

REPORT OF THE 8th BOARD MEETING

The 8th meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 30-31 May 2018 in Lausanne, 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, acknowledging that it was an important meeting to move GCERF forward, and hear directly from grantees about progress being made in-country.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. H.E. Minister Hedi Mekni, Board member for the North Africa and Middle East constituency, kindly agreed to take on the role.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.01: Mr Hedi Mekni of Tunisia (North Africa and Middle East constituency) is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 8th Board meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.2 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.08/DOC.01: Draft Agenda) distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval. The Chair noted that she did not have agenda items making an Executive Session necessary, however she invited Board members to advise if they wished to have an Executive Session.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.02: The agenda for the 8th Board meeting (BM.08/DOC.01) is approved.

Changes to Constituencies

2.3 The Chair welcomed new members to the Board, H.E. Mr Thomas Gass as Board member for Switzerland (who was officially the Board member during the 7th Board meeting however he was unable to attend) and H.E. Mr Audu Ayinla Kadiri as Board member for the constituency of West and Central Africa. The Chair reported that Norway, which had been a financial and intellectual supporter

for some time, had now decided to join the Board and a process was underway to determine which constituency Norway will join. The Chair noted that the constituency of Australia, Japan, and New Zealand had opted to rotate constituency leadership, hence the need for a decision.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 7th Board meeting:

Australia, Japan and New Zealand: Ambassador Paul Foley replaces Mr Yujiro Hayashi as the Board Member.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED) to present his report (BM.08/DOC.02) and welcomed active participation from the Board through comments and questions.

3.2 The ED welcomed Board members, thanked them, the Chair and the Secretariat. He thanked Board members for their support and constructive feedback provided during calls prior to the meeting, and acknowledged the considerable experience and expertise among the Secretariat team.

3.3 The ED reported briefly on progress made to date, including that GCERF is now reaching almost 900,000 people through its grants; a three-fold increase in reach over the second half of 2017 was recorded; and that when the last current round of funding is complete almost 2 million people are expected to be reached—a significant number for a relatively small investment.

3.4 The ED said that the organization has built a platform for growth. GCERF had now been subjected to its first external review. The review; carried out by the United Kingdom, included visits to Bangladesh and Nigeria and several days at the Secretariat in Geneva, and made a positive assessment of GCERF. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) also conducted an internal review to answer strategic questions about GCERF and provide a basis for further funding from the government of Switzerland, the outcome of which was also very positive.

3.5 The ED highlighted that building on this platform there is now potential for greater impact. GCERF is working with 100 local partners and building their preventing violent extremism (PVE) capacity; there is organic replication of programmes outside of directly supported initiatives; and there is strong and consistent political support in all partner countries, and globally GCERF has growing PVE credibility. GCERF also has a three-year strategy to guide its investments and growth. The ED reiterated his observation that the ‘pinch point’ in GCERF is not, therefore, blockages in the project pipeline because of political obstacles or poor local partners, nor reputation, capacity or expertise; it is funding, and without sustained funding GCERF’s potential for increased impact is lowered.

3.6 The ED emphasised that GCERF is a unified effort between the Secretariat and the Board and the Secretariat endeavors to be transparent, acknowledge mistakes and take on constructive feedback from the Board.

3.7 The ED was grateful for conversations with most Board members prior to the meeting and several issues were raised. First, membership of Country Support Mechanisms (CSMs): The ED explained that it is a GCERF principle to respect national ownership, and that the Secretariat will now implement the recommendations provided in the CSM review, working closely with CSM chairs to discuss any gaps and revise the CSM TORs. Second, coordination by the Secretariat with in-country donor representatives: The ED acknowledged there was room for improvement and committed to sharing an improvement plan with the Board which would include: convening regular donor meetings during country visits and sharing key documents as appropriate with local representatives. The ED asked for the Board's support to have Secretariat members invited to donor PVE mechanisms in-country. Third, Board members commented that the Secretariat is not communicating results effectively. The ED acknowledged that important work on the ground is taking place however it is not being showcased adequately and improvements in this regard would be supported by the forthcoming development of a communications strategy.

3.8 The ED reminded that results around prevention of violent extremism are long term, and, as highlighted in the UK review report, GCERF has delivered on programmes but is unsurprisingly not yet able to report on wider impact, and thus its work should not be judged on a snapshot of results.

3.9 The ED suggested that PVE has become more contested than when GCERF was established; the PVE agenda is susceptible to political change; definitions are not clear; there is still no unified agenda among development, counter-terrorism, and humanitarian actors; and PVE is not recognised as a global common good. This means PVE is still underfunded and that funding tends to be tied to national interests. Furthermore, the ED argued that limited PVE funding has resulted in funders being cautious, channeling funding through more established agencies and looking for 'quick-wins'. This has resulted in fewer funds being available than anticipated at the outset of GCERF, requiring GCERF to reinforce its added value—its bottom up approach, neutrality, and PVE specificity—and look again at its structure. If GCERF was being created in today's context, what would it look like?

3.10 As a result, the ED said that significant proposals on how to refine GCERF's added value, funding models and structures including governance, would be shared at the next Board meeting.

Discussion

3.11 The Board member for Qatar announced that the State of Qatar would make a further contribution of USD 5m to GCERF, making Qatar's total contribution to date USD 10m. The Board member expressed his disappointment that Qatar is the only country in the Gulf that is a supporter of GCERF, and he encouraged enhanced partnerships, including with the United Nations.

3.12 A representative for the Board member of the United Kingdom (UK) of the Canada and UK constituency reported on the UK's review of GCERF, explaining that it was undertaken as part of the UK's standard practice after funding an organisation. She highlighted that the review showed GCERF plays a useful role in building an international body of knowledge in a field where there is little consensus, and that the fund is managed to a 'gold standard'. She noted that the UK is pleased that Monitoring and Evaluation efforts are being professionalised to develop the evidence base and that there are plans to raise the visibility of results.

