

THE REPORT OF THE 23RD BOARD MEETING

The 23rd Meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF), co-hosted by the European Union, was held at the Centre Albert Borschette in Brussels, on 9 and 10 December 2025. The approved agenda of the 23rd Meeting of the Governing Board is provided in Annex 1, and the participants' list in Annex 2 of this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1. The Chair of the Governing Board, Mr Stefano Manservigi (Chair), welcomed participants and thanked them for being present in Brussels.

1.2. The Chair expressed gratitude to the European Union for hosting the meeting.

1.3. He noted the strong engagement in the pledging event of GCERF's second replenishment campaign that took place in New York on 25 September 2025 and expressed gratitude to co-hosts Germany and Chad.

1.4. Acknowledging the high demand for GCERF's work amid a context of declining funding, he pointed to the importance of the new Strategy on the agenda for this meeting.

Preliminary matters

1.5. The Chair noted that the Board and decision papers had been shared with Board Members ahead of the meeting.

1.6. As the first order of business, the Board took the following decisions by a no objection procedure:

BM.23/DEC.01: Ambassador Païvi Kairamo of Finland is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 23rd Board meeting.

BM.23/DEC.02: The agenda for the 23rd Board meeting (BM.23/DOC.01) is approved.

BM.23/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its Membership (each without signatory authority) since the 22nd Board meeting:

- **Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and North Macedonia:** Minister Albana Koçiu replaces Mr Zlatko Apostoloski as the Alternate Board Member;
- **Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Mr Daisuke Tsubaki replaces Mr Koichi Warisawa as the Alternate Board Member;
- **Ghana and Nigeria:** Ambassador Richards Adejola has resigned as a Board Member, and the seat is currently vacant;
- **Kenya, Mozambique and Somalia:** Mr Ali Yassin Gurbe replaces Mr Abdullahi Mohammed Nor as the Alternate Board Member;
- **United Kingdom and United States of America:** Mr Joel Borkert replaces Mr Ian Moss as the Board Member.

2. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

2.1. The Chair invited the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser (ED), to present his report (BM.23/DOC.02) and set the tone for the meeting.

2.2. The ED began by thanking the Chair, Board Members, and the Secretariat. He expressed appreciation for the individual discussions held with Board Members, alongside Deputy Executive Director and Head of Portfolio Management, Dr Lilla Schumicky-Logan (DED), and Head of Finance and Compliance, Nicolas Ferigoule (HF&C).

2.3. Remarking on the extraordinary changes that the multilateral system has experienced in 2025, the ED asked Board Members for their strategic advice and support in addressing the challenges of the ongoing threat to multilateralism, development funding volatility and strategic uncertainty.

2.4. Members were urged to consider GCERF's resilience over the past twelve months as an example of the future model for the multilateralism system in need of reform; highlighting features such as the pooled funding mechanism, discipline in remaining true to the mandate, and GCERF's ability to adapt to the global shift from development towards security.

2.5. Highlighting GCERF's forward-thinking approach, the ED remarked that the model from inception included mechanisms being requested by donors today, such as co-funding, national responsibility and ownership, localisation, niche and low overhead expenses.

2.6. The ED expressed that the global environment is more conducive to violent extremism (VE) and terrorism today than potentially at any point during this century. Noting Afghanistan,

the Sahel and the detention camps of northeast Syria. The current threats of VE globally risk undermining the Sustainable Development Goals.

2.7. He described GCERF's funding situation as stable but not secure, with a manageable funding gap in 2026, but serious concerns for 2027. He therefore appealed to Board Members to sustain the effort to mobilise as many resources as possible.

2.8. Foreseeing volatility across the board in both donor and partner countries, as well as the risks of funding pressures to the Secretariat, he made particular note of the impact on GCERF's results and on grantees, many of which are losing funding from other sources.

2.9. The ED concluded with a call for Board Members to execute their responsibilities of ensuring strong oversight, challenging the Secretariat with the aim of helping it improve, and finally, acting as strategic partners to navigate the challenges of these times.

2.10. In order to guide the discussion against this contextual backdrop, attention was drawn to the documents circulated in preparation for the meeting. Particularly, the Report of the ED (BM.23/DOC.02), Reflections on the Second Replenishment Campaign (BM.23/DOC.03), Four-Year Strategy Review (BM.23/DOC.04), GCERF Strategy 2026-29 (BM.23/DOC.05) and Funding Situation (BM.23/DOC.09). He also highlighted other documents circulated in preparation for the meeting, including the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) Report (BM.23/DOC.06), Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) Report (BM.23/DOC.07), Budget 2026 (BM.23/DOC.08), Portfolio Update (BM.23/DOC.10), IRP Update (BM.23/DOC.11), and Results Update (BM.23/DOC.12).

2.11. The ED noted that the agenda is designed to facilitate a strategic dialogue and some of the above papers, although highly important, will not be discussed. Referring to prior questions and interest from Members about GCERF's work in northeast Syria (Portfolio Update, BM.23/DOC.10), and potential programmes directed at Syrian nationals, the ED confirmed that the DED had visited the camps two months ago and the plans for the ED and DED and possibly the Chair to visit Damascus in January 2026 for discussions with the Government. He confirmed absorption capacity for programmes directed at Syrian nationals, of which approximately 15,000 live in the camps. He welcomed Board Members to approach the DED, as well as Regional Managers during the lunch break as they are available to discuss programming in their region.

2.12. In conclusion, the ED asked Board Members to focus on answering the question, 'How should GCERF adapt to remain relevant, credible, and impactful in the new funding and security landscape?'

Discussion

2.13. The Chair thanked the ED for his remarks and stressed the positive impact of GCERF's work where it is needed.

2.14. The Chair opened the floor for discussion on the ED's Report.

2.15. The Board Member for Tunisia welcomed the ED's Report and approved and pledged full support to the new Strategy. In noting the current threats to global stability as outlined in the ED's report, flexibility was emphasised as the key to strength, and diversifying sources of funding will be key. A workshop of all stakeholders, including a field visit, was proposed, due to GCERF's potential to facilitate global consensus on prevention.

2.16. The Board Member for France congratulated GCERF for the success of the replenishment conference and the development of its new Strategy, reaffirming the commitment to its core PVE mandate, and remarked that the dense global multilateral infrastructure required rethinking on how to organise for the future. The recommendations tabled were to continue supporting civil society, particularly youth, and mainstreaming gender. Additional recommendations were to pursue diversification of funding, including in the Middle East and Southeast Asia, as well as private sources, and continue to enhance national ownership with partner country donations. France supports work in the Gulf of Guinea, where prevention can be impactful, and is providing a technical expert to GCERF. France also supports work in Central Asia and welcomes further information from the Secretariat about Syria, as GCERF is well placed to demonstrate value. France acknowledged GCERF for upholding its principles and values while remaining responsive to Board Member states and the adapting landscape.

2.17. The Representative for Germany, concurred that GCERF understands the current constraints but also opportunities and reaffirmed Germany's support as a strategic partner. It was noted that a shift towards hard security cannot work without prevention and GCERF's civil society approach is more relevant than ever. He thanked GCERF for being at the spearhead. Germany reiterated the importance of strategic priority setting and discipline around the mandate.

