

## **REPORT OF THE 15<sup>th</sup> BOARD MEETING**

---

The 15th Meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held in hybrid format on 7–8 December 2021. The approved agenda for the 15th Meeting of the Governing Board is contained in Annex 1 and the participant list in Annex 2 of this report.

### **1. WELCOMING REMARKS**

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Mr Stefano Manservigi, opened the meeting and thanked all for joining. He invited Board Members to make opening interventions if they wished.

#### *Discussion*

1.2 The Board Member for Qatar thanked all for the interesting Sahel Conference that preceded the Board meeting. He mentioned lessons learned from Afghanistan and to what extent they are applicable to countries in the Sahel. Qatar believes there is no military solution to these crises; military action is necessary to protect civilians, states, and institutions, but the best option for lasting peace is national reconciliation, dialogue, and peace processes, which GCERF should concentrate on.

1.3 Speaking for Nigeria, the Board Member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso highlighted the need for government, CSOs and other actors to work together towards a solution. He also reiterated the need for a focus on the drivers to violent extremism for youth.

1.4 Speaking for Mali, the Alternate Board Member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso agreed the Sahel Conference's exchanges were fruitful, especially regarding improvements that can be made in the Sahel. He expressed appreciation to the G5 Sahel, stating the need to strengthen state capacities, which must remain the focus. GCERF's approach should have synergies with the states' approaches.

1.5 Speaking for Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), the Constituency Member for Kosovo, North Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina highlighted the importance of a comprehensive, integrated, international approach, especially regarding the instrumentalization of youth and sensitive ethnic issues. He offered experience from his national context, which deals with issues of blame and mistrust. BiH recognises GCERF as a partner in the implementation of priorities and activities set in accordance with the context on the ground: empowering the local community; reintegration, rehabilitation and resocialisation (RRR) of returnees and their family members; and strengthening the role of

media as well as religious societies in RRR and countering violent extremism. He expressed readiness for further work with GCERF to meet the goals set in the regional strategy for investment in Western Balkans.

1.6 Speaking for Niger, the Constituency Member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso agreed with the Board Member for Qatar concerning the political elements of the solution in the Sahel region and expressed Niger's commitment to this type of solution. He said empowering civil society organizations (CSOs) as part of the solution is important, but that the state remains at the heart of the solution; for example, while CSOs may have access in metropolitan areas, the state is often the key actor in areas of direct conflict.

1.7 Speaking for Burkina Faso, the Constituency Member for Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso expressed appreciation for the Sahel Conference and thanked GCERF for its flexibility in programming. Burkina Faso supports an approach that optimises impact through different levels but reiterated the need for state responsibility. He highlighted the cross-border activity of terrorist groups, further stressing the importance of support for and accountability within the governments.

1.8 The Chair of the Board thanked all for their interventions and starting off the meeting with a good exchange. He agreed with the need to ensure different strands of interventions, particularly for effective programming in the Sahel.

## **2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

### *Appointment of the Rapporteur*

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Mr Fulco Van Deventer, Board Member for the Civil Society constituency kindly agreed to take the role.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.15/DEC.01:** Mr Fulco Van Deventer of the Civil Society constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 15th Board meeting.

### *Approval of the Agenda*

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.15/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.15/DEC.02:** The agenda for the 15<sup>th</sup> Board meeting (BM.15/DOC.01) is approved.

*Confirmation of new Board Members*

2.5 The Chair welcomed new Board Members and representatives from Australia and North Macedonia.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.15/DEC.03:** The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 14<sup>th</sup> Board meeting:

- **Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Ambassador Jeffrey Roach replaces Ambassador Cecile Hillyer as the Board Member;
- **Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Mr Chitaru Shimizu replaces Mr Peter Scott as the Alternate Board Member; and
- **Kosovo, North Macedonia and Bosnia Herzegovina:** Mr Zlatko Apostoloski replaces Mr Borce Petrevski as the Alternate Board Member.

**3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED), Dr Khalid Koser, to present his report (BM.15/DOC.02) and welcomed participation from the Board.

3.2 The ED expressed thanks to all in person and virtually, noting the growing Board. He welcomed the former Chair of the Board, present at the meeting, and expressed thanks to the GCERF Secretariat. He briefly responded to the opening interventions, re-confirming upcoming sessions which will enable the continuation of these conversations.

3.3 The ED noted that the high level of participation in the Sahel Conference is testament to the importance of GCERF's work and the importance of P/CVE. The narrative was clear: violent extremism and terrorism are growing in the Sahel region with much wider implications beyond the region. In prevention of violent extremism, one needs a multi-stakeholder, multi-sector approach. GCERF isn't just doing a good job in the Sahel but in the Horn of Africa, Southeast Asia, Western Balkans - building strong programmes, monitoring and evaluation, and results-based management. He circulated a letter signed by the 14 Chairs of the Country Support Mechanisms (CSMs) offering their support and endorsement for the work of GCERF and appealing for further investment.

3.4 The ED offered a few retrospective points: (i) GCERF signed 11 new grants in 2021, 44 grants across 14 countries in total; (ii) donor visits took place in Kenya and the Western Balkans; (iii) two national conferences, in Mali and Nigeria, were successful in bringing together the diverse actors involved in PVE work; (iv) external evaluations have been

conducted and been positive; (v) Strategy 2025 was approved, a strategy which consulted local partners and donors and which defines entry and exit criteria; (vi) GCERF launched a replenishment campaign, which is ongoing and has boosted external visibility; and (vii) the Secretariat remains a strong team with a strong culture, with dedicated staff and National Advisors working and adding value in almost every GCERF country.