3.13 The Alternate Board member for the Bangladesh constituency reflected on good progress made over the last three years and said that momentum has been generated on the ground. Responding to the ED's comment on the 'pinch-point', the Board member said that the evidence shows that more work needs to be done to tackle the challenge of violent extremism, and ending projects midway would be counterproductive, thus fresh funding is required to build on the solid foundation already laid.

3.14 The Board member for Switzerland spoke about Switzerland's internal review of GCERF noting that it related to funding renewal. The Board member said the review demonstrated that GCERF is a rigorous organisation, and its multi-stakeholder nature, engagement with credible and legitimate community based organisations, and collaboration with governments is very much appreciated by the Government of Switzerland. In addition, the Board member said that support in fragile contexts is important for Switzerland, thus PVE is a key component of its advanced conflict sensitive programme approaches. The Board member announced that in addition to the rental contribution for the Secretariat offices, Switzerland would be continuing its contribution to GCERF's core budget of CHF 1m a year for the next four years. In conclusion, he stated that he looks forward to the continued evolution of GCERF not just as a funding mechanism but as an 'elaborator' of how PVE can be made stronger across all relevant portfolios. In particular, he suggested that in the 21st Century no development agency can be fit for purpose without a focus on PVE.

3.15 The Board member for the Civil Society constituency noted GCERF's inspiring progress, and pointed out the challenge to communicate GCERF's core purpose and its PVE specificity. He reflected on the circular nature of the agenda from counter-terrorism (CT) to PVE, with the current tendency being towards a return to a CT approach. In this shifting context, he noted that GCERF brings the added value of having a strong community based approach while also convening different stakeholders at the global and local levels. The Board member highlighted the need to reform the security sector to enhance GCERF's efforts genuinely to tackle the challenge of violent extremism.

3.16 The Board member for the Netherlands and the United States constituency also highlighted the changing P/CVE sector and encouraged GCERF to take a leadership role in shaping this change, including on the intersection between humanitarian issues, development, resilience and P/CVE, and to look at recommendations on how GCERF can be adapted to the changing environment. The ED expressed his belief that there is potential for GCERF to take on a thought leadership role in this changing environment.

3.17 The Board member for the Netherlands and the United States constituency member noted that national interests will always play a significant role in how each country engages in the P/CVE sector. The Board member stated that the United States remains committed to supporting GCERF and remaining an active participant, and there are different funding streams/objectives that will determine continued support. The Board member announced that the United States provided USD 3m this year and is looking at how support will be continued. Finally, the Board member stated that while it is understood that funding is a challenge it would be disappointing if funding was the sole focus of discussion at GCERF's Board meetings.

3.18 The Constituency member of the Netherlands and the United States constituency stated that the Netherlands, from The Hague through to its representatives in country, is fully committed to supporting GCERF. The Constituency member reported that the Chair and the ED's visit to The Hague earlier in the year was successful in making the case for GCERF's position at the nexus between security and development. The Constituency member further announced that, in principle and subject to approval, there is a plan to allocate EUR 5m from the Official Development Assistance (ODA) stream to GCERF over four years. Reflecting the dual support of security and development sectors from the Netherlands, the Constituency member announced that a new Board member from the security department had been appointed. The ED thanked the Netherlands for its support and encouraged all donor members to facilitate access to different sources of funding from within their governments, as has also occurred in Australia with a recent contribution confirmed from the Home Affairs department.

3.19 The Alternate Board member for the West and Central Africa constituency applauded the leadership of the Chair, thanked the ED and posed a question about how GCERF collaborates with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) at the country level. The ED explained that in some countries UNDP is represented on CSMs, and Secretariat staff regularly meet and update UNDP colleagues during visits to partner countries.

3.20 The Board member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand commended the progress made in terms of the substantial increase in the number of people reached notwithstanding the challenges. He pointed out that it would be helpful for everyone to have a copy of the UK review report to assist with fundraising efforts. The ED reported that the UK had agreed for its report to be shared and that the Secretariat would do so as soon as it is available, along with the self-assessment report conducted with Switzerland. The Board member agreed that national interest will continue to be a determining factor, however there will be ways to harness and refine it effectively to support organisations like GCERF.

3.21 The Board member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand stated that Australia strongly supports the establishment of a GCERF programme in the Philippines and believes the GCERF model will make a strong contribution on the basis of existing robust NGO and CSO infrastructure, and that there is a role for GCERF to play in building partnerships with grassroots organisations. Furthermore, he said that a request by the Government of the Philippines for collaboration with GCERF may be expected soon. In that context, the Board member announced that Australia is proposing a

contribution of at least USD 2m and encourages other Board members to support such a programme. The Alternate Board member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand, said that Japan is also considering a contribution directed at the Philippines.

3.22 The Board member for the European Union (EU) and France reminded the Board that the EU's contribution of EUR 3m was announced at the last meeting. He did not necessarily agree with the ED's analysis that PVE funding is limited, pointing to the significant increase in the EU's funding of PVE projects elsewhere. The ED commented that, in that case, there is a need to better understand why GCERF is only receiving a small proportion of the available funding. He further acknowledged the generosity of the funding announcements made by the Netherlands, Qatar and Switzerland, but made the point that it is not still not sufficient to support the ambition this year to reinvest in Bangladesh and Mali, and to invest in Tunisia.

3.23 The representative of Norway stated that Norway strongly supports GCERF's unique, bottom-up approach. He noted that it is important for Norway that GCERF finds a way to partner with the United Nations.

3.24 Dr Jehangir Khan, Director at the United Nations Office for Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT), reiterated his support for GCERF and the importance of building a partnership between the United Nations and GCERF. The Director further stressed GCERF's role in responding to the enormous needs of the people in the countries where it works, supporting the implementation of National PVE Action plans, and making sure that GCERF fulfills its mandate of making an impact at the grassroots level. He looked forward to concrete proposals for partnership.