2.18. The Board Member for Mali thanked GCERF and echoed the new reality and the opportunities it brings. The clear success of GCERF's mission were noted and adjustments to adapt to the new context were welcomed. Mali confirmed a contribution, with the amount to be specified, and urged GCERF to continue its efforts in the Sahel.

2.19. Speaking for Italy, the Constituency Member reiterated Italy's support to GCERF and for adaptation, noting that collaboration with the international community with a long-term vision is key to countering the challenges of terrorism. The Board was urged to consider the questions of how engagement with the private sector can become a long-term strategic partnership, and how the Board can support this.

2.20. Speaking for Bosnia and Herzegovina, (BiH) the Constituency Member expressed appreciation for the Secretariat and the partnership, emphasising impact on strengthening national and local capacities. Support to the collective effort towards robust, innovative and inclusive prevention measures was reiterated. Testimony was given of the repatriation of BiH nationals from camps, noting the importance of comprehensive support for successful reintegration.

2.21. The Board Member for Private Sector and Foundations stressed the importance of adapting GCERF's message to the interests of the donor, ensuring that GCERF's work can be explained in a way that meets their needs and considering them as investors. A nimbler development function to improve outreach capacity was recommended. The gap left in livelihoods development as a result of the reduction in trade assistance and the need to create opportunities as a tool of prevention was remarked.

2.22. The Constituency Member for Luxembourg, congratulated GCERF's successes and highlighted the approach towards localisation. GCERF was urged to look at the lessons learned from previous PVE work, including on livelihoods, and analyse why VE continues to spread. Many levers are available. He supported investment in innovation by remaining nimble and lean, and taking risks in order to test ideas and learn from these tests. A question was posed as to GCERF's consideration of social media and disinformation as results cannot be sustainable if human rights and civic space are curtailed. GCERF was urged to maintain an innovative spirit.

2.23. The Board Member for Kenya confirmed a deep belief in GCERF's mission and pride in being an investment partner. The mission is more relevant than ever as threat dynamics demand a global coordinating mechanism anchored in multilateralism. In observing the demand of the context to do more with less, she called for adaptability at all levels.

2.24. The Board Member for the European Union welcomed all participants to Brussels and echoed the sentiments already expressed concerning the challenges of the current context and thanked the Secretariat for its results. She concurred with the focus on sustainability and consolidation as well as transparency, noting the technical oversight of results and the new budget structure. She urged strategic priority setting. She thanked Germany for hosting the pledging event, to which the EU contributed significantly, reiterating its belief in the impact of GCERF's work. She highlighted Central Asia as an important area of the EU's collaboration with GCERF, and noted the EU's interest in understanding GCERF's potential role in Syria.

2.25. In thanking GCERF as a credible and strategic partner, the Constituency Member for North Macedonia praised the new Strategy and results, stressing that the current challenges require joint action, noting North Macedonia's extensive collaboration with other States. He highlighted two key challenges for North Macedonia under the new Strategy – building institutional capacity and supporting civil society– and noted the threats posed by Artificial Intelligence (AI), cryptocurrency financing of terrorism and organised crime, as well as the situations in Gaza and Ukraine.

2.26. In reaffirming Switzerland's historic and future support as the Host state to GCERF, the Alternate Board Member highlighted, firstly, GCERF's important role as a convenor of relevant actors such as national and local governments, civil society and the private sector. Second, its vital role in PVE in conflict settings, which have become more frequent, and its support for the reintegration of former fighters and child soldiers and promotion of dialogue. Third, its alignment with Swiss foreign policy priorities of neutrality and conflict resolution through non-violent means, prevention, the rule of law, human rights, and its domestic strategy on the prevention of radicalisation of youth. Switzerland supports GCERF's focus on gender, as access to equal opportunities is a leverage point to achieve community resilience. The Alternate Board Member noted GCERF's unique contribution to international Geneva, working at the nexus of security, development and human rights, bringing policy, research and implementation experience. He stressed the global relevance of the lessons and experience gained through GCERF and encouraged confidence in addressing the fast-changing international relations priorities, digitisation and cyberspace challenges and opportunities with the new Strategy.

2.27. The Constituency Member for Chad concurred with the ED's report, emphasising the threat of VE to progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals and GCERF's example as a model for multilateralism, with solutions designed by and for local communities. GCERF's

interventions have a multiplier effect, contributing directly to peacebuilding, youth empowerment and development.

2.28. The Constituency Member for Mozambique echoed the thanks and observations on the state of the multilateral system. Support was expressed for continued focus on CSOs and for diversification of funding sources, including the private sector. He noted a link between inclusive gains from local investment and prevention of VE. Support was given for adaptation and for partner country contributions.

2.29. The Board Member for Kosovo, shared the experience of returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters (FTFs) and the victims in their families with GCERF's support. Lessons from this successful and ongoing programme are being shared by Kosovo and GCERF with neighbouring countries to widen the impact of this investment. Support was noted for adaptation but also to sustainability of current successful programmes.

2.30. The Alternate Board Member for Somalia noted the highly dynamic security context in Somalia where complex networks of transnational actors exploit youth unemployment, unresolved grievances and the anonymity of cyberspace. Somalia continues to take action, however, military action alone cannot dismantle the extremism ecosystem, therefore prevention is key, particularly livelihood programmes.

2.31. The Constituency Member for the United Kingdom concurred with calls for ongoing investment in prevention alongside hard security. He praised the achievement of the replenishment campaign and intended to continue exploring options for financial or in-kind support. Focus on agility, prioritisation and innovation was supported.

2.32. The Alternate Board Member for Burkina Faso highlighted the opportunities in the new Strategy to adapt to the challenges posed by Burkina Faso's two million internally displaced persons. Ongoing financial partnership with GCERF was pledged despite current contributions being on hold as funds are diverted locally to address the crisis.

2.33. To conclude the opening session and direct the forthcoming strategic discussion, the Chair summarised the following key points from the interventions: Prevention is more relevant than ever, and GCERF is well-positioned for the consolidation of development and hard security. Prioritise while ensuring the sustainability of the added value that has been demonstrated. Innovate to 1- address questions of funding, explore synergies with the private sector and co-financing, and 2 - address sources of terrorism that have a global effect including the camps of northeast Syria, and consider the relevance of the Horn of Africa.

2.34. Addressing comments on the replenishment campaign, the ED urged all Members to acknowledge the symbolic importance of financial input from partner countries, as well as the key role that all Board Members play in mobilising resources and advocacy for GCERF and appealed for support from the Gulf region. Capturing other comments, he noted that GCERF has already commenced engagement with the private sector and plans engagement with Syria. Online radicalisation is in the Strategy and advice is welcomed, and reiterated GCERF's role as a global fund and therefore a risk-sharing mechanism enabling innovation.