3.5 The ED offered prospective points: (i) the new grants must be implemented and managed effectively; (ii) demonstrating results and impact will continue to be a priority; (iii) Strategy 2025 will be implemented, with the added principles of conflict-sensitive programming and results-based management; (iv) Local Knowledge Partners will play a key role on the ground to ensure effectiveness of research, data gathering, and results; (v) a digital heatmapping project piloted in Nigeria will be expanded in other countries; (vi) a global alliance will offer a platform for GCERF partners to share lessons learned and collaborate; (vii) a joint initiative with the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) will look at challenges to funding and capacity-building at the local level; and (viii) emphasis will be further placed on the pillars of sustainable funding and organisational culture.

3.6 The ED acknowledged the replenishment campaign was not concluded as planned due to the global pandemic, with diverted resources and limited travel and networking opportunities. He looks forward to getting this back on track. A large part of the campaign will be pledges made at various key points along the way, with a culmination event at UNGA 2022, for which there is still political support at the highest level

3.7 The ED reiterated GCERF's readiness to work in new countries such as Mozambique, Kazakhstan, and potentially Afghanistan, and an increasing focus on partnerships and the private sector. He concluded by reiterating that GCERF's core work is grant making and grant management but more and more, GCERF is helping build the global field of prevention of violent extremism.

3.6 The Chair thanked the ED for his intervention. He highlighted key points: (i) funding is crucial, especially given the acknowledgement of the unique and effective work of GCERF; (ii) regional programming requires advocacy by the partner countries to ensure support for the model; and (iii) the replenishment campaign must be collaborative and designed in steps to allow for support and participation along the way. The Chair opened the session to comments and questions.

#### *Discussion*

3.7 Speaking for Tunisia, the Board Member for Tunisia and the Philippines thanked all and congratulated GCERF on the innovative nature of the meeting format, putting an emphasis on strategic discussions and political commitments. She provided an update on

violent extremism in Tunisia and the P/CVE steps the government is taking. She said that thanks to the financial support of GCERF, the first phase of the national P/CVE strategy has been completed and the second launched, which takes into account lessons learned from the first. She outlined key features of the second strategy phase and looks forward to continuing to support GCERF's work in Tunisia.

3.8 Speaking for the United States, the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany thanked and congratulated GCERF for its 15<sup>th</sup> Board meeting, and thanked France for hosting it. He highlighted a few positive takeaways: (i) at less than 10 percent, Operating Expenses (OpEx) are at a commendable level; (ii) Strategy 2025 and investment plan creates an essential framework for donors to understand financial allocations; and (iii) the increased monitoring and evaluation helps immensely with fundraising. He was concerned about the low coverage of the 2022 budget and the replenishment campaign target. Referencing the previous funding shortage issues GCERF faced and the global pandemic, he suggested that it is the responsibility of existing GCERF donors to ensure these gaps are filled. The ED thanked the US for helping to articulate the case for investment in GCERF, noting the biggest challenge is income rather than expenditure.

3.9 The Board Member for Qatar echoed the United States' comments about funding. He said the political will of countries to tackle the drivers of violent extremism is important. GCERF's investments aim to build national capacity to coordinate P/CVE efforts, with the eradication of violent extremism as a direct responsibility of the state. He reminded all about the need for clear exit strategy. He thanked the Chair and the ED for acknowledging the request to consider working in Afghanistan, reiterating his previous explanations as to why GCERF should be working in high-profile conflict areas. In order to effectively consider all these priorities, he suggested reform is needed to the decision-making and voting model. The replenishment has been a modest success and he expressed interest in further consideration of why this is so. He also offered the idea that GCERF move from a funding mechanism to an implementing agency.

3.10 The ED agreed the points brought up by the Board Member for Qatar are important, acknowledging that GCERF is meant to facilitate, leverage, and smooth the way for PVE work in partner countries. He reiterated that the Board is invited to reconfirm its commitment to countries every three years by approving new country strategies and rounds of funding. Further, he looked forward to the agenda item on Day 2 which would allow for further discussion on decision making and voting.

3.11 Speaking for the Netherlands, the Alternate Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany thanked GCERF and France. She made

three points: (i) on the issue of funding, she offered support for the comments made by the US; (ii) on entry and exit, she said it is important to operate cautiously to ensure sufficient funding for expansion proposals; and (iii) the growth and expansion of GCERF's Governing Board is welcome, so it is also important to ensure the governance structure is sufficient to support the challenges and growth facing GCERF.

3.12 Speaking for the United Kingdom, the Board Member for Canada and the United Kingdom thanked GCERF and France. She offered support for the intended plans set out in the ED report and echoed some of the points made on funding. She welcomed a commitment to greater donor coordination and the focus on expanding funding sources, for instance by private sector actors. She also supported the combination of Board meetings with high-level events to help raise the profile of GCERF and include additional colleagues.

