

REPORT OF THE 24th BOARD MEETING

The 24th Meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 2–3 June 2026 in Geneva, Switzerland. The approved agenda and participant list can be found in Annexes 1 and 2 of this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1. The Chair of the Governing Board, Mr Stefano Manservigi (Chair), welcomed Board Members, observers, and Secretariat colleagues participating in person and virtually. He noted that the format of the 24th Board Meeting differed substantially from previous meetings, with Day 1 dedicated to an entirely Board-led strategic dialogue focused on the evolving global context for the prevention of violent extremism (PVE), the future of prevention approaches, and GCERF's positioning within a changing international security and development landscape, while Day 2 focused on governance and operational matters.

1.2. The Chair explained that the purpose of the discussion was to assess the position of prevention of violent extremism within an increasingly unstable international environment and to reflect on GCERF's role as a practical example of effective multilateralism.

1.3. The Chair observed that rising geopolitical tensions, conflict, polarisation, and challenges to multilateral cooperation had created conditions conducive to increased radicalisation and violent extremism. He stressed that prevention was more relevant than ever and highlighted GCERF's unique contribution as the only multilateral institution specifically mandated to support community-based prevention efforts. He noted that GCERF had demonstrated measurable results in strengthening community resilience and supporting national prevention strategies through partnerships between governments and civil society.

1.4. The Chair outlined the rationale for structuring the strategic dialogue around geographic and thematic clusters to facilitate discussion of distinct operational contexts. He encouraged Board Members to engage openly, including through constructive criticism and reflection, to generate strategic guidance for the Secretariat.

1.5. The Chair also announced that the 25th Board Meeting would be hosted in Tokyo, Japan, from 24–26 November 2026 in partnership with the Government of Japan and the

Sasakawa Peace Foundation. He welcomed the initiative as an opportunity not only to convene the Board in Asia for the first time but also to strengthen engagement on prevention priorities in the Indo-Pacific region. Additionally, he announced that Norway would co-host the next GCERF replenishment conference alongside the United Nations General Assembly in September 2027.

1.6. Representatives of Japan, the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, and Norway reaffirmed their commitment to supporting GCERF's mission and highlighted the strategic significance of these forthcoming events.

Preliminary matters

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

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

BM.24/DEC.01: Mr Pavle Trajanov of North Macedonia is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 24th Board meeting.

BM.24/DEC.02: The agenda for the 24th Board meeting (BM.24/DOC.01) is approved.

BM.24/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 23rd Board meeting:

- **Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and North Macedonia:** Mr Pavle Trajanov is the Alternate Board Member for this constituency;
- **Germany, the Netherlands, and Norway:** Ambassador Päivi Kairamo has resigned and is no longer represented on the Board;
- **Qatar:** Ambassador Faisal Al-Henzab has resigned and is no longer represented on the Board;
- **United Kingdom:** Ambassador Hemangini Kotecha has resigned and is no longer represented on the Board.

2. STRATEGIC CONTEXT AND FRAMING

2.1. The Executive Director (ED) opened the strategic dialogue by reiterating the Chair's comments on the rapidly changing and increasingly challenging global environment, while underscoring the value of the prevention model that GCERF and its partners have built over the past decade. He highlighted that the purpose of the session was not to revisit whether

prevention works, but rather to examine how prevention can be sustained, strengthened, and reimagined amid growing geopolitical fragmentation, declining development assistance, evolving threats, and pressure on multilateral institutions.

2.2. The ED observed that the current threat landscape is becoming more complex, driven by the convergence of ideologically motivated and nihilistic forms of violent extremism, the interaction between online and offline radicalisation, and the combination of local grievances with global narratives of injustice. He noted that, paradoxically, support for prevention is declining at a time when prevention is needed most, citing reductions in Official Development Assistance and increasing strain on the international prevention architecture.

2.3. Reflecting on GCERF's first decade, the ED emphasised that the Fund had contributed to demonstrating the effectiveness of prevention through community-led approaches, national ownership, multi-stakeholder partnerships, and evidence-based programming. He stressed that GCERF's strategic direction remains unchanged and that operational excellence and implementation of its approved strategy will continue to be its primary focus. The central question for the Board, he suggested, was how GCERF should position itself to contribute to the future of prevention while building on its operational credibility, evidence base, and political platform.

2.4. Through support to local civil society organisations, close engagement with governments, and the generation of a substantial evidence base, GCERF has demonstrated that prevention works. He argued that the key challenge now is whether prevention can be sustained and adapted in a more fragmented and resource-constrained environment.

2.5. The Chair welcomed the Board's strategic engagement, emphasising that the Board's role extends beyond governance and oversight to providing guidance on the future direction of the prevention agenda. He encouraged members to make full use of the dialogue to explore how GCERF could respond to a changing global context and continue advancing prevention as a core element of international peace and security efforts.

Discussion

2.6. Board Members broadly welcomed the strategic framing. Participants from civil society, partner countries and donor states consistently emphasised that prevention remained indispensable despite increasing pressure on multilateralism and development cooperation. Many participants noted that prevention and security responses should be viewed as complementary rather than competing priorities, highlighting the risks of framing

investments in prevention and hard security as a zero-sum choice. Several Board Members highlighted the growing constraints facing civil society space, the continued importance of community-based approaches, and the need to preserve prevention as a central component of national and international security strategies.

2.7. Several Board Members shared national experiences demonstrating the impact of GCERF-supported programming. Board Members from North Macedonia, Kenya, Indonesia, Tunisia, Somalia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mali and Mauritania highlighted the contribution of community-based approaches to strengthening institutional capacities, social cohesion, resilience, rehabilitation and reintegration efforts, and local ownership of prevention initiatives. Many Board Members stressed the importance of preserving local engagement, supporting civil society, and adapting responses to evolving forms of radicalisation, including online recruitment, misinformation, artificial intelligence, and youth vulnerability

2.8. Throughout the discussion, members highlighted the importance of preserving multilateral approaches to prevention at a time when global cooperation is under strain. They noted that GCERF's unique combination of donor support, national ownership, civil society engagement, and local implementation remains highly relevant in addressing increasingly complex and interconnected security challenges.

2.9. In concluding the discussion, the Chair observed broad agreement among Board members that prevention must remain a central component of efforts to address violent extremism and terrorism. He noted a shared view that prevention should be pursued alongside, rather than subordinate to, security responses, and emphasised the importance of securing sustainable financing, strengthening partnerships, and adapting approaches to the changing international environment. The Chair concluded that the discussion had provided a strong foundation for further reflection on how GCERF can continue to advance the prevention agenda and contribute to a more resilient global prevention architecture.