3. REFLECTIONS ON THE SECOND REPLENISHMENT CAMPAIGN AND NEXT STEPS

3.1. The ED referred to the circulated paper (BM.23/DOC.03), which provides a SWOT analysis of the pledging event of the second replenishment campaign prepared by the Secretariat. To allow ample time for Board discussion at this meeting, the ED highlighted the key findings of this analysis.

3.2. Firstly, the strengths include the financial return of USD 48 million, potentially USD 50 million once outstanding pledges are delivered, proof of global partnership, with contributions from donor and partner countries, and the political awareness raised with high-level attendance.

3.3. The weaknesses include that only one new government donor was confirmed, and no pledges were received from the private sector, although progress was made in discussions. Uneven attendance from Board Members at the pledging event was a missed opportunity.

3.4. The opportunities include the potential for networking and awareness raising, for synchronisation of the replenishment and strategic cycles, which did not happen in this case, and, in the spirit of GCERF innovating to be a model for the global community, exploring what a modern form of replenishment would look like.

3.5. Ideas were presented by the ED regarding alternative models to a replenishment campaign, including a joint fundraising platform with other organisations, specific thematic or regional mobilisation of funding or joining with partner organisations on a funding proposal and co-investment by donors.

3.6. The threats surround financing. A reduction in funding, combined with growing competition and the potential threat of unfulfilled pledges. Board Members were urged to fulfil pledges made.

3.7. The ED observed that overall, the added value of a replenishment campaign is both financial, through pledges, predictability and scale, and political, through the value of visibility, advocacy and positioning.

3.8. In opening the floor to the Board for guidance, the ED posed several questions. Firstly, does a compelling investment case help you unlock resources within your administration? Secondly, does political awareness make a difference, that is, does replenishment add value in budget lines or political traction? Finally, what model should the next pledging conference follow: the repeat of alignment with a high-level political moment, a standalone conference, or a hybrid event?

3.9. The Chair elaborated on the importance of elevating the issues addressed by GCERF to a higher political level. He noted the importance of leveraging high-level agendas on VE, such as the G20, to gain political momentum for GCERF.

Discussion

3.10. The Chair stressed the position of GCERF as a global partner to the Board Member states and opened the floor for interventions.

3.11. The Constituency Member from Bosnia and Herzegovina posited that Board Members could arrange meetings with high-level officials, and the Davos meeting could be a good opportunity in this regard. She suggested awareness raising could be enhanced via projects with other organisations, such as UNOCT

3.12. France expressed that an alternative to UNGA would be preferred, such as the annual meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos and the positive elements of a 'shared-bids' model of resource mobilisation.

3.13. The Alternate Member for Finland urged higher political engagement given the current global context and reiterated Finland's preference for un-earmarked or softly-earmarked funding and therefore noted complications in thematic or region-specific resource mobilisation as the focus on prevention is the driver for choosing to fund GCERF as opposed to the other inspired institutions.

3.14. The Constituency Member for Sweden confirmed the added value of GCERF and urged continued transparency toward donors and adaptability. From Sweden's perspective, the timing of pledges may not align with budget processes and recommended an alternative to

UNGA. Donor sharing of experiences has been key to advocating for GCERF within the administration.

3.15. The EU concurred with finding an alternative to UNGA and recommended a mix of resource mobilisation approaches due to the diversity of donor processes. It was explained that the 'shared-bids' model of the European Commission, as initiated for the PRR project in Central Asia, requires strong will for collaboration between the partners. Under the new contract, the EU might consider thematic regional focus, such as the UN's Call for Africa. We should learn from the experiences of other organisations.

3.16. The Private Sector supported a more tailored approach and suggested that the Munich Security Conference is gaining relevance for GCERF, as well as specific events that the private sector is more familiar with, for example, mining conferences. Exploration of World Bank opportunities was also encouraged, including debt swap instruments.

3.17. The representative for the United States expressed support for GCERF and stressed the importance of clear objectives and prioritisation. The calls for a hybrid resource mobilisation approach were echoed, with the suggestion to continue to tailor GCERF's message to the priorities of the respective capitals.

3.18. Switzerland concurred with the sentiment of prior comments that VE has no borders, yet observed a more nationalistic trend that requires GCERF to act as a mechanism for governments to gain political recognition, while remaining faithful to its original principles.

3.19. Tunisia urged greater exploration of private sector and foundations and tailoring of the message for these audiences, and favoured exploration of thematic and regional events.

3.20. The representative for Iraq thanked GCERF for its efforts in promoting stability and social cohesion globally, and particularly in Iraq, noting the positive cooperation. He confirmed that budget discussions continue with the aim of confirming a pledge from Iraq of USD 200,000.

3.21. Kenya confirmed its pledge of USD 50,000 and explained the efforts it is making with international partners and the local private sector to mobilise funds for GCERF. It also acknowledged the grassroots impact of GCERF in Kenya, Somalia, and Mozambique in preventing the radicalisation of youth. The active role of partner countries in resource mobilisation was observed to lead to greater and more sustainable results, as well as the wider impact of GCERF's work across the region.

3.22. The Constituency Member for Norway expressed support for an event such as UNGA, citing the importance of the ability to plan and be consistent. In acknowledging GCERF's role in funding allocation decisions, Norway support generic funding rather than earmarked and echoes the financial strain of the war in Ukraine.

3.23. The Chair noted that the support of Norway at the pledging event was particularly appreciated.

3.24. The Constituency Member for Mauritania recalled its contribution of USD 40,000 last year, expressing support for GCERF, highlighting the value of its management and transparency.

3.25. Germany supported more sophisticated fundraising strategies, including a hybrid model for replenishment, with a larger event focusing on unearmarked funds and smaller, regional or context-specific pledging events. It was also noted that a credible case for investment does help, based on understanding what donors/investment partners, and partner countries need. Appreciation for GCERF's role in coordinating ministerial visits to partner countries to understand the needs was expressed.

3.26. The Constituency Member for the Netherlands seconded this reflection from Germany and supported a hybrid approach rather than trying to attract attention at UNGA and also to ensure a balance of donors. Thematic regional approaches would increase partner country involvement and enhance the advocacy role of GCERF. The benefit of working together to make prevention work part of security policy was highlighted. It was suggested that GCERF explore alternative ways to present its results and utilise its position to convey regional information through expert regional political briefings, including how GCERF can have an impact.

3.27. The Alternate Board Member for Denmark evoked the review of the UN's Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (GCTS) in 2026 and urged collaboration to leverage the diversity of the Board to ensure sustained focus around the pillar on prevention.

3.28. In closure of this item, the ED thanked the Board for responding to the call for strategic input and committed to developing a plan incorporating these ideas for further consultation.

4. STRATEGY REVIEW

4.1. The Head of Performance and Impact, Dr André Alves Dos Reis (HP&I) directed Board Members to the easy-to-read summary of results on the website, with a map indicating the key results for each country, which is intended to enhance transparency by more easily communicating results than via long reports, which are still available for further detail.

4.2. He continued by introducing the key findings of the review conducted of the previous strategy cycle. The two papers provided to the Board (BM.23/DOC.04, BM.23/DOC.12), cover a review by the Performance and Impact unit, an independent unit within the Secretariat and a fully independent external review for full accountability and transparency.