3.13 Speaking for France, the Alternate Board Member for the European Union, France, Denmark and Italy expressed his honour at welcoming the Board in Paris. He stressed that the co-ownership of partner countries along with GCERF's global approach are core guiding values that enhance the importance of GCERF. He thanked the Chair for his initiative with the Sahel Conference and expressed France's satisfaction with GCERF's progress and future plans. GCERF has an important role to play in PVE, which is a broader issue than just the elimination of jihadists. He underlined three core points: (i) the underfunded budget is a problem, and he echoed the Netherlands about pursuing a prudent approach to expansion; (ii) PVE remains a political priority and there is a mandate by the European Union to increase engagement on the subject; and (iii) the pledge increase made at the Sahel Conference by France is not just for the replenishment campaign but is intended to signal a sustainable increase in France's investment.

3.14 The Representative for Switzerland expressed thanks to all and explained his virtual presence due to the pandemic. He echoed points made by fellow Board Members regarding funding. He commended the results achieved by the Secretariat, highlighted in the ED report, and the inclusion of the Sahel Conference on the side of the Board meeting. He explained Switzerland works in multi-year funding cycles, currently through 2022; Switzerland is already reflecting on how it can work with GCERF towards support during the next cycle.

3.15 Speaking for the European Union, the Board Member for the European Union, France, Denmark and Italy joined fellow Board Members in congratulating and thanking GCERF for the meeting and the Sahel Conference. He expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's strong performance despite the pandemic, assuring the EU would remain a strong proponent for GCERF. He welcomed the opportunity for strategic discussions about the direction of GCERF. He reiterated the 'gold standard' results framework at GCERF. He updated the Board that the EU conducted an audit of GCERF and found everything to be high

standard. Regarding funding, he expressed the importance of getting in front of the large donors who might bring significant funding to GCERF. The EU hopes to double its funding to GCERF in 2022. He also agreed that the partner countries can play a greater role in supporting GCERF's resource mobilisation.

3.16 The Board Member for Nigeria thanked all and acknowledged that partner countries may take certain measures to address P/CVE issues. He reminded the Board that P/CVE work is not 'one size fits all' and looks forward to working with GCERF going forward.

3.17 Speaking for Italy, the Constituency Member for the European Union, France, Denmark and Italy thanked all and reiterated the pledge made by Italy at the Sahel Conference for USD 2m. He hopes additional pledges will encourage further contributions by additional donors and by the private sector.

3.18 The Board Member for Bangladesh thanked all. He updated on the progress made on PVE in Bangladesh, a testament to the vigilance of security forces but also through addressing the drivers and ensuring a long-term approach, undertaken in coordination with GCERF. He underlined the sustainability of GCERF's programmes, which in turn require sustainable investments. He expressed support for the ongoing replenishment campaign.

3.19 Speaking for Germany, the Constituency Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany thanked all and offered a couple of points: (i) the high-level visit to the Western Balkans was significant in giving donors further insights into GCERF's work, and she recommended additional visits ahead of Board meetings to encourage donors; and (ii) she encouraged the addition of side events that focus on a geographic or thematic topic.

3.20 Speaking for Australia, the Board Member for Australia, Japan and New Zealand thanked all and appreciated the Sahel Conference. He summarised three themes he heard interest in by fellow Board Members and which he will look forward to further discussions about, namely budget, governance, and external engagement. He realised GCERF is at a pivotal point as an organisation, and it will be important to remember and prioritise collective agreement on the high value of GCERF.

3.21 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency offered observations on GCERF's ability to attract private sector support, recommending local private sector in partner countries as the best opportunity. In particular, he recommended including private sector justification and approach in country strategies, including better articulating why private sector should be involved and an increased approach to outreach to them.

3.22 The Representative for Niger explained how the government supported GCERF to become operational in the country. He also announced approval from the Prime Minister of Niger to make a contribution of USD 50k to GCERF programming for 2022.

3.23 The Chair invited the ED to make any replies or comments. The ED praised the significant and pivotal announcement of a financial commitment of co-investment by a partner country, which shows a real example of partnership. He thanked Niger for its political and financial support and offered Niger as a strong example for other partner countries which might also have finances available to co-invest.

3.24 The ED thanked all for their interventions and confirmed that the rest of the sessions during the meeting will cover most of the comments made. He highlighted a few points: (i) the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) has endorsed the budget, which is necessary; (ii) conversations around topics such as governance structure are important but should not distract from results and financing; and (iii) consistent commitments from donors are essential for sustainable programming and impact by GCERF.

#### **4. PORTFOLIO UPDATE**

4.1 The Chair invited the Head of the Portfolio Management Unit (HPMU) to briefly present the Portfolio Update (BM.15/DOC.03). The HPMU presented the update, highlighting: (i) progress made on discussions with the Mozambique government (BM.15/DOC.03/Annex.01); (ii) GCERF's approach to conflict-sensitive programming (BM.15/DOC.03/Annex.02); (iii) the important reflection period taken to ensure the impact and success of Strategy 2025; (iv) the launch of the Global Action Platform, a network to facilitate collaboration and knowledge-sharing between local partners from around the world; and (v) the increasing request from partner countries for GCERF to aid in the design and implementation of regional or local action plans for P/CVE.

4.2 The HPMU invited participants in the high-level Board missions to the Western Balkans and Kenya to share any feedback with the Board. The attending representative from Germany thanked GCERF and its Western Balkans partners for the opportunity to visit the programmes; he stressed how important it was to see the direct impact of the work they are funding and how complex the programming is, which especially aids in advocating for funding for GCERF. The attending representative from the European Union thanked GCERF for the project visit in Kenya and encouraged more opportunities to visit programme countries as a strong advocacy tool for GCERF support.