3. STRATEGIC EXCHANGE I: THE EVOLVING ARCHITECTURE OF PREVENTION – WHERE DOES GCERF FIT?

3.1. The Chair introduced the first strategic exchange by noting the evolution of the global counterterrorism and prevention architecture, including the review of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (UNGCTS) and reforms under consideration within the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF). He emphasised the importance of

examining how GCERF should position itself within these processes, particularly as prevention faces increasing pressure in a shifting geopolitical environment. The Chair also highlighted the European Union's leadership role within the GCTF and its significance as a major contributor to GCERF.

3.2. The session was led by the European Union which outlined ongoing developments within both the GCTF and the UNGCTS review process. The EU representative stressed the importance of preserving key principles that have underpinned the international prevention agenda, including prevention, human rights, rule of law, civil society engagement, inclusion, and gender mainstreaming. The EU representative noted that GCERF occupies a distinctive position within the prevention architecture due to its operational experience, community-based model, and support for rehabilitation and reintegration programmes. She further highlighted the importance of ensuring that lessons learned from the field inform emerging policy discussions and invited reflections on how GCERF and its constituencies could contribute to shaping future international prevention efforts.

Discussion

3.3. The discussion revealed broad concern that prevention risks losing visibility within an international environment increasingly focused on hard security responses. Participants emphasised that although prevention is no longer a contested concept, it continues to require active political support and evidence-based advocacy. Several interventions stressed that reforms to international counter-terrorism institutions should preserve community-based approaches and avoid losing lessons learned over the previous decade.

3.4. Board Members broadly agreed that GCERF's greatest comparative advantage lies in its evidence base, operational experience, and direct links to communities. Rather than positioning itself primarily as a policy actor, GCERF was encouraged to continue generating field-based evidence and learning to inform policymaking processes at global and national levels. Several Board Members further encouraged stronger collaboration between GCERF and related international platforms. They emphasised that the collective voice of donor countries, partner countries, civil society organisations, and other stakeholders provides a powerful platform for advocating the value of prevention within international forums.

3.5. The ED reaffirmed that GCERF's core mandate remains unchanged and focused on supporting community-based organisations to strengthen resilience to violent extremism. While recognising the value of policy engagement, he stressed that the Fund's primary responsibility is operational delivery. He noted that GCERF's comparative advantage lies in

its extensive practical experience, accumulated over a decade of implementation, and suggested that evidence-driven policymaking offers a valuable avenue for contributing to international prevention discussions. At the same time, he cautioned that expectations regarding GCERF's policy role must be balanced against available resources

3.6. The Deputy Executive Director provided examples of efforts to expand the dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned. She highlighted a growing portfolio of global, regional, and local communities of practice that bring together practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and implementing partners to exchange experiences on issues including rehabilitation and reintegration, mental health, psychosocial support, prison-based interventions, and community resilience. These initiatives have generated policy recommendations and broadened the reach of GCERF's learning beyond countries where it maintains active grant programmes.

3.7. A significant theme emerging from the discussion was the need for stronger links between agenda-setting processes and implementation mechanisms. One Board Member encouraged GCERF to further position itself within broader humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding discussions. He argued that prevention should increasingly be framed as an investment in social cohesion, community resilience, and locally led solutions.

3.8. The Chair proposed that the Board consider developing a collective message to support prevention within the GCTF reform process and the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy review. The objective would be to ensure that prevention remains visible within ongoing international discussions and that Board members collectively advocate for its continued relevance. The Board Members broadly expressed support for this proposal. They noted that contributing evidence-based recommendations to international policy discussions is a natural role for GCERF and suggested that the Fund's operational experience could provide valuable input into the review processes.

3.9. The Board also discussed ways to strengthen the relationship between prevention policy frameworks and implementation bodies, including GCERF, the other GCTF-inspired institutions and GCERF Board members' bilateral cooperation. Several members called for greater coherence, improved coordination, and more operationally focused approaches within the broader counter-terrorism architecture.

3.10. Many constituencies reinforced the importance of community ownership as a foundation of successful prevention and reintegration efforts. They stressed the role of religious leaders, traditional authorities, local government structures, and community

actors in addressing grievances, strengthening social cohesion, promoting dialogue, and reducing vulnerability to recruitment by violent extremist groups. GCERF's Head of Performance and Impact presented findings from evaluations of rehabilitation and reintegration programmes implemented in regions including Iraq, Central Asia, and the Western Balkans. The findings indicated positive outcomes in areas such as family relationships, livelihoods, mental health, and social cohesion. However, broader civic reintegration remained more difficult to achieve and often required longer-term engagement. The discussion underscored the importance of addressing community grievances, building public acceptance, and exploring stronger connections between rehabilitation and transitional justice approaches.

3.11. In concluding the discussion, the European Union observed that the interventions highlighted the importance of evidence-based results of community-based prevention and demonstrated the value of grounding international policy discussions in practical experience. The EU representative encouraged Board members to draw on these examples when engaging in broader discussions on the future of the international prevention architecture. The session closed with broad agreement that community-based prevention should remain a central pillar of national, regional, and global efforts to address violent extremism and terrorism, and that GCERF would prepare a short message to the GCTF and the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review.

4. STRATEGIC EXCHANGE II: CENTRAL ASIA

Evolving Risks and Resilience Factors: Economy, Migration and Security

4.1. The second strategic exchange focused on Central Asia and examined the interplay between economic pressures, migration dynamics, social resilience and evolving security challenges. The discussion was introduced and led by the representative of Uzbekistan, who emphasised the region's growing strategic importance and highlighted the value of regional cooperation in addressing radicalisation, rehabilitation and reintegration, and broader social stability challenges. He noted that no country is immune from the threat of terrorism and stressed the importance of prevention, national ownership, and international partnership as central pillars of the regional response.

4.2. The representative of Uzbekistan welcomed its inclusion on the Governing Board and outlined progress in cooperation with GCERF since 2024, including the establishment of a Country Support Mechanism and the launch of an investment strategy. Early implementation results were highlighted, including community-based initiatives focusing

on vulnerable families, youth, and returnees, as well as the establishment of resource centres, legal support services, and digital resilience programmes. Uzbekistan reaffirmed its commitment to long-term cooperation with GCERF and proposed hosting a future Board meeting in Samarkand.

National Ownership and Community-Based Prevention

4.3. A recurring theme throughout the discussion was the importance of integrating prevention into national systems and local governance structures. The representative of Uzbekistan emphasised that GCERF-funded initiatives are aligned with national priorities, particularly community-level prevention through the 'mahalla' system. He underscored three key principles underpinning current efforts: inclusiveness to avoid stigmatisation, digital resilience to counter online radicalisation, and economic rehabilitation to address root causes of vulnerability.