4.3. The reviews indicated that GCERF's theory of change is conceptually sound, with some questions regarding communicating the relevance of rehabilitation and repatriation (R&R) to P/CVE/CT. At an organisational level, GCERF was found to be lean and efficient vis-à-vis its peers, with a portfolio covering most of the key regions and it has achieved most of its KPIs under the Strategic Management Plan. It achieved meaningful results at community level across its portfolio, working with a vast network of civil society partners.

4.4. Attention was drawn to three highlights. Firstly, expansion in terms of scale and thematics, including R&R, digital and P/CVE, brought results. Secondly, the focus on building up design and 'MEAL' system ensured that programmes achieved their outcomes and contributed to a positive impact on resilience at community level. The corresponding challenges include data standardisation, timely incorporation of learnings and measurement of impact at higher levels beyond community. Thirdly, in terms of programming, a positive impact at community level was noted including better relationships between CSOs and governments. The main strengths are identified as the Local Peace Committees, bridging security, justice and law enforcement with communities, working with religious leaders, and youth. Areas for improvement included livelihoods and beneficiary selection (especially for income-generating activities) and sustainability.

4.5. Funding and sustainability were noted as key challenges. GCERF has not achieved most of its funding KPIs for the previous strategy. The volume of funds received, an increase in non-earmarked funds and reliance on top donors, as well as non-materialisation of funding from other actors such as the private sector were cited. The focus on 'localisation' and the corresponding type of actors supported and scale of investment were given as factors to consider in terms of higher-level impact and sustainability. The evaluation did,

however, note GCERF's actions in this respect and interest in evaluating their results: mainstreaming of sustainability across strategies and grants, ex-post evaluations, focus on capacity building/bridging and exit of certain portfolios.

Discussion

4.6. Following the invitation of the Chair for interventions, the Board Member for Civil Society, Policy, Think and Do Tanks raised that the reports highlight how CSOs can be pushed into politically risky situations and the need for clear mandates and support, not absorbing work that belongs with local authorities. They need to be treated as partners and not only implementers, and they should be consulted to help shape future strategies. The absence of commentary on how the geopolitical context is undermining PVE and the ongoing relevance of prevention mechanisms was remarked upon.

4.7. The representative for Italy asked for further information regarding how a country exit strategy can ensure sustainability and on the role of religious leaders in prevention.

4.8. The HP&I explained that the contextual geopolitical factors during the period in question are wide ranging, from local issues to international and the COVID pandemic. Therefore, the paper remains focused on the results. Limiting the number of pages also ensures readability, linking to an earlier comment about ensuring efficient access to information.

4.9. In response to the point of local authority responsibility and the role of CSOs, the HP&I and DED gave the example of the current Tunisia strategy where clarity is given at the strategic level from the start of the programme and emphasised the importance of the Country Support Mechanism (CSM), and responsibility of national governments in ensuring sustainability, and the consistent presence of local authorities in all discussions to ensure their engagement. The new strategy aims to address the issue of sustainability with its focus on partnerships for impact and for influence, giving a hypothetical example where GCERF can work on prevention of recruitment in very fragile settings, then the role of transforming the economic situation of that community falls to the Development Bank.

4.10. They continued by expressing the fundamental importance of religious leaders, giving one example from Tunisia, although GCERF works with religious leaders globally. The challenge is their loss of influence in communities due to online activity. GCERF sees good

results from capacity building in communication to help them regain social capital and religious leaders are effectively engaged in the R&R process.

4.11. The EU requested elaboration of the report's beneficiary selection point. It welcomed the focus on transparency in the funding mechanism, crucial for the credibility of GCERF and its donors.

4.12. Mozambique gave testimony of their effective and successful CSM and its adaptability to the changing context, with relocation of terrorist activities to Chanyasa and Lampola provinces and 1.4 million internally displaced people, 150,000 people within the last two months. The strategy is working and further engagement of GCERF to find solutions at the community level would be welcomed to address the new challenges.

4.13. Germany suggested that programmes should be linked to other interventions to ensure sustainability, for example, taking the Nexus approach and suggested that awareness raising could be easily linked to other interventions.

4.14. Private Sector and Foundations congratulated GCERF on its rare ability to measure and communicate results at a high level, given the level of budget available and the contextual challenges. The question of whether GCERF would work with local government but without national government buy-in was posed.

4.15. Somalia provided testimony of their satisfaction with GCERF's work and explained how livelihood interventions that provide skills would give hope to the nearly 900 defectors from Al Shabab who need to be reintegrated; therefore, strategies should cover livelihoods. Ongoing discussions for support from the Government of Qatar were mentioned.

4.16. In addressing the questions, the HP&I confirmed that results of GCERF's livelihoods programmes show lower achievement than other interventions, except for R&R programmes where beneficiary selection is clear and supports reintegration. The potential to link with other interventions is illustrated by market access as a key follow-on component of livelihoods programmes to ensure sustainability. Partnerships with the private sector for supply chain access can be beneficial.

4.17. On beneficiary selection, he elaborated that every strategy has a theory of change, a results framework, a workplan and a budget. The evolution of GCERF's design process including more specific target populations has happened in the last two years and cannot be seen in this report. Lessons were learned and acted upon. An example from Niger was cited

where the endline evaluation was used to identify the profiles of those successfully supported and inform the new project cycle.

4.18. The ED gave one example from Pakistan to the point about disagreement between local and national authorities and confirmed that the Bylaws and GCERF approach prevent work without national government agreement. He updated the Board that the National government has now invited GCERF to discussions. The HP&I gave clear examples from Kenya and the Philippines where GCERF acted as a bridge between local and national authorities leveraging technical support, such as via Local Knowledge Partner grants, to bring parties together to find a common approach. There is room for more strategic discussion around engagement of the various levels of government.

4.19. The DED added to Somalia's intervention, illustrating GCERF's responsiveness by the example of a rapid assessment that has been launched to identify, on the basis of empirical evidence, the needs related to the population of defectors mentioned. The annual review of strategies is designed to ensure that GCERF can respond to emerging issues. This agility was also demonstrated during the COVID pandemic and in GCERF's current response to the typhoon in Sri Lanka to reallocate funds to adapt to the situation and ensure the sustainability of the work of the programmes so far.

4.20. In closing this session, the ED reiterated that the HP&I's report is based on a large number of independent external evaluations and his job is independent of influence from the Secretariat. Linking to the session to follow, it was highlighted that the evaluation proves judicious management of expansion, evidenced by the results and economies of scale. Foreshadowing the budget presentation, almost every year over the last strategy period the budget has been fulfilled by the end of Q1, and finally, the results show the importance of non-earmarked funding for GCERF to be an investment partner. Three examples were invoked. The government of Kenya is offering to put in a proportion of funding if it can be matched, Switzerland has tabled funds if they can be matched, and Qatar is offering to match USD 6 million. These offers can only be matched with non-earmarked funding.