3.25 The Board member for the West and Central Africa constituency lauded the Secretariat for its work in preparing the Nigeria re-investment plan and reported that grantees in Nigeria are highly appreciative of the support. He further registered appreciation for the launch of the Community of Practice (COP) in Nigeria.

3.26 The Alternate Board member for Policy, Think and Do Tanks thanked the Secretariat for its transparency in the reporting process, noting that the length of the Board documents creates a burden on the Secretariat and at times also on the Board. He proposed revision to this process. The ED reflected that the length of the papers may be symptomatic of an unwieldy governance structure on which he would propose changes at the next meeting. The Chair reiterated that she had made requests to the Secretariat to reduce the Board papers, and prepare proposals for change for the next meeting.

4. INSIGHTS FROM THE FIELD

4.1 The ED introduced three representatives of GCERF Principal Recipients (PR) in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria.

4.2 Grantee from Bangladesh presented on the project 'Light of Youth' which focuses on youth mobilisation and community engagement against violent extremism in Cox's Bazar. He reported that

key challenges in Cox's Bazar include tensions between the local community and Rohingya community, and the Buddhist and Muslim Bangladeshi communities. The programme, which works with 10 community based organisations, reaches 18,000 youth across three categories: colleges, madrasahs and out of school youth. He spoke about the importance of understanding the local context to best strategise programming and of being guided by community members who understand best how to respond to community problems. He explained that extremist groups have a narrative that is often attractive to youth, and before directly countering that narrative it is necessary to build up the critical and logical thinking skills of youth through debate clubs and discussions. Finally, he said that while the first round of funding will end this year, communities face a long term challenge and further action and support is required.

4.3 Grantee from Mali described the context of the programmes in Central Mali that is affected by spillover violence that started in the North. The focus groups for the initiative are religious leaders, women, young boys and girls, Koranic school students, and young men with precarious employment situations. He noted that extreme poverty and misunderstanding of religion are key drivers of violent extremism. To respond to this the consortium carries out vocational training to reinforce the role of young men in their communities so they are less vulnerable to extremist groups. Furthermore, he explained that Islamic leaders are working with vulnerable groups to enhance their religious understanding and to educate that religion does not support violence. A key challenge across the programmes is the fear that talking about VE will lead to retaliation from VE groups. A good practice learned throughout the project is that working through respected religious and community leaders helps develop trust and brings credibility to the programmes.

4.4 Grantee from Nigeria explained that initiatives in Nigeria cover the North-Central states and not the North-East because the North-Central states are a recruiting ground for VE groups operating in the North-East. Initiatives work with youth, women, and community and religious leaders. He explained that one of the key reasons why young people and community members support VE is because of ignorance and disengagement from their communities. Therefore, it is important to build their capacity to be able to contribute and play an active role in their communities. He described this as 'shifting power to the people' through developing skills such as Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA) whereby community members analyse and develop plans to respond to community problems themselves. In addition, the organisation supports Community Based Organisations to formalise and become officially registered. He said that women play a key role in PVE, therefore programs also work to build their leadership skills. The capacity of religious and community leaders is also built. Finally, he reported that the network developed throughout the initiatives is acting as a bulwark against Boko Haram's influence in the North-Central States.

Discussion

4.5 The Alternate Board member for the West and Central Africa constituency announced that GCERF's work aligns well with Mali's CT policy. In addition, he noted the positive impact that GCERF-supported work is having on vulnerable groups; however, to make the most of this impact funding would need to continue beyond 2020.

4.6 A representative of Switzerland commented that while community watch groups are important, they can often manifest as vigilante or paramilitary groups and represent a significant risk. With reference to community watch groups grantee from Mali noted that in Mali these groups are local, unarmed and they work with government to encourage people to lay down arms.

4.7 The Board member for the Netherlands and the US, and a representative of Switzerland asked about project replicability and sustainability. In Nigeria, grantee explained, the Ministry of Education is interested in integrating into school curricula the Peace Mentor Manual created under the GCERF supported Peace Club programme. Grantee from Bangladesh added that while programme modalities can be replicated, priorities should be contextualised to the new location. Regarding sustainability he highlighted that ‘change agents’ and CBOs—who are on the ‘frontline’—will remain in the community after GCERF funding ends and programmes will continue through them. He added that while the ‘Light of Youth’ programme is reaching 18,000 youth in Bangladesh, this is a small proportion of the overall population at risk, and there is a need for scale-up and more time to bring about behavioral change. The Board member for the Netherlands and the US asked if initiatives are reaching people who are at the ‘tipping point’ of joining VE groups. Grantee from Mali responded that activities are reaching youth who were indeed on the cusp of being recruited by VE groups and the vocational programmes provided an alternative, thus reducing the appeal of these groups.

4.8 The Alternate Board member for the Canada and United Kingdom constituency asked the recipients of GCERF funding why they insisted funding from GCERF had been so valuable compared to other sources of funding. The response from recipients was that GCERF funding is unique because it reaches very local organisations that have not received funding before; it is bottom-up and PVE specific. The CSM was also cited as a valuable part of the GCERF model as it provides a way for recipients to engage government stakeholders. Finally, grantee from Mali highlighted that in Mali, GCERF funding is also helping the national PVE policy become more concrete.

5. RESULTS

5.1 The ED briefly presented the key points in the Portfolio Investment Report (BM.08/DOC.03) highlighting that around 900,000 people had been reached across Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria representing a rapid acceleration in reach, and financial disbursement had increased by more than half in the second half of 2017 compared to the first six months of the year. He noted that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) adviser has begun to categorise people reached and projects by the GCERF Strategy leverage points, and that monitoring of qualitative indicators is also underway.