4.4. The representative of Kazakhstan emphasised the value of a whole-of-society approach involving government institutions, academia, civil society, psychologists and religious experts. He highlighted rising concerns regarding increasing religious fervour and online radicalisation among youth and called for stronger international cooperation to develop prevention tools tailored to digital environments. He also identified priority areas for cooperation with GCERF, including rehabilitation, support to returnees, reintegration of former prisoners, and systematic research capable of transforming national experiences into transferable lessons for the wider region.

4.5. The representative of Tajikistan similarly highlighted the importance of comprehensive national programmes focused on rehabilitation and reintegration, particularly for women and children returning from conflict zones. He emphasised the need to position returnees as individuals requiring protection, support and opportunity, and described ongoing efforts to integrate psychosocial assistance, education, employment and community-based interventions into national strategies. The representative of Tajikistan welcomed planned GCERF and EU support for returnees, while highlighting the need to expand programming to other vulnerable groups, including migrant families, youth in economically distressed areas, and communities along migration corridors. He stressed the importance of a holistic approach, particularly in light of regional security risks linked to Afghanistan.

4.6. The Central Asian representatives stressed that sustainable resilience depends upon inclusive interventions that extend beyond returnees and address the needs of

broader vulnerable populations, thereby avoiding stigma and strengthening social cohesion.

Migration, Economic Pressures and Emerging Vulnerabilities

4.7. The linkage between labour migration and prevention emerged as a central topic noting the critical economic importance of migration and remittances while simultaneously acknowledging the risks associated with exposure to extremist recruitment and radicalisation abroad. The representatives of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan described extensive national efforts to manage migration through diversification of destination countries, skills development programmes, legal protections and engagement with diaspora communities. Both countries stressed the importance of addressing migration-related vulnerabilities through work undertaken both within countries of origin and in receiving states.

4.8. Reflecting on discussions held with Central Asian delegations, the ED highlighted labour migration as one of the defining strategic issues facing the region. While remittances remain essential for local economies, migration can also create pathways for recruitment and radicalisation. Board Members noted the challenge of balancing economic necessity with prevention objectives and encouraged GCERF to continue supporting evidence-based approaches that address both dimensions simultaneously.

4.9. Youth unemployment was similarly identified as a major resilience challenge. Several speakers cautioned that skills development programmes alone are insufficient if economic opportunities do not materialise. The discussion emphasised the need to bridge the gap between training and meaningful employment, recognising that long-term resilience requires both social and economic inclusion.

Rehabilitation, Reintegration and Knowledge Sharing

4.10. The discussion reaffirmed Central Asia's role as an important source of experience and learning on rehabilitation and reintegration (R&R). The representatives of Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan described significant efforts undertaken to return citizens from conflict zones and support their reintegration through coordinated national programmes. Participants highlighted psychosocial support, family assistance, educational interventions, and community engagement as key elements of successful reintegration processes.

4.11. The ED observed that Central Asia has developed substantial expertise in rehabilitation and reintegration and suggested that GCERF could help project these lessons globally. He noted that the region provides important examples of pragmatic and rights-

based approaches to the return and reintegration of citizens from conflict zones, generating experiences that could inform policy and operational discussions elsewhere.

4.12. The Secretariat provided examples of ongoing efforts to facilitate regional learning and exchange, including experiential visits, communities of practice and regional cooperation programmes. Participants welcomed these efforts and encouraged continued investment in regional knowledge sharing and the dissemination of practical lessons learned.

Online Radicalisation and Digital Resilience

4.13. Another key theme was the growing challenge posed by digital recruitment and online radicalisation. Delegations consistently highlighted social media, encrypted communication platforms and digital communities as increasingly significant factors influencing radicalisation pathways, particularly among young people. Participants stressed that digital spaces are becoming a primary arena for the dissemination of extremist narratives and therefore require dedicated preventive approaches.

4.14. Countries described initiatives focused on media literacy, critical thinking, emotional resilience and digital awareness as important components of prevention. The representative of Uzbekistan highlighted youth-focused digital resilience initiatives, while the representative of Kazakhstan pointed to the need for more comprehensive international cooperation in the development of online prevention mechanisms. The Secretariat noted that ongoing programming already includes efforts to strengthen digital literacy and resilience but acknowledged the need for deeper engagement with technology companies and digital platforms.

4.15. Several Board Members also highlighted concerns regarding the online recruitment activities of terrorist organisations and shared examples of broader international efforts to support capacity building and counter-terrorism cooperation in the region. They agreed that technological developments are reshaping the threat environment and that prevention approaches must continue to evolve accordingly.

4.16. The discussion concluded with reflections on the value of regional cooperation and the importance of maintaining flexibility in responding to evolving challenges. The ED noted the notable degree of regional coherence across Central Asia, observing that countries often face similar challenges related to migration, rehabilitation and reintegration, online radicalisation, and border security. He suggested that greater regional coordination could

further strengthen prevention efforts while preserving the flexibility needed to address national circumstances.

4.17. The representatives of the Central Asian region broadly welcomed GCERF's role in supporting national strategies, facilitating evidence-based dialogue and connecting community-level realities with policymaking processes. The discussion reinforced the importance of maintaining national ownership while ensuring that regional and international cooperation continues to support local resilience and long-term prevention objectives.

5. STRATEGIC EXCHANGE III: SAHEL AND COASTAL DYNAMICS

Prevention, Resilience and Regional Stability in an Evolving Security Environment

5.1. The third strategic exchange focused on the Sahel and the growing interaction between security dynamics in the Central Sahel and neighbouring coastal states. The session was introduced by the Permanent Representative of Mali, who framed the discussion around the region's evolving security environment, the resilience of local communities, and the role of prevention in addressing increasingly complex and interconnected threats.

5.2. The discussion acknowledged the considerable challenges facing the region, including violent extremism, organised crime, intercommunal tensions, population displacement, fragile governance structures, climate-related pressures and economic vulnerabilities. At the same time, several Board Members stressed that the Sahel should not be characterised solely through the lens of insecurity. Speakers from the Sahel region highlighted the resilience of communities and emphasised that social cohesion, coexistence and local ownership remain important foundations for long-term stability.

Community Resilience and National Ownership

5.3. A central theme of the discussion was the importance of community-centred approaches. Representatives from Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger consistently emphasised that prevention efforts can only succeed when communities themselves are placed at the centre of planning and implementation. They highlighted the role played by religious leaders, youth organisations, local authorities, civil society groups and traditional community structures in addressing vulnerabilities and strengthening resilience.

5.4. Several interventions stressed that prevention should not be viewed as a substitute for security responses but rather as an essential complement to them. Community

dialogue, social cohesion initiatives, local conflict resolution mechanisms, economic empowerment programmes and support to vulnerable populations were repeatedly identified as critical tools for reducing the appeal of extremist movements and strengthening trust between communities and state institutions.