5. GCERF STRATEGY 2026–2029

5.1. In the introductory remarks, the ED commented on the boldness and importance of defining a four-year strategy in the current environment, and GCERF is doing so without external consultants in order to be cost-effective, but with extensive consultation with the Board, Independent Review Panel and other stakeholders. The purpose of the Strategy (BM.23/DOC.05) is to outline the principles, establish guardrails, and indicate the direction of

travel, without constraining agility, while continuing to focus on the mandate and what GCERF does well.

5.2. In continued transparency and partnership, strategy implementation plans and country investment plans will be shared.

5.3. The ED pointed out the following strategic topics that had informed the Strategy development and should continue to be considered going forward:

5.3.1. Demonstrating that PVE is relevant to national security;

5.3.2. Transitioning from grant making to an investment partner to governments and the private sector, demonstrating a return on investment;

5.3.3. More explicitly defining milestones towards sustainable national responsibility;

5.3.4. Geographical footprint, for example, interest has been expressed regarding Pakistan and in the Gulf of Guinea;

5.3.5. Next generation challenges such as online radicalisation, R&R, the intersection of VE with migration, the intersection with climate and also the topic of prisons;

5.3.6. The positioning of GCERF within the reforming global architecture of counter terrorism. For example, being part of the Global Coalition Against DAESH and representing the prevention pillar of the GCTF, participation at the UN CT Strategy review conference advocating for prevention.

5.4. The increased prominence of R&R in the strategy and strategic partnerships, including knowledge sharing with non-ODA eligible countries was noted by the DED.

Discussion

The Chair reopened the floor. The first intervention from Civil Society, Policy, Think and Do Tanks stressed the key role of GCERF in leveraging its experience and evidence to advocate for the complementarity of security and prevention. A contradiction between the global frameworks on PVE and prevention work on terrorism financing was suggested. He invited GCERF to explore inviting banks to the CSM to help overcome difficulties posed by risk assessments and prove the importance of funds reaching locations of prevention work.

5.5. The Constituency Member for Australia reaffirmed that community engagement and resilience have never been more important for PVE, resisting external intervention, aggression, transnational and hybrid threats. Australia's support in Southeast Asia continues. In principle support was given to a flexible approach to investment models and to feasibility testing to

ensure programme viability before full commitment. Further information on the proposed pilot allowing GCERF to engage in programmes with more politically sensitive entities without conferring full membership was requested. Two specific questions were tabled. Firstly, if feasibility is not proved, how is board representation impacted? Secondly, would Board membership follow automatically or would Board approval be required? Assurances of mechanisms to prevent violation of Australian sanctions were requested and further detail on whether private sector engagement would lead to Board membership.

5.6. On behalf of New Zealand, Australia noted a potential contribution of NZD 3 million over three years for the Philippines and noted the need for focus on countering the malicious use of AI, focus on sustaining and reinforcing current programmes, and enquired as to what *partnerships for influence* referred to on page 16 of the Strategy would look like in practice.

5.7. Switzerland recognised the Strategy as robust and solid with a principles-based approach before questioning whether it gives enough flexibility to support new and emerging bilateral developments and multinational frameworks where the global attention is and funding available, where expertise in prevention can be played but where there is not a narrow link to VE or a PVE label? For example, after extreme violence in Ukraine or the Middle East, where traumas need to be addressed for those communities to become resilient to violence, for long-term prevention of VE.

5.8. The Private Sector and Foundations reiterated the need for livelihood development to be included and applauded the reframing of the budget to be more realistic and called for a development budget.

5.9. Kenya supported the Strategy's forward-looking approach and highlighted the need to continue to engage in dialogue with local communities, giving the example of the CSM that is prioritising understanding of how communities are organically responding to challenges they face and encouraging that interventions intentionally invest to amplify and align with these locally driven efforts. Encouragement was given to develop clear pathways to sustainability by embedding local ownership, building institutional and community capacities and aligning with existing systems priorities.

5.10. Germany expressed support and requested regular exchange with the Board regarding implementation.

5.11. Italy commended the balance between consolidation and innovation and noted the importance of Sahel, Central Asia and Iraq, as well as the issue of online radicalisation.

Questions were posed about Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, as well as Syria, and echoed the high strategic importance of online threats.

5.12. Sweden congratulated the work on the Strategy and agreed with the geographical priorities, as well as R&R as a thematic priority. The importance of exit strategies and investments from partner countries was noted, and support given to an approach involving consolidation and streamlining of the global CT infrastructure.

5.13. Indonesia welcomed the Strategy citing its alignment with National policy and supporting the flexibility it affords. Past and future efforts to strengthen the CSM with the aim of sustainability were noted. An invitation to Jakarta for a resource mobilisation event was extended.

5.14. The EU recognised the Strategy as ambitious and coherent, reflecting the experience of GCERF. Noting GCERF's advocacy role as pivotal in P/CVE, support was given to the plans for clearer positioning within the CT infrastructure and encouraged to provide some clear examples. Further understanding was also sought on implementation of further partnerships with academia and the private sector; information about the implementation plan was welcomed. Efforts towards long-term impact and sustainability were recognised as priorities.

5.15. Mali reiterated the alignment of GCERF's approach with National plans and proximity to local communities, highlighting efforts aimed at women and youth, as well as socio-economic support for former combatants. Noting the large number of combatants surrendering their arms over recent months and the number in prison, the importance of reintegration support was demonstrated.

5.16. Luxembourg complimented the clarity and transparency of the document. In concurring with the essence of Switzerland's intervention, that violence breeds violence for generations, it was suggested to consider GCERF's role in breaking the cycle, in the context of GCERF's positioning within the infrastructure, as previously raised. Support was expressed for the geographical priorities. Flexibility to work in non-ODA countries while respecting donor requirements was noted. Support to collaborate on testing the feasibility of alternatives to traditional grants was offered, focusing on using reduced ODA for high-impact pilot projects such as de-risking investments and reducing the cost of capital to encourage investment.

5.17. The Secretariat welcomed the highly constructive discussion and confirmed the following in response to the questions posed.

5.18. The ED gave a potential example of a situation where flexibility around the full governance process and Board approval might be enacted. A one-year R&R project from northeast Syria to the Maldives may be piloted with Board approval, but without constituency Membership, etc. We would consider short, discreet projects for this faster mechanism. Engagement beyond the pilot would trigger the full governance process.

5.19. GCERF is deeply committed to sustainability and will explore ways to express this commitment more prominently in the Strategy.

5.20. The three categories of partnerships include partnerships for influence that might include participation in global coalitions or movements. Academic partnerships would help share GCERF's learnings. The Board would maintain oversight.

5.21. The strategy implementation process is iterative, with a formal mid-term review at the two-year mark, with discussion and examination at each Board meeting.

5.22. We are committed to the regional footprint for the duration of the Strategy and are present in all Central Asian countries except Turkmenistan. We can probably expect small, strategic expansion following formal requests from Syria and the Gulf of Guinea.

5.23. Conveying the success of GCERF programmes such as R&R via advocacy directed toward non-ODA eligible states would be one example of how GCERF can expand its influence without making grants, which is not part of GCERF's mandate, but facilitating de-risking. Another example of GCERF as a tool for de-risking is programmes to make private sector investment, such as mining, much less risky, and therefore more attractive.