4.3 The attending representative from the Netherlands thanked GCERF for the opportunity to visit the Western Balkans which offered greater insights into the measurement and impact of programming, particularly within the framework of a regional



approach. She agreed on the importance of these visits and stressed the responsibility that falls back on donors to ensure the sustainability of these programmes. The Chair of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) added that the learnings from the Western Balkans programme, particularly in the area of rehabilitation and reintegration (R&R), are beneficial.

4.4 The HPMU concluded with a few forward-looking points: (i) modest expansion to Sahel programming; (ii) strengthening of returnee programme and potential expansion to Central Asia; (iii) broadening of work in south-east Africa; (iv) launch of the Global Action Platform; and (v) harmonisation of capacity-strengthening approaches. The Chair thanked the HPMU and opened the floor for comments and questions.

#### *Discussion*

4.5 The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency congratulated GCERF on its conflict-sensitive approach to programming. He was glad to see Mozambique at the meeting but reminded the Board that the government of Mozambique receives a lot of ODA funding and development aid so suggested that development programmes can also be tweaked to be PVE-relevant.

4.6 The Observer from Mozambique thanked GCERF for the invitation to the meeting, allowing his country to become further educated about GCERF's mission and work. He summarised some of the ongoing efforts in Mozambique and expressed interest in the signing of an agreement with GCERF. The ED thanked him and added that he and a colleague met with officials in Maputo to discuss potential programming and are looking forward to continuing the discussion.

4.7 The Board Member for France congratulated GCERF on its accomplishments and prospects for the future, notably in the Sahel where France's financing is directed. As GCERF did for the Sahel, he could envision a regional approach in the area of Mozambique, noting people are also recruited from Tanzania.

4.8 The Board Member for the United Kingdom appreciated the update from PMU and from Board Members participating in the programme visits, expressing interest in participating in a future trip. She acknowledged and appreciated the monitoring taking place on the ground, particularly the forging of close relationships with local governments for decision making and delivery. She also expressed appreciation for the conflict-sensitive approach to programming.

4.9 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency offered input on private sector in Mozambique, agreeing there is great opportunity for private sector investment in PVE in Mozambique and suggesting that companies in South Africa might also

have interest in supporting programming, as many of them are service providers in Mozambique.

## **5. RESULTS UPDATE**

5.1 The Chair invited the Performance and Impact Manager (PIM) to present the Results update (BM.15/DOC.04), the Strategic Management Plan (BM.15/DOC.05), and the Monitoring and Evaluation Update (BM.15/DOC.06). The PIM briefly presented the Results update, which included GCERF's fulfilment of its mandate to make and manage grants, to reflect and learn from its programming, and to contextualise PVE programming to reflect local needs. He highlighted the update on monitoring and evaluation (BM.15/DOC.06): (i) GCERF is analysing results at three levels, grant-, country/regional-, and global/corporate-level; (ii) the M&E system of GCERF is plural, relying on overlapping layers of monitoring and evaluation to ensure its reliability; and (iii) the deliberate focus on capacity building in every aspect of GCERF's work.

5.2 The PIM offered a summary of the Strategy Management Plan (SMP) (BM.15/DOC.05), which is akin to a results framework for the Strategy 2025. Including six pillars and 18 objectives with respective indicators and targets, the SMP will be reported on annually to monitor progress and to increase transparency and accountability. The Chair thanked the PIM and opened the floor for discussion.

### *Discussion*

5.3 The Board Member for the United Kingdom commended the increased focus on results and impact, noting the difficulty of achieving them in PVE work. She was happy to see the gender balance and the distinction between the local, regional, and global levels. She welcomed a further increased focus on demonstrating new, sustainable capacities and in sharing best practices.

5.4 The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency asked if his understanding that the emphasis is on the resilience of communities is correct, noting it is a priority in PVE but often in coordination with other aspects. He offered that it might be highlighted further.

5.5 The Alternate Board Member for Mali requested clarification on the question of reintegration of former combatants, asking if it was only for returnees in the Balkans or all former combatants from armed groups, terrorist, or other groups? The HPMU confirmed that programming does not only target returnees, but those disengaging from any organised groups, including violent extremist and organised crime.

5.6 The Representative for Switzerland thanked GCERF for inviting Switzerland to consult on the M&E process. He updated the Board that Switzerland felt the process was moving in the right direction and that they encouraged GCERF from the beginning towards results-based management. There is always further room for improvement but for the time being, he said that there is a very solid basis from which to report and advocate. He added that Switzerland also consulted on the conflict-sensitive approach, which is relevant as an important tool feeding the continuous development of results. He offered to continue consulting as needed.

5.7 The PIM thanked all for their comments and, in particular, thanked Switzerland for its consultations. With regard to the SMP, he explained that indicators at the grantee level include achievements related to community agency, including measuring the relationship between the community and the state. He offered examples in Kenya and Nigeria, and looks forward to condensing all of these into one comprehensive learning to be shared.

## **6. LAUNCH OF THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE OF PVE PARTNERS**

6.1 The ED introduced the GCERF Global Action Platform, a collaborative Secretariat effort in response to the engagement and interest from grantees in sharing learnings and connecting on common topics. He offered that the Global Action Platform is an interesting way to increase scale without the formalities of grant-making. He played a [short video](#) to launch the alliance.