5.2 The Board member for Foundations pointed out the significant hurdles of M&E in this field, particularly in moving from monitoring quantitative indicators to measuring attitudinal change, and asked what the Secretariat would require to become a leader in this field. The M&E adviser conceded that he is stretched and must prioritise in accordance with the constraints of the budget, and more could be done with a larger budget. Nevertheless, he will soon be supported on IT for M&E by an intern.

5.3 The New Zealand representative of the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency said that gender responsiveness and the impact of programming on women and families is important to New Zealand. Similarly, the representative of Norway noted that gender disaggregated data across all activities is important for Norway. The M&E adviser highlighted that the approach was to focus initially on basic gender disaggregated data and then begin to gather data on, for example, how an understanding of gender can be used to inform more strategic engagement.

5.4 In addition, the representative of Norway commented that increased disbursements are not really results and asked how impact is being documented. The M&E adviser highlighted that disbursements are a proxy of the implementation dynamic and an indicator that activities are taking place. Furthermore, with the first 11 grants coming to an end this year or early next, some will be selected for evaluation and at this point more meaningful outcomes will be evaluated through end-line surveys and reflection workshops to look at lessons learned over the programme period.

5.5 The representative of the Board member for the EU and France commented that were the EU to undertake an evaluation they would not ask the organisation being reviewed to be present, as was the case when a GCERF Secretariat member accompanied the UK review team. The M&E adviser responded that as GCERF's programming is sensitive, the Secretariat is careful not to stigmatise the communities with which it works, and is thus cautious about engagement with partners on the ground. However, third party monitoring of certain grants, to add and validate information received from PRs, is planned for this year.

6. HR MATTERS

6.1 The Chair introduced and shared a short paper for the Board's approval on the establishment of a Human Resource (HR) committee and apologised for introducing the matter without giving prior notice. Based on a discussion with GCERF's lawyers—consulted to help with occasional legal matters—the Chair said she had decided to form an HR committee which would take a similar shape to the Ethics Committee. The Chair noted that, while HR is largely a management issue for the Secretariat, there are occasionally matters related to the senior management that require Board oversight.

6.2 The Alternate Board member for Switzerland asked why the need for the committee had arisen now and what are the risks of not having such a committee. The Chair responded that there is a gap in the delegation of authority for any matters related to the ED.

6.3 The Chair decided to provide further information after the Board meeting to inform the Board's deliberations and that a decision would be taken electronically after the meeting.

7. NIGERIA COUNTRY STRATEGY: RE-INVESTMENT PLAN

7.1 The ED prefaced the discussion of the Nigeria Re-investment plan (BM.08/DOC.08) by saying that the Secretariat takes feedback seriously, is adaptive, and that whatever is approved at the meeting is not locked in; the process of consultation will continue. He reminded the Board that at the last meeting, it approved a focused re-investment in Nigeria and USD 5m had now been raised to support this. The ED explained that the reason for reinvestment first in Nigeria and not Mali or Bangladesh, was partly because the nature of funding received was earmarked for Nigeria; because a separate additional investment through the AFM in Bangladesh is already underway; and because there are security concerns and questions about absorption capacity in Mali. Finally, the ED highlighted that a contextual analysis and comprehensive consultations in-country had informed the plan and that it clearly addresses the priorities laid out in the government's own action plan.

7.2 The Board member for West and Central Africa reported that the Re-investment Plan had been endorsed in Nigeria by critical stakeholders and the CSM. The Board member for the United States encouraged GCERF to continue working closely with in-country Board representatives as the plan is implemented. She also commented that the original draft had perhaps extended beyond GCERF's mission and that it was important to ensure the P/CVE focus of the plan.

7.3 The Board took the following decision:

BM.08 DOC.04: The Board approves USD 5 million to be allocated to Nigeria from the Board-approved 2018 budget, in line with the GCERF Country Strategy for Re-investment in Nigeria.

8. KENYA NATIONAL APPLICATION: FUNDING DECISION

8.1 Ambassador Dr. Martin Kimani Mbugua, Chair of the CSM in Kenya, introduced the National Application (BM.08 DOC.08) and highlighted that Kenya's CVE strategy, which enjoys high-level political support, aims to reduce recruitment and increase levels of resilience to VE ideologies. The strategy will be re-launched in October and GCERF grants will be used to catalyse its implementation. One way that this will be facilitated is by the formation of a CSM that has senior representatives to aid in decision making, and Ambassador Kimani hoped that these representatives can engage closely with GCERF's work with PRs. Ambassador Kimani highlighted that the national application covers the counties most susceptible to VE and described the reasons for the selection of each of the PRs: the first PR has a large network of partners and credibility in the community; the second PR has disrupting the path to recruitment as a key part of its strategy and focuses on education and media with specific P/CVE content; and the third PR has experience in promoting inter-religious harmony and dialogue and religious freedom as well as a strong network of women's and faith-based organisations. Finally, Ambassador Kimani made the point that VE extremist narratives seem to provide to some people a way to change the world and address its problems, but this ambition should be channeled in non-violent ways. He noted that the initiatives described in the National Application will enable this.

8.2 The Chair of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) (by video-conference) said the IRP endorsed the national application particularly because it aligns with Kenya's national policy. The three applications focus on different demographics, there is no duplication of resources, and each uses differentiated approaches. The IRP further noted that it would be good to see the expansion of this programming from one region to another; there is a strong need to undertake risk analysis to try to ensure that everyone involved in the process is safe; regarding one of the organisations there is a need to ensure women are included in all activities; and related to another, clear responsibilities and allocation of resources to each consortium partner needs to be assigned.