5.5. The representatives from the Sahel region also underlined the importance of national ownership. Countries highlighted efforts to incorporate prevention into national strategies, establish dedicated institutions, and strengthen links between community-level interventions and broader stabilisation policies. The Chair recalled that GCERF's ultimate objective is not to be a substitute for national systems but rather to help embed prevention approaches within national policies, institutions, and budgetary frameworks so that they can be sustained over time.

Regional Dynamics and the Question of Spillover

5.6. The discussion devoted considerable attention to the relationship between insecurity in the Sahel and developments in neighbouring coastal states. Several Board Members highlighted concerns regarding the expansion of violent extremist activity into areas previously considered less affected. Particular attention was given to the movement of armed actors, illicit trafficking networks and growing pressures on border communities.

5.7. The representative of Ghana described the increasing risks associated with porous borders, competition over natural resources, illegal mining activities, and tensions affecting local communities. Prevention was presented as the most sustainable response to these emerging challenges, with investment in social cohesion, border area development, community resilience and inclusive governance identified as strategic priorities.

5.8. The representative of Nigeria highlighted the emergence of new extremist threats linked both to Sahelian dynamics and to developments within the Lake Chad Basin. He proposed further strengthening cross-border cooperation, expanding support to coastal states and investing in evidence generation concerning rehabilitation, reintegration and prevention outcomes.

5.9. While many participants discussed regional connectivity, the representative from Mali cautioned against simplistic narratives portraying insecurity as a one-directional 'spillover' phenomenon. He stressed that each country possesses its own vulnerabilities and local drivers of instability and argued that prevention strategies must be tailored to national realities while recognising wider regional interconnections. The discussion ultimately

reflected broad agreement that regional challenges are shared, even if specific manifestations differ across contexts.

Resource Constraints and the Strategic Case for Prevention

5.10. The exchange took place against a backdrop of growing concern regarding shrinking international funding for prevention efforts. Several Board Members repeatedly noted the contradiction between increasing threats and declining resources available to address them. Several interventions observed that reductions in external funding arrive at precisely the moment when prevention approaches are most needed.

5.11. Speakers emphasised that military and security responses alone have not resolved the underlying drivers of instability. Many Board Members argued that prevention should remain central to regional and international approaches because it addresses the root causes of radicalisation and contributes to sustainable resilience. The Chair stressed the importance of predictable and sustained funding, noting that prevention efforts require continuity if they are to achieve lasting impact.

5.12. The discussion also highlighted the growing importance of co-financing arrangements and stronger partnerships between national governments, development actors, international financial institutions and private sector stakeholders. Participants suggested that future approaches should increasingly seek to leverage complementary resources and create stronger links between prevention objectives and broader development investments.

Climate, Natural Resources and Emerging Drivers of Vulnerability

5.13. The relationship between environmental pressures and violent extremism emerged as a major topic of discussion. The Head of Performance and Impact shared evidence from ongoing research exploring the nexus between climate stress, resource competition and recruitment into violent extremist groups ([GCTF Initiative on Addressing the Nexus between Climate Change and Violent Extremism Conducive to Terrorism](#) co-led by Germany and Kenya). He highlighted how environmental degradation, reduced access to livelihoods and competition over land and water resources can create conditions exploitable by extremist actors.

5.14. The discussion highlighted several examples illustrating how violent extremist groups increasingly exploit environmental and economic vulnerabilities. Participants noted emerging patterns linking recruitment to climate-related pressures, degradation of pastoral and agricultural livelihoods, and contestation over access to natural resources.

These dynamics were described as particularly relevant in rural areas where state presence is limited, and communities face growing economic insecurity.

5.15. The Secretariat emphasised the importance of incorporating environmental stress into prevention analysis and highlighted existing work undertaken through the GCTF climate-security initiative. The Board Members broadly agreed that environmental pressures should be considered alongside traditional political, social and economic drivers of violent extremism.

Private Sector Engagement and Economic Resilience

5.16. The role of economic factors in prevention was another prominent theme throughout the session. Several speakers stressed the need to address underlying economic grievances, particularly among young people, as part of broader resilience-building efforts. Discussions highlighted unemployment, limited livelihood opportunities and exclusion from economic development as factors that can increase vulnerability to recruitment.

5.17. Special attention was given to extractive industries and natural resource economies, particularly the gold sector. The Board discussed the relationship between illegal mining, organised criminal activity, local grievances and insecurity. The Secretariat representatives described emerging partnerships in Ghana aimed at engaging the mining industry, local communities and government actors in collective approaches to addressing the impact of illegal mining activities.

5.18. Private sector representative also stressed the interconnected effects that insecurity can have on agriculture, mining and other productive sectors. Participants argued that prevention strategies should increasingly engage with economic systems and private sector actors, recognising that livelihoods, social stability and security are closely linked.

Strategic Value of GCERF's Regional Presence

5.19. Throughout the discussion, numerous participants highlighted the value of GCERF's presence across both the Sahel and neighbouring coastal states. The organisation's ability to work with governments and communities in diverse political and security contexts was viewed as an important comparative advantage. Several Board Members noted that GCERF continues to operate in environments where other actors face limitations, while maintaining constructive relationships with national authorities and local communities alike.

5.20. The ED recalled that expansion into additional coastal states remains a strategic objective under the approved strategy, although progress will depend on the availability of additional resources. Board Members broadly supported further engagement with coastal states while emphasising the need to preserve existing investments and avoid overextension.

5.21. The session concluded with reflections on the importance of maintaining prevention as a strategic priority, strengthening community resilience, fostering political dialogue and ensuring sustainable financing. The Chair summarised the discussion by stressing the urgency of translating broad consensus on prevention into practical partnerships, coherent policies and predictable resources capable of supporting long-term resilience across the wider region.

6. STRATEGIC EXCHANGE IV: MIDDLE EAST AND SYRIA

Rehabilitation, Reintegration, Social Cohesion and Emerging Regional Fragilities

6.1. The fourth strategic exchange focused on the Middle East, with particular attention to rehabilitation and reintegration, the situation in northeast Syria, and the broader regional dynamics affecting prevention of violent extremism. The Chair introduced the session by noting that the Middle East is both a geographic priority and a setting where wider global prevention challenges are acutely visible. He observed that rehabilitation and reintegration concerns are closely linked to questions of regional stabilisation, social cohesion, and the reconstruction of societies affected by conflict, repression and violent extremism.

6.2. The Chair highlighted the increasing relevance of Syria, including a recent expression of interest from the Syrian authorities for potential engagement with GCERF, and emphasised the need for careful assessment of needs, capacities, and available resources before any expansion of activities. He recognised that Syria raises issues directly relevant to GCERF's mandate, including reintegration, prevention and the rebuilding of the social fabric. The Chair invited the representative of Iraq to lead the discussion and asked the ED to provide an update on Syria.

