membership for Board approval, using the no objection procedure set out in Article 2.9 of the Bylaws.

11. 2016 ANNUAL REPORT FOR SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

11.1 The Chair asked the Board to approve the 2016 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority:

The Board took the following decision:

BM.06/DEC.09: The Board approves the 2016 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.06/DOC.14 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 The Chair noted that during the Executive Session on the previous day a number of matters were discussed, including the Board Self-Assessment 2014-2016, the evaluation of the Executive Director and that of the Board Chair.

12.2 The Board took the following decisions:

BM.06/DEC.10: The Board extends the term of the current Chair, Carol Bellamy, to November 2020. A process to review the role and composition of the Board and the profile of the Chair will be launched by June 2018. An annual review will then ensue.

BM.06/DEC.11: The Board extends the term of the current Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser, to June 2022, subject to an annual performance review. Recruitment timetable to be defined in June 2020.

BM.06/DEC.12: The Board encourages the early constitution of an Advisory Council to support the Chair, Executive Director and the Board in raising GCERF's profile and mobilising resources, the terms of reference of which and profile of members to be agreed by the Chair in consultation with Board Members.

12.3 The Board member from Qatar offered to host the next Board meeting in Doha.

ANNEX 1

BM.06/DOC.01: AGENDA

MONDAY 26 JUNE 2017

Location –Grange White Hall Hotel, 2-5 Montague Street, Russell Square, London

Time	Event
9:00 – 9:30	Welcome coffee
9:30 – 12:30	Meeting of the Strategy Reference Group Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Strategy Reference Group
12:30 – 13:30	Working Lunch: Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome) Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Member of Ethics Committee
13:45 – 16:15	Strategy Discussion (all Board members) Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Board members

Location –Foreign & Commonwealth Office, King Charles Street, London

17:00 – 18:30	Donors' Meeting (the Nightingale room) Board Chair / Executive Director
18:30 – 20:00	Reception hosted by the Foreign & Commonwealth Office and M&C Saatchi (the Map Room)

TUESDAY 27 JUNE 2017

Location –Google Inc. Offices, 1 St Giles High Street, London

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
08:30 – 09:00	Registration		
09:00 – 09:15	Welcoming Remarks		Board Chair
09:15 – 09:30	Preliminary Matters		Board Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members 	DOC.01	
09:30 – 10:30	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
10:30 - 10:45	Coffee break		
10:45 – 12:00	Performance and Operations Update	DOC.03 (for information)	Executive Director/
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfolio Progress Report • Update on Operations • CSM Review 	DOC.04 (for information)	Chief Operating
		DOC.05 (for information)	Officer
12:00 – 12:30	Operationalising Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM)	DOC.06 (for decision)	Executive Director/
			Chief Operating
12:30 – 13:00	Kosovo National Application	DOC.07 (for decision)	Officer
			Chief Operating
			Officer
13:00 – 14:00	Buffet Lunch		
14:00 – 15:00	Financial Matters	DOC.08 (for decision)	Chief Financial Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016 Financial Statements • Current Financial Matters and Human Resources 	DOC.09 (for information)	

15:00 – 15:15 **Coffee break**

15:15 – 15:45	Update Resource Mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update on Resource Mobilisation• Update on Private Sector	DOC.10 (for information)	Executive Director/Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer
---------------	--	--------------------------	---

15:45 – 17:45	Executive Session – Board Members only <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board Self-Assessment 2014-2016• Executive Director Evaluation• Board Chair Evaluation	DOC.11 (for information) For decision	Board Chair Board Chair All Board – discussion chaired by Switzerland
---------------	--	--	---

WEDNESDAY 28 JUNE 2017

Location –Google Inc. Offices, 1 St Giles High Street, London

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 – 10:30	GCERF’s Strategy to Engage Communities and Address the Drivers of Violent Extremism (2017-2020)	DOC.12 (for decision)	Board Chair/ Executive Director
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee Break		
10:45 – 11:00	Report of the Ethics Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status Update• Approval of membership	DOC.13 (for information and decision)	Chair of Ethics Committee
11:00 – 11:15	2016 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority	DOC.14 (for decision)	Board Chair
11:15 – 11:30	Any other business		Board Chair/ Executive Director
11:30	End of the meeting		
11:30 – 12:30	Sandwich Lunch		