8.3 The Board member for the Netherlands and United States asked about the organisation of the CSM and UNDP's role. Also regarding the CSM, the Alternate Board member for Switzerland asked if the composition of the CSM was already clear and about interaction between the CSM and donors. Ambassador Kimani responded that the UNDP are not currently substantively engaged in the process, however their engagement would be welcome. Furthermore, he commented that all donors are welcome on the CSM and Kenyan government representation is deliberately light to ensure its independence. He also made the point that Kenya is, in effect, a donor as it covers the costs of staff time, office space and refreshments during CSM meetings. The ED commented that this contribution should indeed be formally recognised and as per the CSM review consideration should be given to remuneration of costs.

8.4 The Board member for the Netherlands and United States asked for further clarity about one grantee given they do not have PVE programmes. Ambassador Kimani responded that the grantee has moved beyond only reacting to crises and instead now takes preventive action. In addition, they have a credible reputation on the ground and a track record of making a positive impact. The EU representative at the Board meeting noted that the EU had also recently provided funding for that grantee for PVE.

8.5 The Board member for the Netherlands and United States also commented that the US had recently suspended one of PR's sub-recipients (SRs). The ED replied that the Secretariat has a rigorous due diligence process that would now ensue.

8.6 The Board member for the EU and France registered full support for the application and suggested attention be paid to avoid overlaps. The Senior Grants Officer responsible for programmes in Kenya noted that all recommendations from the IRP and the Board will be responded to; proposals will be shared with donors in-country for another round of review to ensure they are de-conflicted with other programmes; and the Secretariat will continue to keep the Board informed on how it is responding to the IRP recommendations.

8.7 The ED proposed additional language to the decision to reflect the need to fulfill the IRP and the Board's recommendations and to regularly update the Board.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. welcomes the National Application submitted by the Kenya Country Support Mechanism (“CSM”) and the recommendations and feedback provided by the Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) as detailed in BM.08/DOC.08;
- b. approves the National Application of the Kenya CSM as presented in Annex 6 “Signed Kenya National Application in full” of BM.08/DOC.08;
- c. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the finalisation of grant agreements with the selected Potential Principal Recipients (“PPRs”) as described in Section 7 “Next Steps” in BM.08/DOC.08, subject to the fulfilment of the IRP’s and Board’s recommendations, and to regular updates to the Board; and
- d. authorises the Secretariat to enter into grant agreements with the selected PPRs as identified in BM.08/DOC.08 for a total of not more than USD 5 million.

9. TUNISIA COUNTRY STRATEGY: INVESTMENT PLAN

9.1 The Board member for the North Africa and Middle East constituency introduced the Tunisia country strategy, highlighting that terrorists acts and recruitment to violent extremist groups present serious challenges for Tunisia. He pointed out that given the geographic and economic situation of Tunisia—referencing the challenges faced by its neighbouring countries—Tunisia requires support from multiple sources so that civil society can work to bring about behavioral changes to prevent recruitment to violent extremist groups. The National Counter Terrorism Commission (CNLT) was set up in 2015 and has a mandate to coordinate all P/CVE efforts. It is comprised of representatives from all ministries and will establish the CSM.

9.2 The ED commented that there is political momentum in Tunisia and a CSM ready to start work and therefore it is appropriate that this momentum is seized. He reminded the Board that in developing the investment plan the Secretariat had consulted widely and triangulated the data as much as possible. In addition, he noted some criticism of the plan related to the lack of specificity and the need to define GCERF’s niche. He committed the Secretariat to refining the Strategy and providing a revised version to the Board in the coming weeks.

9.3 In the absence of the IRP Chair, the ED read the Chair’s statement noting that the IRP had provided feedback on the plan which has been included, and that it endorses the plan. The plan reflects important aspects of PVE needs in Tunisia, including: the focus on youth given the youth bulge and identified drivers; the urgency to include rehabilitation and reintegration of violent extremist offenders and support for their families; and the selection of geographic areas given they have not received attention from other donors.

9.4 The Board member for Civil Society underlined that it is an important moment for Tunisia in terms of preventing VE and, in his extensive experience working in Tunisia and with the CNLT, it is clear that GCERF is supporting an issue that other donors often shy away from given its sensitivity and the political risk involved. He further noted that it will be important to partner with UNDP and look at including a regional dimension to the response.

9.5 The Constituency member for the EU and France commented that, given there is already much international support, it is important for fundraising purposes to show GCERF will add value, and was particularly interested in how GCERF will work with religious leaders.

10. FINANCIAL MATTERS

10.1 The Chief Financial Officer (CFO) summarised aspects related to the 2017 financial statements. She highlighted that as of the end of 2017 USD 13m in commitments were signed and GCERF has a comfortable cash position thanks to donors that provided cash ahead of the grant helping to avoid potential cash-flow problems. She pointed out that there are no financial reserves which is a risk—while the Secretariat has comprehensive insurance there are risks that cannot be mitigated through insurance. The CFO stated that most income received is restricted; with the majority coming from the US for Secretariat costs and from Canada for support to the M&E function. While unrestricted income was mostly from Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Qatar.

10.2 Regarding expenses, the CFO highlighted that in 2017, governance and Secretariat costs represent the majority of expenses. In terms of expenses by country, investments began in Kosovo in 2017, the commitment in Mali was topped up to ensure Round 1 recipients in all countries including Mali received an amount close to what had been committed in 2015. She noted that the Secretariat tries to reduce operating expenses as much as possible, however there are always fixed costs, especially for staff. Finally, the reason why financial performance in budget terms was so poor is both due to the fact that half of the donor commitments could not be secured in 2017 and due to delays as a result of external events pushing the funding commitment in Kenya to 2018.

10.3 The auditors from BDO provided a summary on the process and result of the audit of the 2017 financial statements explaining that two sets of financial statements were 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). One aspect of risk that the audit focused on was the advances paid to partners in-country and the commitment based on the information about the use of funds provided by partners. The auditor reported that to complete the audit, it also reviewed reports prepared by Moore Stephens, the firm in charge of auditing projects in the field. The auditor noted it was concerned that the annual budget be covered by contributions to avoid the organisation facing difficulties at the end of 2017. Finally, the auditor spoke about internal control and noted that recommendations made in 2016 had been addressed.