Iraq's Experience in Prevention, Rehabilitation and Reintegration

6.3. Iraq provided a comprehensive overview of its cooperation with GCERF, describing it as a key partner in supporting both national prevention efforts and large-scale reintegration of returnees from camps in north-eastern Syria, particularly Al-Hol. The representative highlighted the work of Iraq's National Committee for Preventing Violent

Extremism, which operates across multiple sectors, including education, youth, women, media, and religious affairs. Iraq noted that its approach has evolved from remediation to prevention, supported by early warning systems, monitoring mechanisms, and the development of a dedicated legal framework focused on preventing extremism.

6.4. Iraq further emphasised that the drivers of violent extremism are increasingly linked to identity-based divisions, perceptions of injustice, and social fragmentation, rather than solely economic factors. Particular concern was raised regarding the growing role of online radicalisation, individualised extremism, and transnational identity narratives. The representative described the Middle East as a highly complex environment shaped by historical grievances, ideological conflict, cross-border dynamics, and ongoing instability, including the legacy of ISIS and unresolved conflicts.

6.5. With regard to Syria, Iraq highlighted several key risks, including unresolved social tensions, lack of guarantees for minority protection, challenges related to transitional justice, and the uncertain status of individuals formerly in camps and detention facilities. The representative stressed the importance of rebuilding social cohesion, addressing grievances, and ensuring inclusive governance as essential elements for long-term stability. Proposals were also made for strengthening international cooperation, including the development of a global alliance for prevention and tools to monitor social fragility and polarisation.

Changing Drivers of Extremism and the Importance of Social Cohesion

6.6. A major theme was the evolving nature of violent extremism in the Middle East. The representative of Iraq argued that extremism can no longer be understood solely through the lens of poverty or unemployment. Instead, it is identified by collective perceptions of victimisation, identity-based divisions, social fragmentation and online mobilisation as increasingly important drivers. He stressed that extremist narratives are being amplified by digital platforms, algorithms, emotionally charged content and transnational identity narratives.

6.7. The intervention placed particular emphasis on social cohesion as a matter of national security. The Board Member of Iraq argued that the erosion of coexistence, trust, and shared identity creates fertile ground for extremist narratives and that social cohesion should not be treated as a secondary or optional concern. He encouraged a broader understanding of extremism as a cumulative outcome of social fragmentation, marginalisation and the collapse of trust between communities and institutions. He proposed that prevention efforts should increasingly focus on social justice, trust-building

between citizens and institutions, protection of cultural, religious and ethnic diversity, and long-term programmes addressing the root causes of social fragility. The intervention also referred to work undertaken by Iraq on a global risks matrix for social cohesion, intended to help identify regions at risk through multidimensional analysis.

Syria, Northeast Syria Camps and Regional Risk

6.8. The discussion then turned to Syria and the implications of developments in northeast Syria for Iraq and the wider region. The Middle East was described as a complex region in which historical, ideological, political, sectarian and cross-border dynamics intersect. The legacy of ISIS, ongoing displacement, unresolved social tensions, and the movement of foreign fighters and weapons were identified as factors contributing to persistent fragility.

6.9. Particular concern was expressed regarding Al-Hol camp and detention facilities in northeast Syria. The Iraqi representative referred to reports concerning the movement or disappearance of individuals linked to ISIS from camps and prisons, while noting that Iraqi institutions were still verifying such information. The intervention stressed that uncertainty regarding the fate of individuals formerly held in Al-Hol and related facilities presents serious risks, including the potential reconstitution of sleeper cells and increased activity along the Syrian-Iraqi border.

6.10. The Iraqi representative highlighted the geographical, tribal, religious and historical interconnectedness of Iraq and Syria, observing that developments in one country have direct implications for the other. He noted that Iraq had already repatriated thousands of families from Al-Hol and had taken in a large number of prisoners convicted of terrorism offences, while also underlining the complexity and sensitivity of managing these files.

6.11. The discussion also identified transitional justice, guarantees for minorities, housing, services and employment as essential issues for Syria's stabilisation. Iraq suggested that its own experience with laws addressing communities affected by ISIS could provide relevant lessons for Syria, particularly in relation to rights, coexistence and redress for those harmed by conflict and repression.

Strategic Implications

6.12. The Chair invited reflections from Board members on priorities for engagement in Syria, noting that the challenge extends beyond camp-based reintegration to the broader reconstruction of Syrian society. He emphasised the need to balance ambition with realism, particularly given the scale of needs and limited resources. He noted that Syria presents

overlapping challenges, including the reintegration of individuals from camps and other locations, the reconstruction of a social fabric deeply affected by conflict, and the need to prevent further fragmentation.

6.13. The European Union reaffirmed its strong engagement in the region across prevention, security, and socio-economic dimensions. The EU representative highlighted the importance of GCERF's role in linking community-based interventions with national strategies and welcomed ongoing cooperation with Iraq. With regard to Syria, the EU noted that its current focus includes transitional justice and security sector reform and emphasised the importance of coordination and complementarity among international actors.

6.14. The Deputy Executive Director provided an update on GCERF's engagement in Syria, noting recent missions (January and February 2026) to Damascus and consultations with government authorities and international partners. GCERF currently maintains limited programming in northern Syria, primarily focused on supporting foreign nationals in camps such as Al-Roj and engaging in the newer site Ak-Burhan. Syrian authorities have expressed interest in expanding cooperation beyond camps to include support for Syrian nationals, internally displaced persons, youth, education, livelihoods, and local infrastructure.

6.15. Board Members welcomed the update and noted that the situation in Syria has evolved significantly, warranting a renewed assessment of GCERF's potential role. They emphasised the importance of addressing vulnerable groups beyond camp populations, including minorities and communities affected by conflict. The Secretariat noted that while there is interest in expanding engagement, available resources remain limited, requiring prioritisation to ensure meaningful impact.

6.16. Summarising the discussion, the Chair noted broad agreement that Syria now represents a significantly different operational context, with growing expectations for engagement beyond camps and into broader recovery and stabilisation efforts. He proposed a phased approach, beginning with exploratory consultations with Syrian counterparts and other stakeholders, followed by a more comprehensive assessment of needs, potential areas of added value, and resource requirements. Several Board members, expressed support for this approach, emphasising the importance of coordination with existing initiatives and the need for a careful, evidence-based assessment before expanding activities. It was widely acknowledged that any meaningful engagement in Syria would require additional resources beyond currently available funding.

6.17. Following a brief intervention from a representative of the Government of the Maldives, the Board also briefly discussed the Maldives as part of the proposed pilot engagement decision. The Chair noted that the Maldives case was more limited and operational, while Syria required more extensive consideration.