5.24. Maintaining a focus on PVE allows enough flexibility to address wider issues, including severe community violence. PVE as a flexible tool was illustrated by the recent example in Sri Lanka, where programmes were affected by the typhoon, programme objectives were realigned to meet the immediate community needs and therefore maintain the trust in our local partners, enabling more sustainable PVE programming outcomes. Another example given referred to discussions with Japan around using PVE to meet wider development objectives in camps housing Rohingya populations in Bangladesh.

5.25. On the topic of AI and Universities, the HP&I noted the complementarity of expertise-building projects within the Secretariat as well as AI-focused programming. Examples of partnerships with universities, including Deakin University in Australia and participation in an AI initiative by EPFL in Switzerland, were cited as examples of leveraging external expertise and

capacity in research, as well as AI, in exchange for GCERF's data and insights to achieve cost and time efficiency and greater impact.

5.26. The target is for the Key Performance Indicators for the new four-year Strategy to be shared with the Board by the meeting of June 2026.

5.27. In comments on the investment model, the strategic aim is to be more deliberate and concrete when incorporating lessons into programme design, leading to greater impact and sustainability.

5.28. GCERF's participation in the EU's Knowledge Hub was explained by the DED as an example of advocacy and sharing of GCERF's expertise on a greater scale and urged the Board to communicate the existence of similar fora in other regions to GCERF. GCERF arranges Global Community of Practice events with the same purpose of greater sharing of learnings.

5.29. The Board Member for Kyrgyzstan congratulated the work on the Strategy and highlighted the nature of VE as a regional issue, urging focus on digital radicalisation.

5.30. In conclusion, the Chair acknowledged the approval by the Board of the Strategy (BM.23/DEC.04), after a qualifying point was added at point c, acknowledging the additional explanations and clarifications given by the Secretariat in this session following interventions by Switzerland and Australia.

BM.23/DEC.04: The Board:

- a. approves the GCERF Strategy 2026–29 contained in Annex 1 of BM.23/DOC.05;
- b. thanks the External Reference Group and acknowledges the valuable contributions of the many additional stakeholders who provided feedback for the Strategy;
- c. welcomes the Secretariat's explanations on the Strategy, which will be reflected in the Board Report;
- d. notes that the Strategy is a living document;
- e. looks forward to oversight through annual implementation plans, routine reporting to the Board and its committees, and a mid-term review; and
- f. commits to actively promoting and supporting the Strategy.

6. GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE (GEC) SESSION

6.1. The Chair of the GEC opened the session by providing Board Members with an overview of the Terms of Reference of the GEC and inviting any questions about Membership.

6.2. The Chair of the GEC confirmed that the current Chair of the Board does not seek an extension to the current term expiring on 31 December 2026. The GEC recommended proceeding with transparent and timely succession planning in line with the Bylaws and will propose a recruitment process ahead of the 24th Board meeting in 2026.

6.3. Confirming the GEC's review of Board Membership in the context of policy on donor grace periods and extensions, the Chair of the GEC noted that several upcoming changes have been listed in the GEC report. Support was given to a comprehensive governance review to ensure that the governance framework remains fit for purpose in light of the evolving environment for the forthcoming Strategy period.

6.4. It was noted that the contract term of the ED would expire in June 2029.

BM.23/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of Ambassador Hema Kotecha, Alternate Board Member for the United Kingdom and United States of America constituency, from the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) and thanks her for her service;
- b. requests the Chair to consult with Board Members interested in joining the GEC, and present a recommendation on the committee's Membership for Board approval; and
- c. requests the GEC to initiate a formal governance review process.

7. FINANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE (FAC) REPORT

7.1. The Acting Chair of the FAC confirmed the outcome of the FAC review of GCERF's proposed revised cost structure and the 2026 budget.

7.2. In terms of the revised cost structure, following careful examination, the FAC endorses the revised cost structure on the basis that it better reflects programmatic realities, enhances transparency, aligns with international best practices and with most donor expectations.

7.3. The FAC confirmed its finding that the 2026 budget strikes a balance between ambition and financial realities and confirmed the FAC's endorsement of the 2026 budget. The proposed budget is USD 28.7 million, representing an 8% reduction on 2025. The Board was reminded of the need to address the 24% funding gap, representing approximately USD 7 million, through intensified resource mobilisation and mitigation measures.

7.4. In conclusion, the FAC recommended confirmation of the new FAC Member and supported the proposed revision of the Terms of Reference to allow for the inclusion of independent experts on the Committee.

BM.23/DEC.06: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of Mr Craig Bennett of New Zealand from the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) and thanks him for his service;
- b. approves the revised FAC Terms of Reference as detailed in Annex 1 to BM.23/DOC.07; and
- c. approves the appointment of Ms Elizabeth Ama Yankah of Ghana as a member of the FAC.

7.5 Australia, and also on behalf of New Zealand, thanked Mr Bennett for his service on the FAC.

8. FINANCIAL MATTERS

8.1. The Chair opened this session by confirming that Spain has announced a contribution of EUR 50,000, in particular for work in the Sahel, then invited the HF&C to present the financial matters.

8.2. The HF&C thanked the Acting Chair of the FAC for her expertise and service and welcomed the representative of Ghana to the FAC, before welcoming nominations of any other interested members. The Board was reminded that the oversight by the FAC is complemented by independent external audits.

8.3. Referring to the two papers distributed in advance, the HF&C firstly addressed the Budget 2026 (BM.23/DOC.08), indicating that under the new cost structure, upon which the 2026 Budget has been built, programme services will represent a minimum of 90% of GCERF's costs, meaning that less than 10% of costs will relate to operating expenses and governance.

8.4. Implementation of the new Strategy, the funding available, including the funding gap of USD 7 million, and currency fluctuations, were key considerations for the Budget development. The Board was reminded that it is not unusual to have a funding gap, however, clear mitigation measures are tabled in the paper and have been reviewed by the FAC.

8.5. Acknowledging prior questions from the Board regarding these measures, the HF&C gave a detailed explanation. In terms of evolution of income over 2026, the Board was urged to ensure that all pledges made at the pledging event will be received as concrete contributions, and to make efforts for un-earmarked contributions. In addition, resource mobilisation efforts continue and there are currently approximately USD 40 million value of proposals under consideration with potential donors. These factors have been considered in reasonable forecasts that the funding gap will be covered in 2026. Expenses are tightly controlled by the entire Secretariat and will be reconsidered in the annual budget revision that is presented to the Board in June. If income forecasts are adjusted down, expenses will consequently be adjusted.

8.6. The HF&C addressed the second paper (BM.23/DOC.09), highlighting that the final financial outcome of the replenishment campaign stands at USD 48 million in pledges, directed to the 2025 Budget, with USD 20–22 million available in 2026 and USD 10–11 million available in 2027. The Board was again reminded of the necessity to gain additional funding.

Discussion

8.7. Following the Chair's invitation for interventions, Norway requested clarification of the classification of support costs on programme services versus operating expenses and governance, clarification of which partners were consulted on the new cost structure, and finally, the classification of mission-critical expenses.