10.4 An unqualified report on the financial statements would be issued. No violations of law, the Foundation's statutes, or the organisations regulations were noted. There were no difficulties encountered in accessing information or collaborating with GCERF's management, and overall the accounts were in excellent order.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/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 2018 financial year.

Funding situation and Other Financial Matters

10.5 The CFO explained the implications of the need to decrease the 2018 budget due to the funding situation, including that approximately 40 percent of the Core Funding Mechanism (CFM) budget would need to be cut meaning in particular that there are no funds for another round in Bangladesh for the CFM nor enough to support even another smaller round in Mali this year. Furthermore, operating expenses will be cut while at the same time preserving the capacity to operate effectively and continue to strive for impact. There will be no changes to the amount approved and allocated for the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) in Bangladesh; the Board approved amount for Kenya should be committed by year end; grant commitments in Kosovo for this year are signed; and funding for another round in Nigeria should proceed as planned. In summary, from an initial budget of USD 30m and making the cuts described, the total expenses funded for 2018 are budgeted at close to USD 22m. The expense budget is fully funded except for an amount of USD 140,000 which should be covered by the end of the year.

10.6 The prospective for 2019 does not look as good. 85 percent of the cash resources received will have been spent by the end of 2018. Assuming other donors maintain their current level of commitment and based on commitments announced by the Netherlands, Qatar and Switzerland during the Board meeting, an annual budget of USD 10-15m can be foreseen for both grants and operating expenses. Therefore, by 2022 USD 52m could be invested—an amount significantly different from the Strategy that was approved in 2017. This means that the expected decline in the ratio of operating expenses to grant commitments as a result of a growing fund, will not occur. One effect of this is that the Secretariat will need to be much more cautious and ask donors to commit funds in tranches over the years of the commitment, rather than having the full amount committed in the first year as was initially the case in 2015.

10.7 The CFO reiterated the key characteristics of a healthy fund: that there is predictable long term funding to establish credibility and have the ability to plan in a strategic manner with

unrestricted funding being ideal; substantial funding is available to achieve the reach and impact expected; and economies of scale can be leveraged. Finally, as described in the Board paper, the CFO outlined the intention to try to secure long term funding of operational expenses to develop the Secretariat as a platform on which more grants can be added and committed quickly, that can be nimble and respond to emerging issues.

Discussion

10.8 The Board member for the Netherlands and the United States concurred that Board members need to play an active role in funding raising while at the same time, she noted, that as the budget is being revised there needs to be consideration of the extent to which GCERF should expand or not. In addition, she highlighted that the reality is that unrestricted funding for PVE may be less available.

10.9 The Alternate Board member for Switzerland acknowledged the challenges faced in launching initiatives in countries and the investments required related to this, however, he pointed out that there continues to be an unhealthy ratio between the operating expenses and grants. Furthermore, he expressed support for the ED's comments that bold proposals to remedy this situation will be provided to the Board.

Internal Control

10.10 The CFO noted that it is a requirement under Swiss law that the Board provide direction to management on how it operates and designs its internal control system. The CFO reported that on the basis of risk appetite approved by the Board in 2017: (i) the Secretariat carries out regular assessment and analysis of risks to GCERF objectives in terms of financial management; (ii) every time a new process is introduced the COSO model of internal control guidelines is followed; and (iii) financial and administrative policies and regulations are regularly reviewed. The CFO highlighted the key risks outlined in the Board paper and noted new elements in the internal control system, including that an anti-fraud strategy had been distributed which compiles all aspects of fraud prevention work into a framework, and that an 'integrity line' or 'whistle-blowing hotline' is now accessible to anyone via GCERF's website. Finally, the CFO noted that the Secretariat has updated the delegation of authority regulation, introduced the grievance policy and incident management reporting process to all staff, and finalised the compensation regulation to be shared with all staff.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.07: The Board requests the Secretariat to continue developing and operating the internal control system on the basis of the principles and approach described in document BM.08/DOC.07. It endorses the internal control measures currently in place.

11. OPERATIONS UPDATE

11.1 The ED gave an overview of operations (BM.08 DOC.04) by country. In Bangladesh, the CFM is ongoing and the AFM is now operational. Programs in Cox's Bazar are adapting to the challenges of doing long-term preventive work in the context of a humanitarian crisis. The grant making process is in progress under the CFM in Kenya and the AFM, intended to attract matching funding from the private sector, is ready to move forward. In Kosovo new grants have been signed in new regions. Grants are running in Mali in spite of growing security concerns. In Nigeria funding of USD 5m is now secured for a second round and programming is being sequenced to not interfere with the election period.

11.2 The ED noted that Myanmar is a beneficiary country and said the Secretariat has responded to a draft MoU from the new government and is waiting on a response. He also said that pending funding, a CFM could be launched in Tunisia. In addition, a letter from the government of the Philippines requesting collaboration is expected shortly for Board approval as a new beneficiary country.

11.3 The ED highlighted that as some grants begin to end this year the Secretariat will be handling grant making, grant management, and grant closure at the same time. He further pointed out that another key focus of work is capacity building of partners in-country which is helping to create ripple effects as programmes begin to be replicated beyond GCERF funding. On a separate issue, the ED noted that the Secretariat has hired a part time safety and security officer to work on putting in place measures to improve Secretariat staff and grantee security.

11.4 The ED reported that the Independent Review Panel (IRP) will be replenished to ensure there is the requisite expertise to reflect the expansion of the organisation.

11.5 Finally, the ED mentioned the CSM Review annexed to the Operations Update paper, noting that the Secretariat will work closely with the Chairs of the CSMs to implement the recommendations outlined in the review and ensure they are functioning optimally. Also annexed to the paper is the External Reviews Position Paper which sets out general guidelines and principles for conducting reviews and recommends that donors conduct joint reviews where possible so as not to over-burden the Secretariat.