6.18. The Board subsequently adopted the following decision:

BM.24/DEC.04: The Board:

- a) welcomes the expressions of interest from the Governments of Syria and the Maldives as a strong indication of the continued relevance and added value of GCERF's model;
- b) consistent with the Strategy 2026–2029, the Board encourages the Secretariat to explore opportunities for pilot engagement and to undertake the necessary consultations, partnership development and resource mobilisation efforts required to bring forward proposals for future consideration; and
- c) looks forward to receiving an update on progress at its next meeting.

6.19. The Chair noted that this decision provides a mandate for further exploratory work while recognising the need for careful planning and adequate resourcing.

6.20. The session concluded with the presentation of video examples showcasing GCERF-supported rehabilitation and reintegration efforts, including in the Western Balkans. Board members highlighted these as evidence of the effectiveness of long-term, community-based approaches. Albania underscored the broader security benefits of successful reintegration, while the Deputy Executive Director emphasised that sustained investment has contributed to the absence of a return to violent behaviour among beneficiaries supported.

6.21. In closing, the Chair highlighted rehabilitation and reintegration as a core area of GCERF's comparative advantage and encouraged members to build on these lessons in future engagements, including in complex contexts such as Syria. He also recalled the earlier discussion on the international prevention architecture and invited Board members to consider a collective statement to reinforce the role of prevention in ongoing global counterterrorism processes.

7. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

7.1. The ED used the report to reflect on the previous day's strategic dialogue and to draw three conclusions. First, prevention remains important but faces a more challenging political and financial environment and must continue and be accelerated without losing sight of its core principles. Second, the Board itself is an important part of GCERF's value proposition, serving as a political platform where diverse perspectives can come together for open discussion on strategic issues related to counter terrorism and violent extremism. Third, the strategy discussion and the governance discussions were directly related, with prevention and GCERF both framed as shared responsibilities.

7.2. The ED argued that GCERF entered the current strategic discussion from a relative position of strength. The organisation had a strategy approved at the end of the previous year, a strategy management plan explaining how it would be implemented, and operational papers showing a portfolio growing in scale, maturity, and complexity. The ED reported that GCERF had 71 active grants across 21 partner countries, had reached 5 million mainly young people at direct risk of radicalisation and recruitment, and had done so at an average cost of around USD 40 per person.

7.3. The Executive Director also noted continuing demand for GCERF's work, including in relation to Syria, the Maldives and the littoral states, while stressing that expansion must be strategic, sensible and credible. He further noted that the external auditor had issued an unqualified opinion on the 2025 accounts, that no material weaknesses had been identified in the internal control system, and that GCERF continued to strengthen risk management and internal controls.

7.4. On financial sustainability, the Executive Director welcomed the fact that the previously underfunded budget was now fully funded, referring to expected or anticipated support from the European Union, Norway and Germany. He called for stronger sustainability, including through the replenishment campaign hosted by Norway.

Discussion

7.5. The Chair thanked the Executive Director and linked the report to the broader need to present prevention as a political priority, not only as GCERF's operational mandate. He underlined that prevention had to be stabilised conceptually in a context marked by insecurity, wars and rapid change.

7.6. Board members raised the importance of linking the strategy management plan to results uptake and impact measurement. One Board Member asked about the strategy management plan, results uptake and impact-level KPIs, noting that some international metrics were not easily accessible. Another Board Member welcomed GCERF's intention to improve aggregation of results across the project portfolio and offered technical input. The Secretariat responded that GCERF was developing an organisational-level results framework aggregated by thematic area, including use of PHQ-9 for depression and the Harvard Trauma Questionnaire for PTSD among returnees and victims, with pilots in the Sahel, the Philippines and other countries.

7.7. The ED described this as an institutional progression from outputs to outcomes, and now toward impact. He noted that impact is the end of the value chain and the hardest level to demonstrate, but stated that GCERF was attempting to demonstrate the long-term impact of its work

8. FINANCIAL MATTERS

8.1. The Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) reported that the external auditor had issued an unqualified opinion on GCERF's 2025 financial statements and confirmed that no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies had been identified in the internal control system. The Committee endorsed the 2025 audited financial statements and the internal control system in place in 2025, while noting that financial predictability beyond 2026 remained a significant strategic challenge requiring continued donor mobilisation and diversification, including engagement with the private sector.

8.2. The Head of Finance presented three key messages: the strength of the audit outcome, the meaning of the 2025 results, and the growing challenge of funding risk. He stated that GCERF remained well controlled and well governed, with effective internal controls, but that this could not offset the lack of predictability in funding. He clarified that the approximately USD 4 million accounting gain in 2025 should not be read as financial comfort or growing operating capacity, as it resulted from lower expenditure, especially grant commitments, and unrealised foreign exchange gains.

8.3. The Head of Finance further stated that actual expenditure reached only half of the revised budget, mainly due to funding constraints, and that these constraints had negatively affected operations. He also reported that the internal control system was robust, tested and effective, and that the corporate risk register had been reviewed in light of events in the Middle East.

8.4. Regarding 2026, the Head of Finance noted that the budget gap identified in December had been or would be filled, assuming contributions from the European Union, Germany and Norway were confirmed. He emphasised that the larger challenge was 2027 and beyond, where available funding was too limited to operate and implement the strategy, making the issue a strategic funding challenge rather than only a budgeting issue.

8.5. The Chair linked the financial discussion to the strategic dialogue, including Syria, and stressed the need for GCERF to be equipped to consolidate where it is already working and respond credibly to new challenges. He called for more predictable and stabilised funding, connected this to the replenishment process under Norwegian guidance, and encouraged partners to channel prevention funding toward GCERF where prevention was already an objective of bilateral or multilateral engagement.

8.6. One Board Member asked whether the reported USD 4.1 million gain could be treated as a reserve. The Head of Finance clarified that it was not a reserve, but an unrealised foreign exchange gain resulting from currency fluctuations, and that it was not cash materialised in GCERF's bank account. He further stated that GCERF is not allowed to make a profit or build reserves from donor funding.

8.7. The Board approved the following decisions:

BM.24/DEC.05: The Board approves the 2025 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.24/DOC.03 for submission to the Swiss Federal Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

BM.24/DEC.06: The Board approves the 2025 financial statements prepared in US Dollars and in accordance with the IFRS for SMEs and the statutory financial statements presented in Swiss Francs (CHF).

BM.24/DEC.07: The Board approves the internal control system currently in place. It requests the Secretariat to continue developing and operating the internal control system in accordance with the principles and approach described in document BM.24/DOC.07.

9. GOVERNANCE FOR THE NEXT PHASE

Constituency Management

9.1. The Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) introduced the governance discussion, covering constituency management, governance review, and the Chair selection process. The Committee noted that the Board had 15 constituencies: six

donor constituencies, six partner country constituencies, one civil society and think tanks constituency, one private sector and foundations constituency, and one Swiss host seat. The Committee also noted that the Bylaws allow up to 21 constituencies and that constituencies are self-managing.