### *Discussion*

6.2 The Board Member for France saluted the initiative, seen as an excellent opportunity for best practices and exchanges. This regional and global sharing will build even further on the existing work by GCERF to share lessons learned, which will hopefully bring even more interesting results.

6.3 The Board Member for Nigeria commended the intellectual alliance and asked how it will fit into the wider PVE work?

6.4 The Board Member for the United States echoed colleagues in congratulations and thanked GCERF for the idea. He said that GCERF's benefit of working at the hyper-local level offered a unique opportunity for global exchange and the US has seen success in its own alumni network programmes so is happy to be involved.

6.5 The Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina expressed appreciation for the efforts around this initiative. He stressed the value of leadership in creating value and contributing to things like communication and the redefinition of programmes.

6.6 The ED thanked all for their questions and comments, ensuring there would be a consultation period and emphasising the intention to allow the network to be driven by its participants rather than by the Secretariat.

## **7. FINANCIAL MATTERS**

7.1 The Chair introduced Financial Matters, including three papers: (i) the Finance and Audit Committee Report (BM.15/DOC.08); (ii) the 2022 Budget (BM.15/DOC.09); and (iii) the Funding Situation (BM.15/DOC.10), noting the 2022 Budget has a decision attached. The Chair invited the Finance and Compliance Manager (FCM) to introduce the sessions.

### *Finance & Audit Committee (FAC) Report*

7.2 The Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) presented the FAC report (BM.15/DOC.08), highlighting the Committee's support for the 2022 Budget, which balances ambitious optimism and the available budget. He encouraged donors to make pledges and commitments to support the ongoing replenishment campaign and the Strategy 2025.

### *Funding Situation*

7.3 The FCM presented the Funding Situation (BM.15/DOC.10), highlighting: (i) total confirmed contributions of USD 112m; and (ii) the budget performance for 2021 is expected to be 85% versus 60% in 2020.

### *2022 Budget*

7.4 The FCM presented the 2022 Budget (BM.15/DOC.09), for decision. He explained that the budget for 2022 is USD 35m, absolutely necessary for implementation of the Board-approved Strategy 2025 and endorsed by the FAC. He provided an overview of the budget structure, which includes grant commitments, portfolio management, and operating expenses (OpEx).

7.5 Current coverage of the 2022 Budget is 48% versus 91% for the budget 2021 a year before. There will be a budget revision if necessary, with reductions in investments and activities as necessary based on available funding. If current pledges are delivered, coverage of the 2022 Budget will increase to 85%. However, he warned that some pledges are still missing and requested the donors to communicate with the Secretariat what support they need to continue the process.

### *Discussion*

7.6 The Board Member for the United States thanked and congratulated the Secretariat for hitting the USD 112m mark, providing a strong talking point which the United States uses regularly. He reiterated the increased US pledge for 2021 of USD 5m, which he anticipates maintaining for 2022 and is in the process of approving.

7.7 The Representative for Germany thanked GCERF for the report and noted that Germany just held elections, so looks forward to consider GCERF for its budget for 2022. He noted that in-country donor meetings and communication is helpful for advocating for GCERF and its work to other government stakeholders.

7.8 The Board Member for the European Union confirmed that USD 6m is close to approval for 2022 and he is working on an additional USD 6m for 2023. He reminded the Board that many donors, including the EU, require earmarking but that they try to soft earmark based on where there is a need for the funding. He hopes existing funding can be used to help leverage additional funding.

7.7 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.15/DEC.04:** The Board:

- a. appreciates the work of the Finance & Audit Committee (FAC) for its thorough review of the proposed budget and notes its endorsement;
- b. approves the 2022 budget as follows:
  - Revenue: USD 34.9m
  - Expenses: USD 35.0m; and
- c. notes that 48% of the proposed 2022 budget is funded at this time. Confirmation of announced contributions, as well as new funding is needed.

## **8. Independent Review Panel (IRP) Update**

8.1 The Chair invited the HPMU to provide an overview of the IRP Update (BM.15/DOC.11), for decision. She gave an introduction to the IRP and IRP membership, in particular the selection of four new members. She invited the Chair of the IRP to speak.

8.2 The Chair of the IRP offered an overview of the process for selection of new IRP members and explained how the selection committee came to their nomination decision. He noted the inclusion of a former Board constituency member as a nominee for IRP membership.

*Discussion*

8.3 The Board Member for the United States thanked the outgoing IRP members, many of whom have been involved since the beginning of GCERF. He expressed support for the new nominees and noted the high number of applicants as a positive sign of external interest in GCERF.

8.4 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.15/DEC.05:** The Board:

- a. notes that the second and final term of Mr Tom Wuchte and Ms Qadeem Mossarat as members of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) will end by 31 December 2021 and thanks them for their service;
- b. approves the appointment of the following experts to the IRP also until 31.12.2024:

1. JRAD, Ms Eya
2. LAMALAN, Ms Fatima Star Usman
3. RAVNKILDE, Mr Adam
4. SAMPSON, Mr John

- c. confirms that the following members are serving on the IRP panel:

Second and final term:

1. EVANS, Sir Malcolm, until 31.12.2022;
2. KHAN, Ms Humera, until 31.12.2023;
3. SAINAZAROV, Mr Keneshbek, until 31.12.2022;
4. SCHIRCH, Dr Lisa, until 31.12.2022;

First term:

5. GLAZZARD, Dr Andrew, until 31. 12. 2024
6. MALEFAKIS, Dr Medinat until 31. 12. 2024
7. MALET, Dr David until 31. 12. 2024; and

- d. requests the launch of a renewal process of the IRP membership well in advance of the end of 2022.