Discussion

11.6 The Alternate Board member for the Netherlands and the United States constituency highlighted that one spin-off effect of GCERF is that the Secretariat is becoming a hub of expertise—on PVE generally and on M&E for PVE—and this is reflected in participation at GCTF meetings and other international fora. The Alternate Board member encouraged the Secretariat to continue developing and sharing expertise.

11.7 The Alternate Board member for Switzerland welcomed the information regarding security and comprehensive risk management. In a similar vein, the Alternate Board member for Australia,

Japan, and New Zealand reiterated the importance of being attentive to threats to physical security during programming in Bangladesh. In the context of risk, the ED added that there is a risk of a different order that GCERF raises expectations in communities, and ending support prematurely presents a possible risk of frustration and anger emerging—a situation that is precisely what GCERF is trying to prevent.

11.8 Regarding operations in Bangladesh, the Alternate Board member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand highlighted the importance of both implementing the AFM in a timely manner and working in close partnership with the Government of Bangladesh. The ED reassured that the AFM team has coordinated with its partner in-country on the implementation timeline in order to avoid delays. He added that the Secretariat has a very strong partnership with the Government of Bangladesh.

11.9 Regarding the issue of whether to focus on existing countries or expand, the Board member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand commented that a global fund needs to have a global reach, and it is important for Australia that there is an appropriate global spread of countries. The ED expressed his agreement noting that the focus is strategic and judicious expansion. Adding to this, the Board member for the EU and France said the EU would fully support expansion into countries that would allow GCERF to attract more funding. On a separate note, the Board member encouraged continued engagement with the private sector. The ED responded that realistically the private sector is not going to become a significant funder, however there are alternative ways to collaborate with the sector and the Secretariat is working on these.

11.10 Regarding the CSM review, the Board member for West and Central Africa reiterated that membership of the CSM should be balanced and reflect national ownership. Also in relation to CSMs, the Board member for Kenya added that many CSM members had built up expertise and experience and should be allowed to remain on the CSM even after their job function or position changes.

12. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

12.1 The Chair of the Ethics Committee reported that no conflicts of interest had been identified and noted that according to the GCERF policy on ethics and conflicts of interest ‘covered individuals’ need to sign annual declarations of interest forms and requested Board members to submit these. The Chair of the Ethics Committee noted that CSMs and PRs are subject to the GCERF policy on conflicts of interest and conflicts of interest can arise and should be addressed, however none had been reported to date. Furthermore, he noted that at the last Board meeting there was a recommendation that CSMs draft conflict of interest policies, however, no policies had yet been finalised. Regarding funding recipients, they are bound by codes of conduct and they are reviewed during grant making and financial audits ensure compliance with minimum standards.

The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.08: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of **Ms Noor Ibrahim Al-Sada** of the Qatar constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee, and thanks her for her service; and
- b. approves appointment of **Mr Abdullah Khalifa Al-Sowadi** of the Qatar constituency as a member of the Ethics Committee for the period until 30 June 2019 in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee.

13. 2017 ANNUAL REPORT FOR SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

13.1 The Board took the following decision:

BM.08/DEC.09: The Board approves the 2017 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.08/DOC.13 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

14. RESOURCE MOBILISATION

14.1 The ED introduced the RM session (RM.08 DOC.11) by saying that the purpose of the session was to seek the Board's advice on how to seek resources more successfully. He described the architecture from the resource mobilisation (RM) strategy implementation plan, including that: the foundation of any RM strategy is an engaged Board; there is a need to invest resources (e.g. in staff) to raise resources; there is a need for strong M&E and results and knowledge generation; and a clear statement and case for why channeling funds through GCERF allows donors to help prevent violent extremism more effectively. He reiterated the call for the Board to facilitate access to senior members of government, as Qatar recently did resulting in a meeting with the Foreign Minister. In addition, the ED stated that the objective is to reach a funding target of about USD 50m per year by 2023, and asked for the Board's feedback on this target.

14.2 The ED acknowledged that national interests are predominant and while currently half of GCERF's funding is earmarked he hopes to increase the level of unearmarked funding to two thirds of overall funding. Furthermore, the ED commented that the focus of fundraising efforts would continue to be directed to current donors before moving into a more expansive fundraising phase. GCTF members should be targeted and current donors have a role to play. The Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer made the point that support from existing donors helps to attract and instill confidence in potential new donors.

Discussion

14.3 The Board member for the Netherlands and US commented that GCERF needs to clarify its direction if it is to meet the funding goal mentioned. The Board member noted that more work needs

to be done to articulate the dual emphasis of development and security in its approach and encouraged the Board to reflect on whether GCERF needs to choose between a 'prevention' and a 'countering' approach; that is, between PVE and CVE.

14.4 The Alternate Board member for the Netherlands and the US asked if the idea of the high level panel raised last year was being considered in the context of the RM strategy. The Chair responded that the idea is not ruled out and it has potential, however there is a challenging in finding appropriate members.

15. CONCLUDING REMARKS

15.1 The Chair brought the meeting to a close acknowledging the hard work of the Secretariat, including staff and interns not at the meeting; thanking the ED and the Board as a whole.

15.2 The ED thanked the Board for a challenging meeting, and invited the Board to reflect on its own role: Are donors supporting the Fund as originally committed? Are they able to distinguish their responsibilities as donors from their responsibilities as Board members? Are beneficiary countries placing unrealistic expectations on the Fund? Are the non-governmental constituencies fulfilling their role as Board members? Does the Board as a whole subject the Secretariat to a level of scrutiny and oversight appropriate for its size? He reiterated his intention to make significant proposals for change at the next Board meeting.