9.2. The GEC identified an emerging imbalance among donor constituencies and an anomaly among partner country constituencies. It noted that Kyrgyzstan was in an otherwise Indo-Pacific constituency, while Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Yemen were outside any constituency. The Committee suggested that a Central Asia constituency could be considered, while noting that any expansion of partner country constituencies might require corresponding donor-side adjustment to maintain balance.

9.3. The possible departure of the United Kingdom from the Board was discussed in light of the two-year grace period for donors that do not contribute. The United Kingdom explained that it was not currently in a position to make a new financial commitment due to internal restructuring affecting budgetary clarity and planning but expressed openness to continued collaboration and interim engagement.

9.4. Board members discussed possible approaches to partner country constituencies, including the creation of a Central Asia constituency. Tajikistan supported bringing Kyrgyzstan back into a Central Asian grouping and joining Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan together, given GCERF's presence across much of Central Asia. The ED noted that such a move would create seven partner country constituencies and, in the event of UK departure, potentially only five donor constituencies unless donors reorganised themselves or accepted vacant donor seats. Board members requested relevant document references to support the internal discussion concerning the reorganisation of constituencies.

9.5. The Board also discussed potential engagement with regional banks and other financial institutions. The Board Member for the Private Sector suggested that institutions such as the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Islamic development institutions, the World Bank, and sovereign wealth funds could be explored as potential contributors or partners, particularly given GCERF's cross-border engagement. The Chair responded that engagement with multilateral banks should be operationally grounded and linked to concrete initiatives, pointing to ongoing work with the African Development Bank and the possibility of involving the Asian Development Bank in Indo-Pacific discussions around the Tokyo Board meeting.

Governance Reform

9.6. The GEC recommended concluding the governance review initiated at the previous Board meeting, with recommendations to be presented at the next Board meeting. Areas for consultation included expanding representation of non-governmental actors, such as additional seats for the private sector, multilateral institutions, or victims of terrorism; creating a 'strategy' subcommittee; and establishing a small executive committee composed, for example, of the Board Chair, subcommittee chairs, and Executive Director to support oversight as the Board becomes more strategic.

9.7. The Executive Director stressed that the governance review was a good governance process and not a response to crisis. He noted that the Board works well but that periodic review is responsible.

9.8. Some Board Members raised cautions and requests for further detail about creating a 'strategy' subcommittee that could risk downgrading the Board to a body focused mainly on finance and administrative matters, particularly given the strategic quality of the discussions held during the meeting. They requested more detail before the next Board meeting on the proposed executive committee and strategy subcommittee, including composition, criteria, remit and interaction with the Board. One Board Member noted the existence of the International Review Panel and cautioned against creating too many panels and committees that the Secretariat would need to support

9.9. The Chair suggested considering a broader advisory or trustee-type body composed of people with high-level credibility and standing who could connect GCERF's work to wider global debates and enhance its visibility. The private sector representative welcomed analysis of such an idea while cautioning that GCERF is a small organisation with a tight budget and that such a body would require human and possibly financial resources.

Chair Selection Process

9.10. The GEC reported that the current Chair's second three-year mandate ends at the end of 2026. A selection process had been launched, revised terms of reference had been circulated, and a nomination deadline of 15 May had been set. By 18 May, no formal nominations had been received. The Committee concluded that a short extension of the nomination period alone would not provide sufficient time to identify and onboard a new Chair or to reflect properly on future governance needs.

9.11. The Committee noted that the current Chair had indicated willingness, subject to Board approval, to serve a further mandate. The Committee considered that continuity of leadership during a significant strategic transition could support institutional development and broader governance modernisation, while maintaining flexibility around future leadership transition. The GEC highlighted the need for more time, including the possibility of recruitment agency support.

9.12. One GEC member emphasised the importance of a clearer terms of reference for the Chair position and of ensuring that the process reflected GCERF's legacy, core values, smooth transition, and strategic vision.

9.13. The Board approved the following decisions:

BM.24/DEC.08: The Board:

- a) expresses its strong appreciation for the Chair's leadership;
- b) kindly requests the continuation of the Chair's mandate for a minimum period of one year from 1 January 2027 and expresses its gratitude for his willingness to support a smooth transition once a credible successor has been identified and approved;
- c) cognizant of the need to ensure continuity of leadership at GCERF, the Board expresses a clear expectation that a new Chair will be appointed by the end of 2027; and
- d) commits to intensifying its efforts to identify and encourage nominations for a successor.

BM.24/DEC.09: The Board:

- a) The Board approves the appointment of Ms Lejdi Dervishi of Albania as a member of the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC);
- 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, using the no objection procedure set out in Article 2.9 of the Bylaws.

10. GCERF'S POSITIONING IN INTERNATIONAL COUNTER-TERRORISM PROCESSES

10.1. The Chair returned to the possibility of a statement or call from the Board and GCERF in view of the upcoming Global Counterterrorism Forum meeting in Brussels and the parallel discussion on the new United Nations counter-terrorism strategy. The proposed purpose was to keep prevention high on the agenda and make it more visible as a fundamental pillar of any new counter-terrorism strategy.

10.2. The Secretariat had prepared a draft text for possible transmission to the co-chairs of the relevant processes: the European Union and Egypt for the GCTF process, and Morocco and Finland for the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Strategy Review process. The ED noted that the text was intended to be relevant to both GCTF and the United Nations and to achieve consensus among Board Members.

10.3. The Board broadly welcomed the statement as reflecting the Board's discussions and suggested that Board Members be named explicitly subject to consent and requested a short written procedure to allow consultation. The GEC Chair suggested strengthening the language on prevention so that it clearly referred to addressing the root causes of violent extremism and was distinguished from coercive prevention measures. The Chair and ED proposed proceeding on the basis of trust, with Board Members invited to send input by email but without turning the statement into a protracted negotiation. The ED indicated that the final statement would reflect the broad consensus and would be submitted shortly after the final comments.

11. CONCLUDING REMARKS

11.1. The Chair and ED reflected on several strategic points when concluding the meeting. First, the Board reaffirmed prevention as a political priority and not merely an operational approach. The Chair explicitly stated that prevention is not only GCERF's work but a broader political priority, and that in the current environment there is a supplementary duty to stabilise the concept and keep it visible in international policy debates.

11.2. Second, the Board repeatedly connected strategic ambition to financial sustainability. Discussions on Syria, the Maldives, the broader expansion of GCERF's work, and the replenishment process all returned to the same point: GCERF's credibility depends on matching expectations with resources. The Chair and ED both framed the central question as whether prevention, and GCERF as an institution, can be sustained.