8.8. Germany enquired as to the expected impact on staff costs, and any link between cost review and the review of governance tabled at this meeting.

8.9. Addressing these points, the HF&C clarified that the 2026 Budget shows 7% operating expenses excluding governance. Governance represents 2% of costs and although this is not a reason for reform, it should be examined for efficiency as per all costs. Consultation involved a number of donors who have strict requirements, and the requirements of all other donors will most likely be met. Staff costs are reduced in the 2026 Budget.

8.10. Private Sector and Foundations supported the organisation of Board meetings in partner countries, citing the value of visiting programmatic locations to the Board's understanding and execution of its role.

8.11. The ED and DED concurred with the view that in-person Board meetings allowing Members to see the impact of the work of GCERF are highly important, and highlighted that visits are arranged for donor representatives in many countries, recent examples being the EU in Indonesia and the upcoming Global Community of Practice meeting in Erbil, followed by Chad and Accra. The significance of GCERF's collaboration with Missions in the capital cities and in-person programmatic visits was also noted.

BM.23/DEC.07: 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 2026 budget as follows:
 - Expenses: USD 28.7M; and
- c. notes that 76% of the proposed 2026 budget is funded at this time. Confirmation of announced contributions, as well as new funding, is needed.

BM.23/DEC.08: The Board:

- a. appreciates the work of the Finance & Audit Committee (FAC) for its thorough review of the proposed new budget structure and notes its endorsement; and
- b. approves the new budget structure as presented in Board paper BM.23/DOC.08.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9.1. The following decision on the IRP Membership was approved by no objection (the decision was shared with Board Members ahead of the meeting):

BM.23/DEC.09 The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of Mr Adam Ravnkilde and Ms Eya Jrad as members of the IRP and thanks them for their service;
- b. extends the present term of five of the twelve IRP members as per IRP Terms of Reference:

1. GLAZZARD, Dr Andrew
 2. MALEFAKIS, Dr Medinat
 3. MALET, Dr David
 4. LAMALAN, Ms Fatima Star Usman
 5. SAMPSON, Mr John
- c. Confirms that the following members are serving on the IRP panel:

Second and final term:

1. CHRISTIAN LEKE, Mr Achaleke until 31. 12. 2026;
2. ROURE, Ms Maud until 31. 12. 2026;
3. GLAZZARD, Dr Andrew, until 31. 12. 2027;
4. MALEFAKIS, Dr Medinat until 31. 12. 2027;
5. MALET, Dr David until 31. 12. 2027;
6. LAMALAN, Ms Fatima Star Usman until 31. 12. 2028;
7. SAMPSON, Mr John until 31. 12. 2028.

First term:

8. DANZIGER, Mr Richard, until 31. 12. 2026;
9. SANS, Ms Gazbiah until 31. 12. 2026;
10. LYANNMOURI, Mr Rida; until 31. 12. 2027;
11. ANWAR, Mr Deka until 31. 12. 2027;
12. KOHNO, Dr Takeshi until 31. 12. 2027.

9.2. With regards to the PRR project in Central Asia: the EU acknowledged the difficult start of the programme, thanked GCERF for the efforts in coordinating with the partners and called for continuous dialogue with the EU and other stakeholders. On the Sahel the EU invited GCERF to regularly update the board, considering the sensitivity of the topic and the importance of “do no harm” approach.

9.3. As no other items were raised, the Chair concluded that the meeting has shown that GCERF is delivering well and is projected to address the new challenges discussed. The budget represents a difficult funding environment, however, with forecasts that the associated risks can be mitigated. Reference to the goodwill to continue collaboration with the United States and the State of Qatar was made, as well as efforts to collaborate with other new partners, such as additional European Union Member states.

9.4. The Chair thanked the Board and the Secretariat for their meaningful contributions and urged the unique spirit of cooperation around GCERF to continue before adjourning the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
BM.23/DOC.01: AGENDA**

TUESDAY 9 DECEMBER 2025

Conference Room 4C, Centre Albert Borschette, Rue Froissart 36, Brussels

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| 09:30 – 10:00 | Welcome Coffee | | |
| 10:00 – 10:15 | Preliminary Matters | | Board Chair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of New Board Members | DOC.01 (for decision) *1 | |
| 10:15 – 11:15 | Report of the Executive Director | DOC.02 (for discussion) | Executive Director |
| 11:15 – 12:15 | Reflections on the Second Replenishment Campaign and Next Steps | DOC.03 (for discussion) | Executive Director /Deputy Executive Director |
| 12:15 – 14:00 | Buffet Lunch & Programmatic Regional Updates | Sahel, Middle East, East Africa, Central Asia | Regional Managers |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Strategy Review | DOC.04 (for discussion) | Head of Performance and Impact |
| 15:00 – 15:30 | Coffee Break | | |
| 15:30 – 17:00 | GCERF Strategy 2026–29 | DOC.05 (for decision) | Executive Director |
| 17:00 – 18:30 | Reception | | |

WEDNESDAY 10 DECEMBER 2025

Conference Room 4C, Centre Albert Borschette, Rue Froissart 36, Brussels

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 09:30 – 10:30 | Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEC Report • Discussion | DOC.06 (for decision)* | Chair of the GEC |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) Report | DOC.07 (for decision)* | Acting Chair of the FAC |
| 10:45 – 11:15 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:15 – 12:15 | Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget 2026 • Funding Situation | DOC.08 (for decision) DOC.09 (for discussion) | Head of Finance and Compliance |
| 12:15 – 12:30 | Any Other Business | | Board Chair |
| 12:30 | End of Meeting | | |
| 12:30 – 14:00 | Lunch & Networking | | |

Additional papers include:

- Portfolio Update – DOC.10 (for information)
- Independent Review Panel (IRP) Update – DOC.11 (for decision) *
- Results Update – DOC.12 (for information)

ANNEX 2

PARTICIPANTS LIST (*attending virtually)

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Mr Stefano Manservigi

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan, and New Zealand

Alternate Board Member: Ms Yuki Ikoma,* Deputy Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, on behalf of Mr Daisuke Tsubaki, Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

Constituency Member: Australia – Mr Fergus McFarlane, Counsellor, Australian Embassy to Belgium and Luxembourg and Mission to the EU and NATO, Brussels

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and North Macedonia

Board Member: H.E. Mr Xhelal Sveçla, Minister of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

Alternate Board Member: Ms Lejdi Dervishi,* National Coordinator / Director, The CVE Coordination Center, Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Albania, on behalf of H.E. Ms Albana Koçiu, Minister of Interior, Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Albania, Tirana

Constituency Members:

Bosnia and Herzegovina: Ms Lucija Ljubić, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations Office in Geneva

North Macedonia: Mr Pavle Trajanov, National Coordinator for Prevention of Violent Extremism and Counter-Terrorism of North Macedonia, Skopje

Kosovo: Mr Mensur Hoti, Director of Department for Public Safety, Ministry Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

Ms Jeta Tela Shema, Chief of Staff, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