## **9. GOVERNANCE UPDATE**

9.1 The Chair invited the Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) to briefly present the GEC Report (BM.15/DOC.12). The Chair of the GEC provided a brief summary of the report, namely an update on Ethics and Conflicts of Interest, reporting no conflicts of interest reported, and an update on governance reform.

9.2 The Chair of the GEC offered an overview of the ongoing discussion around governance reform, including how it came about and the primary topics of concern, voting and constituency membership. In consideration of potential changes to the governance structure, the GEC considered: (i) maintaining a multi-stakeholder governing board, keeping GCERF strong and credible; (ii) enabling financial growth and sustainability by acting as an attractive vehicle for donors to invest in PVE; and (iii) ensuring effective and manageable governance structures. He summarised the illustrative governance structures offered for discussion only in the non-paper on governance reform.

9.3 The Chair thanked the Chair of the GEC and expressed that there are important questions for consideration and without undue delay, they would be considered over a period of time to ensure a strategic and sustainable way forward. He opened the floor for discussion.

### *Discussion*

9.4 The Board Members thanked the Chair, the ED, and the GEC for the information and the opportunity to hold a strategic discussion around governance. They agreed that GCERF is at a critical stage in its growth and that any governance reform must take into consideration any ongoing shifts. Board Members provided thoughtful comments on how potential changes might be perceived by new donor or partner countries, agreeing on the need to ensure an attractive model based on the original values of a multi-stakeholder, manageable governing board.

9.5 Several Board Members cautioned against premature changes to the governance structure given the ongoing replenishment campaign and anticipated additions to donor and partner representation. A few Board Members countered this caution with the suggestion that these ongoing changes present a positive opportunity to reflect on the governance structure.

9.6 Board Members provided feedback on the illustrative governance scenarios prepared in the non-paper, with many supporting the regional constituency model as a basis and a few articulating challenges that would come with a financial allocation

constituency model. The point was made that regardless of model, the Board must ensure the financial sustainability of GCERF through a strategically structured governing board.

9.7 Some donor Board Members expressed a desire to see their financial contributions to GCERF better reflected in the governance structure, particularly in case a matter ever came to a vote. Several perspectives were shared, and it was agreed that the topic must be considered further.

9.8 The Chair thanked all for the thoughtful discussion, following which he would consult the GEC on concrete steps to take as the Board expands and evolves.

## **10. GCERF APPROACH TO AFGHANISTAN**

10.1 The Chair introduced the topic, explaining the background to GCERF considering work in Afghanistan and the questions that must be answered in order to do so. He reminded the Board that the session was for discussion only.

### *Discussion*

10.2 The Board thanked the Chair and the ED for presenting the topic for discussion. They noted the relevance of such a discussion and the need for further consideration of how GCERF programming would work in Afghanistan. The Board member from Qatar felt that engaging with Afghanistan would raise GCERF's prominence and relevance as a global actor, and offered to help facilitate contact with the government.

10.3 Many Board Members expressed concern about the legitimacy of the government in Afghanistan and its ability to fulfil the necessary functions for GCERF to operate there. One Board Member made the point that many of the Board Member countries have previously or were currently engaging with the government of Afghanistan in some way, so suggested engaging with them as a first step in considering the potential for GCERF to operate there.

10.4 A couple of Board Members expressed cautious optimism about GCERF's unique ability to operate in such a complex environment. The point was made that in the years that have passed, many international organisations have commenced and had to cease working in Afghanistan. All acknowledged the increased risk of such an investment. The Board would like to see certain human rights observed in order to proceed.

10.5 The Chair agreed with several points made by the Board and determined to explore further what GCERF programming would look like in Afghanistan, including a possibility of a meeting with the government facilitated by the Board Member for Qatar.



## **11. GLOBAL COMMISSION ON CORPORATE ENGAGEMENT IN PVE**

11.1 The Chair opened the session and invited the ED to present the Global Commission on Corporate Engagement in PVE (the Commission) (BM.15/DOC.14). The ED explained the concept of the Global Commission and highlighted several points: (i) the ongoing challenge to engage the private sector in PVE balanced with the consistent interest from the Board in pursuing it; (ii) the Board should mobilise to nominate Commissioners and the Secretariat will follow up and carry the Commission forward; (iii) the Secretariat's private sector strategy will maintain a focus on in-country engagement with targeted, high-level global engagement to facilitate financial contributions; and (iv) global commissions have proven effective for garnering high-level support for an issue. He stressed that the Commission would serve the wider PVE community and would be an appropriate project for GCERF to lead.

11.2 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency added that it would greatly help to articulate the impact of the private sector on prevention of violent extremism, building the case for engagement. Over the years, there has been an increase in social engagement by corporates, but violent extremism is rarely included so the Commission could help increase understanding of the impact and role. He also stressed that GCERF should maintain its role as a thought leader in PVE and this is a great opportunity to continue doing so.