11.3. Third, the Board recognised GCERF's value proposition not only in programme delivery, but also in the strategic function of the Board itself. The ED described the Board as a rare platform bringing together diverse perspectives around counter-terrorism and violent extremism. Board members' engagement in strategy, governance, financing, and external positioning reinforced the importance of maintaining the Board as a strategic partner rather than reducing it to a purely administrative or approval-oriented body.

11.4. Fourth, governance reform was understood as a means to strengthen participation, ownership, and strategic relevance rather than as an end in itself. The discussion on constituencies, possible Central Asia representation, private sector and multilateral engagement, subcommittees, executive structures, and advisory mechanisms was framed around the need to adapt GCERF's governance to a changing environment while preserving effective Board engagement.

11.5. Finally, the discussions highlighted the importance of evidence and impact. The ED and Secretariat emphasised that GCERF is moving toward impact-level evidence, while Board members encouraged the development of accessible and aggregated results frameworks. This was linked directly to GCERF's external positioning, as the organisation's ability to demonstrate results was presented as central to making the case for prevention and resource mobilisation.

11.6. The meeting reaffirmed that GCERF is seen by the Board as a relevant, well-governed, and operationally credible organisation with recognised added value in prevention, rehabilitation and reintegration, local resilience, and community-based approaches. At the same time, the Board's discussions made clear that GCERF's future strategic effectiveness will depend on predictable funding, careful expansion, robust governance, stronger impact evidence, and continued collective ownership by Board members.

11.7. The Chair thanked the Board and the Secretariat for their meaningful contributions before adjourning the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
BM.24/DOC.01: AGENDA**

DAY ONE – Tuesday 2 June

Prevention in a Fragmenting World: Strategic Directions for GCERF

08:30 – 09:00 Welcome coffee

09:00 – 09:15 Opening and Adoption of the Agenda

Chair

09:15 – 09:45 Strategic Context and Framing

Executive Director

A forward-looking overview of global trends and the strategic questions they raise for GCERF.

09:45 – 10:45 Strategic Exchange I: The Evolving Architecture of Prevention: Where Does GCERF Fit?

Board-led discussion (the EU)

A discussion on the evolving international architecture for prevention – including the role of the EU, GCTF and other actors – and implications for GCERF's positioning and partnerships.

10:45 – 11:15 Coffee Break

11:15 – 12:15 Strategic Exchange II: Central Asia

Board-led discussion (Uzbekistan)

A discussion on evolving risks and resilience factors in Central Asia, including the interplay between economic pressures, migration, and regional security dynamics: implications for GCERF's future engagement.

12:15 – 12:30 Reflections

Chair

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:00 Strategic Exchange III: Sahel and Coastal Dynamics

Board-led discussion (Mali)

Examining developments across the Sahel and coastal states, including spillover risks, shifting donor engagement, and implications for GCERF's footprint and model.

15:00 – 15:30 Break

15:30 – 16:30 Strategic Exchange IV: Middle East and Syria (Rehabilitation and Reintegration)

Board-led discussion (Iraq)

A focused discussion on regional dynamics, including rehabilitation and reintegration challenges, and GCERF's comparative advantage.

16:30 – 17:00 Synthesis and Implications for GCERF

Executive Director

17:30 Reception

DAY TWO – Wednesday 3 June

Ensuring GCERF is Fit for Purpose

09:00 – 09:30 Report of the Executive Director

Internal priorities and Organisational Updates

09:30 – 10:00 Financial Matters

Condensed consideration of financial updates and audit outcomes.

10:00 – 10:30 Break

10:30 – 11:15 Governance for the Next Phase: Board Discussion

Facilitated discussion

Exploring whether GCERF's governance arrangements are aligned with its strategic ambitions and operating context.

11:15 – 12:00 Conclusions and Next Steps

Executive Director and Chair

12:00 – 13:00 Lunch

ANNEX 2

PARTICIPANTS LIST (*attending virtually)

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Mr Stefano Manservigi

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan, and New Zealand

Alternate Board Member: Ms Satoko Sawada, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations Office in Geneva 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: Ms Yuki Ikoma,* Deputy Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and North Macedonia

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

Constituency Members:

Albania: Ms Lejdi Dervishi, National Coordinator / Director, The CVE Coordination Center, Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Albania

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

Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Philippines

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 Dion Swasono, Director for Regional and Multilateral Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BNPT), Jakarta

Mr. Yaenurendra Hasmore 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

Mali: H.E. Mr Sékou dit Gaoussou Cisse, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

Constituency Members:

Chad: Mr Moussa Soumaine, CSM Chair, 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 Isabel Candela-Rodriguez,* Deputy Head of Unit, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission on behalf of 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: Ms Anne Birgitte Hansen, Senior Adviser, Department for Security Policy on behalf of Mr Adam Ravnkilde, Counterterrorism Coordinator / Chief Adviser, Department of Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

Constituency Members:

Italy: Mr Emanuel Ferrari,* Second Secretary, Directorate General for Political Affairs and International Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rome

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

Luxembourg: Mr Claude Jentgen, Coordinator of the Bilateral Cooperation Service, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs, Defence, Development Cooperation and Foreign Trade of 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

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, the Netherlands, and Norway

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

Constituency Members:

The Netherlands: Ms Nicoline 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 Ali Yasin Gurbe, Director General, Tubsan National Centre for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism of the Federal Republic of Somalia, Mogadishu

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

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

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

Nigeria: Mr Hass'na Daggash, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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 Member: Ms Nere Emiko, Executive Vice Chairman, Kian Smith, Lagos

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,* President, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Alternate Board Member: 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

Tunisia: Mr Wadie Ben Cheikh, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Permanent Mission of Tunisia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

United Kingdom

Ms Sakeena Alam,* Deputy Head, Counter Terrorism Department, Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office of the United Kingdom, London

Ms Olivia Ingram,* Policy & Programme Manager, Counter Terrorism Department, 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

Mr Bakhtiyor Mustafaev, Deputy 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

Tajikistan

Major-General Manuchehr Mahmudzoda, Head of the Department of International Legal Cooperation, Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Tajikistan, Dushanbe

OBSERVERS**European Union Advisory Mission in Iraq (EUAM)**

Mr Waut Es, Senior Strategic Adviser on CT, Prevention & CVE, EUAM Iraq, Baghdad

Ms Marwa Dallyousif, National Language Officer, EUAM Iraq, Baghdad

Maldives

Mr Tholath Raufuddeen,* Director General, Security Coordination Department, Ministry of Homeland Security and Technology of the Republic of Maldives, Malé

Morocco

Mr Irchad Benqadi,* Head of Section, Global Issues Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, African Cooperation & Moroccan Expatriates of the Kingdom of Morocco, Rabat

Experts

Mr Richard Danziger,* Chair of the GCERF Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Dr Charles Salvaudon, Independent Finance Expert, Member of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC); Professor of Geopolitics, Author

GCERF Secretariat