Ms Merita Vidishiqi, Head of the Department for the EU Integration, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Philippines

Board Member: H.E. Mr Omar Sultanov, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Kyrgyz Republic to the United Nations in Geneva; Embassy of the Kyrgyz Republic to Switzerland

Alternate Board Member: Mr Jon Paulo V. Salvahan,* Undersecretary (Plans and Programs), Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Philippines (DILG), Manila

Constituency Members:

Indonesia: Mr Dionnisius Elvan Swasono,* Director for Regional and Multilateral Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BNPT), Jakarta

Mr. Yaenurendra Hasgoro Aryo Putro,* Deputy Director for Regional Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BNPT), Jakarta

Ms Anita Sofiana,* Policy Analyst, National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BNPT), Jakarta

The Philippines: Mr Brian Mey Tomas, Assistant Secretary for Legal and Legislative Affairs, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Philippines (DILG), Manila

Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger

Board Member: Mr Alassane Demba Touré, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: Ms Sanogo Mariam Tounkara, Director General of Religious, Customary and Traditional Affairs, Ministry of Territorial Administration and Mobility of Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou

Constituency Members:

Chad: H.E. Ms Fatima Haram Acyl, Minister Delegate for Economy and Planning, Ministry for Economy, Development Planning and International Cooperation of the Republic of Chad, N'Djamena

Mauritania: Mr Beyte Allah Ahmed Leswed, Secretary-General, Ministry of Islamic Affairs and Original Education of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Nouakchott

Niger: Mr Yahaya Adié,* Secretary-General, The High Authority for the Consolidation of Peace (HACP), Niamey

Civil Society, Policy, Think and Do Tanks

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

European Union

Board Member: Ms Maria Rosa Sabbatelli, Head of Unit, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

Constituency Member: Ms Sophie Huet Guerriche, Programme Manager – Global Threats and Challenges, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

France, Denmark, Italy, Sweden and Luxembourg

Board Member: Ms Amélie Delaroche, Deputy Head, Counter Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Alternate Board Member: Mr Adam Ravnkilde, Counterterrorism Coordinator / Chief Adviser, Department of Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

Constituency Members:

Italy: Mr Fabio Rugge, First Counsellor, Permanent Representation of Italy to the European Union, Brussels

Sweden: H.E. Ms Josefin Simonsson Brodén, Ambassador and Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Security Policy Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Stockholm

Luxembourg: H.E. Mr Georges Ternes, Ambassador and Director General for Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, Defence, Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade, Luxembourg

Mr Sigert Vehent, Africa Desk – Sahel, Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs Department, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, Defence, Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade of Luxembourg

Denmark: Ms Anne Birgitte Hansen, Senior Adviser, Department for Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

France: Ms Aurélie Zanotti, Counter Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Germany, Netherlands, Norway, and Finland

Board Member: Mr Tobias Grothe, Head of Division S03, Stabilisation, Crisis Prevention, Peacebuilding (Policy and Instruments), Federal Foreign Office on behalf of Ms Anka Feldhusen, Director for Civilian Crisis Prevention and Stabilisation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Ms Päivi Kairamo, Ambassador for Counterterrorism Cooperation, Legal Service, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki

Constituency Members:

The Netherlands: Ms Noline van der Torre, Senior Policy Officer Security Policy/Counterterrorism, Security Policy Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Norway: Mr Asgeir Steindal, Senior Advisor, Section for Security Policy and North America Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway, Oslo

Mr Trond Kvarsvik, Senior Adviser, Section for Prevention and Stabilisation, Department for Humanitarian and Comprehensive Response, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Oslo

Kenya, Mozambique, and Somalia

Board Member: Mr Kibiego Rotich Kigen, Director, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC) – Kenya, Nairobi

Alternate Board Member: Mr Ali Yasin Gurbe, Director General, Tubsan National Centre for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism of the Federal Republic of Somalia, Mogadishu

Constituency Members:

Mozambique: H.E. Mr Geraldo Gonçalves Miguel Saranga, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mozambique to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Kenya: Mr Fredrick Ndegwa, Head of Partnerships, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC) – Kenya, Nairobi

Ms Caroline Jemutai, Officer, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC) – Kenya, Nairobi

Nigeria and Ghana

Alternate Board Member: Ms Elizabeth Ama Yankah, Deputy National Security Coordinator on behalf of Osman Abdul Razak, National Security Coordinator, Ministry of National Security of the Republic of Ghana, Accra

Private Sector and Foundations

Board Member: Mr Tony Carroll, Founding Director, Acorus Capital; Non-resident Fellow at the Carnegie Endowment, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: Dr Maho Nakayama,* Director, Peacebuilding Program, on behalf of Dr Atsushi Sunami, President of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation (SPF), Tokyo

Constituency Members: Ms Nere Emiko, Executive Vice Chairman, Kian Smith, Lagos
Mr Jin Fujimoto,* Program Officer, Peacebuilding Program, Sasakawa Peace Foundation (SPF), Tokyo

Qatar

Board Member: Mr Hussain Al-Sada, Director of the Office of the Special Envoy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs on behalf of H.E. Mr Faisal Abdullah Al-Henzab, Ambassador and Special Envoy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar for Counterterrorism and Mediation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

Constituency Members: Ms Dana Al-Thani, Office of the Special Envoy to the Foreign Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

Ms Rwodah Ibrahim AlNaimi,* Investment Department Manager, Qatar Fund for Development (QFFD), Doha

Switzerland

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

Tunisia and Iraq

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr Ahmed Alsmay,* National Committee to Combat Violent Extremism (NCCVE) on behalf of Mr Ali Abdullah Abbas Al-Bdair, Head of the National Committee to Combat Extremism, Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) of the Republic of Iraq, Baghdad

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

United Kingdom and United States of America

Board Member: Mr John Hassan,* Deputy Director of the Bureau of Counterterrorism's Office of Programs, on behalf of Mr Joel M. Borkert, Deputy Coordinator, Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT), U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: Mr Will Robey, Head, Drivers of Terrorism Hub, Counter Terrorism Department, National Security Directorate on behalf of H.E. Ms Hema Kotecha, Ambassador and Lead on Foreign Ministers' Migration Conference, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom, London

Constituency Members:

United States: Mr Nick Calbos,* Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Mr John Yim,* Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

United Kingdom: Ms Olivia Ingram,* Policy & Programme Manager, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom, London

Kazakhstan

Mr Anuar Khatiyev, Chairman of the Committee on Religious Affairs, Ministry of Information and Culture of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana

Uzbekistan

Dr Eldor Aripov,* Director, Institute for Strategic and Regional Studies under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent

Mr Timur Akhmedov,* Head of Department, Institute for Strategic and Interregional Studies under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan (ISRS), Tashkent

OBSERVERS

Morocco

Mr Irchad Benqadi, Head of Section, Directorate of Global Issues, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, African Cooperation and Moroccan Expatriates, Rabat

EU CT Coordinator Office

Mr Piotr Krygiel, Principal Adviser and Team Leader, Office of the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Brussels

Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Mr Richard Danziger,* IRP Chair

GCERF Secretariat