ANNEX 1
BM.08/DOC.01: AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 30 MAY 2018

Location – Mövenpick Hotel, 4 avenue de Rhodanie Ouchy, 1007 Lausanne

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 – 10:30	Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome)		Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team/ Member of Ethics Committee
10:30 – 10:45	Welcome Coffee		
10:45 – 11:00	Welcoming Remarks		Board Chair
11:00 – 11:15	Preliminary Matters		Board Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members 	DOC.01	
11:15 – 12:30	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
12:30 – 13:30	Buffet Lunch		
13:30 – 14:45	Insights from the Field		Executive Director / GCERF Grantees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion with Principal Recipients from Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria 		
14:45 – 15:30	Results	DOC.03 (for information)	Executive Director / Senior Performance Monitoring & Evaluation Advisor
15:30 – 15:45	Coffee Break		
15:45 – 16:15	Operations Update	DOC.04 (for information)	Executive Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the CSM Review 		
16:15 – 18:00	Kenya National Application: Funding Decision	DOC.08 (for decision)	Executive Director/ CSM Chair / IRP Chair
	Nigeria Country Strategy: Re-Investment Plan	DOC.09 (for decision)	
	Tunisia Country Strategy: Investment Plan	DOC.10 (for decision)	
18:00	Reception		
	Restaurant at the Mövenpick Hotel		

THURSDAY 31 MAY 2018

Location – Mövenpick Hotel, 4 avenue de Rhodanie Ouchy, 1007 Lausanne

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 – 10:00	Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017 Audited Statements • Funding Situation & Other Financial Matters • Internal Control System 	DOC.05 (for decision) DOC.06 (for information) DOC.07 (for decision)	Chief Financial Officer / External Auditors
10:00 – 10:45	Resource Mobilisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Resource Mobilisation • Resource Mobilisation Plan 	DOC.11 (for information)	Executive Director/Senior Resource Mobilisation Officer
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee break		
11:00 – 11:15	Report of the Ethics Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status Update 	DOC.12 (for information)	Chair of the Ethics Committee
11:15 – 11:30	2017 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority	DOC.13 (for decision)	Board Chair
11:30 – 11:45	Any other business		Board Chair/ Executive Director
11:45	End of the meeting		
11:45 – 12:30	Executive Session (Board Members only)		Board Chair
12:30 – 13:30	Buffet Lunch		
13:30 – 14:30	Donors' Meeting		Board Chair/ Executive Director



ANNEX 2
8th GCERF Board Meeting
30-31 May 2018
Lausanne, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

Board Member: Mr Yujiro Hayashi, Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

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

Constituency Members:

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

Ms Hine-Wai Loose, Senior Policy Adviser, Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Bangladesh

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

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: H.E. Ms Miriam Shearman, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations and Other International Organisations in Geneva on behalf of Ms Sue Breeze, Team Leader – Bilateral (Middle East & Asia), International Counter Extremism Group, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

Alternate Board Member: Ms Michelle Cameron, Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Constituency Member: Ms Batoul Hussain, Senior Project Manager, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

European Union and France

Board Member: Mr Jesper Steen Pedersen, Head of Sector, Global and Transregional Threats, Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO), European Commission, Brussels on behalf of Mr Olivier Luyckx, Head of Unit, Stability, Security, Development and Nuclear Safety, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

Alternate Board Member: Mr François Gave, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of France on behalf of H.E. Ms Elisabeth Laurin, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Constituency Members:

Ms Maria Castaldi, Programme Manager-Countering Violent Extremism, Unit B5 –Security, Nuclear Safety, DG DEVCO, European Commission, Brussels

Ms Estelle Feriaud, Desk Officer, Counterterrorism and Organized Crime Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Mrs Clarisse Gerardin, Political Counsellor, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Foundations

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr David Barth, Director, Youth Opportunity and Learning, Ford Foundation, New York

Kenya (Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa)

Board Member: H.E. Mr Andrew Kihurani, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva on behalf of H.E. Dr Stephen Ndungu Karau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Constituency Members:

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

Mr Joseph Onyango Opondo, Deputy Director, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC), Nairobi

Mr Kennedy Ochieng Mwai, Assistant to the Director, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC), Nairobi

Kosovo

Constituency Member: Mr Kujtim Bytyqi, CSM Chair; Senior Security Policy Analyst, Secretariat of Kosovo Security Council, Pristina

Mali and Nigeria (West and Central Africa)

Board Member: H.E. Mr Audu Ayinla Kadiri, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate 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. Mr Mamadou Henri Konate, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Norway

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

Policy, Think and Do Tanks

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

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: Mr Almuhammad Al-Hammadi, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the State of Qatar Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Switzerland

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

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

Constituency Members:

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

Dr Céline Glutz, Senior Adviser Counterterrorism and Prevention of Violent Extremism
Directorate of International Law, Counterterrorism Coordination, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Mr Derek Müller, Head of the SDC South Asia and Conflict & Human Rights Division, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Tunisia (North Africa and Middle East)

Board Member: H.E. Minister Hedi Mekni, President of the National Counter Terrorism Commission of Tunisia, and Secretary General of the Government, Tunis

Constituency Member: Ms Mouna Mcharek Hadiji, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Tunisia to the United Nations Office at Geneva

United States of America and the Netherlands

Board Member: Ms Alina Romanowski, Acting Principal Deputy Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, on behalf of H.E. Mr Nathan Sales, Ambassador and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Constituency Members:

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

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

PRESENTERS

GCERF's grantees from Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria

Chair of GCERF Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Ambassador Dr Martin Kimani Mbugua, Chair of the CSM, and Director, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC), Special Envoy CVE in Kenya, Nairobi

OBSERVERS

Italy

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

Morocco

Ms Asmae Benni, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Morocco to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

United Nations Office of Counter- Terrorism (UNOCT)

Dr Jehangir Khan, Director, UNOCT, New York

Mr Hubertus Juergenliemk, Associate Political Affairs Officer, UNOCT, New York

GCERF Secretariat