ANNEX 2

6th GCERF Board Meeting 26-28 June 2017 London, United Kingdom

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

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

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Mr Carl Worker, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, Wellington

Constituency Members:

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

Ms Megan Addis, Policy Officer, International Security and Disarmament Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, Wellington

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

Bangladesh

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Mr M. Shameem Ahsan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Bangladesh Bangladesh to the United Nations and Other International Organisations 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 and 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

Constituency Members:

Mr Alastair King-Smith, Head of International Counter Extremism, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

Ms Brooke Logan, Senior Project Manager, Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program (CTCBP) East Africa, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

Alternate Board Member: Dr Edit Schlaffer, Founder and Executive Director, Women Without Borders / Sisters Against Violent Extremism, Vienna

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

European Union

Board Member: Mr Olivier Luyckx, Head of Unit, Stability, Security, Development and Nuclear Safety, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (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 Eelco Kessels, Executive Director, Global Center on Cooperative Security, New York on behalf of Mr Alistair Millar, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Global Center on Cooperative Security

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

France

Ms Anne-Pascale Lux, Policy Adviser for CT, Counterterrorism and Organized Crime Division, Directorate for Strategic, Security and Disarmament Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Mali and Kenya

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

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

Nigeria

Board Member: Ms Anthonia Ukah, Foreign Service Officer (International Organizations Department), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja on behalf of H.E. Ms Nonye Udo, Ambassador Director, Second United Nations Division, International Organisations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Nigeria

Policy, Think, and Do Tanks

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

Constituency Member: Ms Camilla Schippa, Director, Institute for Economics & Peace, Sydney

Qatar

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

Switzerland

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 Member: Ms Barbara Affolter Gómez, Conflict and Human Rights Advisor, Conflict and Human Rights and South Asia Division, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), 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

Mr Mark Freedman, Special Assistant, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Ms Olga Kalashnikova, Global Programs Manager, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

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

OBSERVERS

Italy

Mr Gianluca Brusco, Counsellor, Embassy of Italy, London

Mr Davide Ceccanti, Intern, Embassy of Italy, London

Morocco

Mr Yassine Gaouane, Counsellor, Embassy of the Kingdom of Morocco, London

Norway

Mr Geir Michalsen, Senior Adviser, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo

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

Tunisia

Mr Naoufel Hdia, Counsellor, Embassy of Tunisia, London

Civil Society

Mr Eric Rosand, Co-Chair, Global Solutions Exchange, Washington, D.C.

Foundations

Mr David Barth, Director, Youth Opportunity and Learning, Ford Foundation, New York

Private Sector

Ms Miriam Estrin, Public Policy Manager for Europe, Middle East and Africa, Google Inc., London

Mr Alexander Guittard, Director, Governance and Strategic Communications, M&C Saatchi World Services, London

Mr Jérôme Perez, Head of Sustainability, Nestlé Nespresso S.A., Lausanne

Mr Dean Sanders, Founder and Chief Inventor, GoodBrand, London

Mr Ankur Vora, UK Public Policy Analyst, Google Inc., London

Policy, Think, and Do Tanks

Mr Andrew Glazzard, Director, National Security and Resilience, Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies (RUSI), London

Dalberg Global Development Advisors:

Mr Anders Kjemtrup, Dalberg Global Development Advisors, Geneva

Mr Sam Lampert, Associate Partner, Dalberg Global Development Advisors, Paris

Ms Tamara Pironnet, Dalberg Global Development Advisors, Geneva

Mr Wijnand de Wit, Regional Director for Europe, Dalberg Global Development Advisors, Geneva

GCERF Secretariat