11.3 The Chair thanked the ED and the Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency for clearly articulating the issue and the proposed solution. He reiterated the importance of connecting dots between the various initiatives of GCERF, suggesting the Commission fits in well with the ambitions of the Strategy 2025 and replenishment.

## **12. INAUGURAL CAROL BELLAMY FELLOWSHIP AWARD**

12.1 The Chair opened the session and invited the ED to present the award (BM.15/DOC.15). The ED expressed thanks and gave credit for the creation and growth of GCERF to the first Chair of the Governing Board, Ms Carol Bellamy. He explained the background of the Fellowship and played a [short video](#). He also pointed out that future iterations of the Fellowship could be sponsored by the private sector.

12.2 The former Chair of the Governing Board said it was her honour and privilege to Chair GCERF for so many years. She acknowledged the significant growth and progress made by GCERF, thanking the ED and Secretariat, the Board, and the recipients of GCERF grants. She stressed women as pivotal actors in their communities and worthy of this investment.

**13. Any Other Business**

13.1 The Chair invited the Board to make any closing remarks.

13.2 The Board Member for Somalia thanked all and thanked GCERF for the new grant in southern Somalia, which they will work to support. He said the Somali government is committed to being part of GCERF and its global forum and looks forward to continuing to work with them on PVE in Somalia.

13.3 The Board Member for Burkina Faso thanked all, saying he found the meeting content very interesting and felt reassured to be part of the organisation in light of the new Strategy, which will have a significant impact. He expressed gratitude to neighbours Mali and Niger, who face similar situations. He congratulated the meeting organisers.

13.4 The Chair thanked all for their active, frank participation. He looks forward to working together to stabilise the financing of the organisation. He announced the next Board meeting will be held in May/June, format and location to be announced. He acknowledged the willingness of Tunisia to host a meeting when possible and he confirmed he would like to host a side event similar to the Sahel Conference.

13.5 The Chair closed the meeting.

**ANNEX 1**

**BM.15/DOC.01 AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2021**

Location – Hybrid (9:00 – 5:00 CET), Maison de la Chimie, Conference room 101, [28 Saint-Dominique Street, Paris](#)

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>9:00 – 13:00</b>	<b>SAHEL HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE</b>	Please see separate agenda attached	
13:00 – 14:30	<b>Buffet Lunch</b>		
14:30 – 14:45	<b>Preliminary Matters</b>		Board Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of Rapporteur</li> <li>• Approval of Agenda</li> <li>• Confirmation of new Board members</li> </ul>	DOC.01 (for decision)	
<b>Information Sessions</b>			
14:45 – 15:15	<b>Report of the Executive Director</b>	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
15:15 – 16:15	<b>Portfolio Management Update</b>	DOC.03 (for information)	Head of Portfolio Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mozambique</li> <li>• Conflict-sensitive programming</li> <li>• Board Feedback on Western Balkans and Kenya Visit</li> </ul>		
16:15 – 16:30	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
16:30 – 17:00	<b>Results Strategic Management Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Update</b>	DOC.04 (for information) DOC.05 (for information) DOC.06 (for information)	Executive Director / Performance & Impact Manager
17:00 – 17:15	<b>Launch of the Global Alliance of PVE Partners</b>	DOC.07 (for information)	
17:15 – 17:30	<b>Any Other Business</b>		Board Chair
17:30 – 18:30	<b>Reception</b>		

**WEDNESDAY 8 DECEMBER 2021**

Location – Hybrid (9:30 – 16:00 CET), Maison de la Chimie, Conference room 101, 28 Saint-Dominique Street, Paris

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
8:30 – 9:30	<b>Donors' Meeting</b>		
9:30 – 9:45	<b>Welcoming Remarks</b> (update for Virtual Participants)		Executive Director
<b>Decisions to Adopt</b>			
9:45 – 10:00	<b>Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) Report</b>	DOC.08 (for information)	Chair of the FAC
10:00 – 11:15	<b>Financial Matters</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2022 Budget</li> <li>• Funding Situation</li> </ul>	DOC.09 (for decision) DOC.10 (for information)	Finance & Compliance Manager
11:15 – 11:30	<b>IRP Update</b>	DOC.11 (for decision)	Head of Portfolio Management / IRP Chair
11:30 – 11:45	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
<b>Exchange of Views / Discussion Sessions</b>			
11:45 – 12:45	<b>Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) Report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance Reform</li> </ul>	DOC.12 (for information)	Board Chair
12:45 – 14:00	<b>Buffet Lunch</b>		
14:00 – 14:30	<b>GCERF Approach to Afghanistan</b>	DOC.13 (for information)	Executive Director
14:30 – 15:00	<b>Global Commission on Corporate Engagement in PVE</b>	DOC.14 (for information)	Executive Director
15:00 – 15:30	<b>Inaugural Carol Bellamy Fellowship Award</b>	DOC.15 (for information)	Carol Bellamy / Executive Director
15:30 – 16:00	<b>Any Other Business</b>		Board Chair
16:00	<b>End of the Meeting</b>		

**ANNEX 2**

**PARTICIPANTS LIST (\*attending virtually)**

**GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR**

Mr Stefano Manservigi

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**Australia, Japan and New Zealand**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Jeffrey Roach, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Chitaru Shimizu\*, Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

**Constituency Members:**

**New Zealand:** Mr James Munro\*, Unit Manager International Security Policy, Unit Manager International Security Policy, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Wellington

Mr Jack Doig\*, Policy Officer, New Zealand Embassy, Paris

Ms Kate Russell\*, New Zealand Embassy, Paris

Mr Satoshi Mori\*, Assistant Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

---

**Bangladesh**

**Alternate Board Member:** H.E. Mr Md. Mustafizur Rahman, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Constituency Member:** Mr Md Baky Billah\*, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office 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 in Geneva

**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Christine Constantin\*, Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs (ICC), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

**Constituency Members:**

Mr George Braun\*, Deputy Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs (ICC), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Ms Courtney Black\*, Senior Project Manager, Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program (CTCBP), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Mr George Dodds-Smith, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom, London

Ms Maya Solnitzky, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom, London

---

**Civil Society**

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

**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Selena Victor\*, Director of Policy & Advocacy, Mercy Corps Europe, London

---

**European Union, France, Denmark and Italy**

**Board Member:** Mr Jesper Steen Pedersen\*, Deputy Head of Unit, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Adrien Frier, Head of the Suppression of Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

**Constituency Members:**

**Denmark:** Ms Marie Helene Steinrücke, Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

**Italy:** Mr Arnaldo Minuti, Head Office VII (International cooperation in counter-terrorism, transnational organized crime, drug trafficking), General Directorate for Political Affairs and Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rome

Ms Hermine Carde, Counterterrorism Expert, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Ms Sihame Zanifi, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

---

**Kenya**

**Board Member:** H.E. Dr Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu\*, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Kosovo, North Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**Board Member:** Mr Mensur Hoti, Director of Department for Public Safety, Ministry Internal Affairs on behalf of H.E. Mr Xhelal Svecla, Minister of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Zlatko Apostoloski\*, National Coordinator for Prevention of Violent Extremism and Counter-Terrorism of North Macedonia, Skopje

**Constituency Members:**

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** H.E. Dr Selmo Cikotić, Minister of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo

Mr Senahid Godinjak, Chief of Staff, Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo

---

**Mali, Nigeria, Niger and Burkina Faso**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Abiodun Richards Adejola, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Adama Coulibaly, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office 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

---

**Constituency Members:**

**Niger:** Brigadier General Mahamadou Abou Tarka, Minister and President of the High Authority for the Consolidation of Peace (HACP), Niamey

**Burkina Faso:** H.E. Mme Madiara Sagnon Tou, Minister Delegate to the State Minister of Burkina Faso in charge of Decentralization, Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization, Ouagadougou

Mr Bruce Emmanuel Sawadogo, Director General for Public Liberties and Political Affairs at the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Decentralization, and Chief of Burkina Faso Regional Cell for the Prevention of Radicalisation (CELLRAD), Ouagadougou

Ms Ogoritsewarami Mattu, Special Assistant of the Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Dr Soumana Ali, Office of the President of the High Authority for the Consolidation of Peace (HACP), Niger; member of the Sahel Regional Funding Panel, Niamey

**Policy, Think and Do Tanks**

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

---

**Private Sector**

**Board Member:** Ms Jessica Long\*, CSO & Managing Director, Closed Loop Partners, New York

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Tony Carroll, Founding Director, Acorus Capital; Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.

---

**Qatar**

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

---

**Somalia**

H.E. Mr Abdihakim Hassan Ashkir, State Minister, Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia, Mogadishu

---

**Switzerland**

**Board Member:** Dr Derek Müller\*, Head of Division Middle East and Northern Africa and Fragility, Conflict & Human Rights Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland on behalf of 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 Member:** Ms Inanna Göbel-Bösch\*, Policy Advisor, Fragility, Conflict and Human Rights, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

---

**Tunisia and the Philippines**

**Board Member:** Ms Neila Feki\*, Vice-President, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis



**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Joan Tolibas\*, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Peace and Security, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Republic of the Philippines on behalf of Mr Alexander Macario, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Peace and Security, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Republic of the Philippines, Manila

---

**Constituency Members:**

Ms Sonia Abbassi\*, Permanent Secretary, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Mr Souhail Neili\*, Deputy Director, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

---

**United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany**

**Board Member:** Mr Irfan Saeed, Deputy Coordinator (Acting) for Prevention & Detention, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Naomi Yorks, Deputy Head of Section, Counterterrorism & National Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

**Constituency Members:**

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

**Germany:** Ms Heike Thiele\*, Director for Civilian Crisis Prevention and Stabilisation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Mr Matthias Kennert, Desk Officer, Crisis Prevention, Stabilization, Peacebuilding Sahel / West Africa, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Ms Dominique Kok, Counterterrorism & National Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Ms Barbara Paoletti, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

---

**OBSERVERS**

**Albania**

Ms Fatilda Smajlaj\*, Head of Division on Education Sector, The Coordination Center for Countering Violent Extremism, Tirana

**Mozambique**

Mr Sérgio Mário Mate, Minister Counselor, Embassy of the Republic of Mozambique in France,  
Paris

---

**UNOCT**

Ms Carole Magnaschi\*, Political Affairs Officer, UN Office of Counter-Terrorism, United Nations  
Liaison Office for Peace and Security, Brussels

---

**Independent Review Panel (IRP)**

Mr Keneshbek B. Sainazarov, IRP Chair and Central Asia Programs Director, Search For  
Common Ground, Bishkek

---

Ms Carol Bellamy, a former GCERF Governing Board Chair

---

**GCERF Secretariat**