

## **REPORT OF THE 2<sup>nd</sup> BOARD MEETING**

---

The 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Governing Board (the “Board”) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) was held from 20-21 April 2014 in Marrakech, Morocco. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in **Annex 1**, and the attendance list in **Annex 2** to this report.

### **1. WELCOMING REMARKS**

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, introducing herself and the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser. She thanked the Board members for attending and the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco for hosting the meeting.

1.2 The Chair introduced His Excellency Mohammed Belhaj, Director for Global Issues at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Morocco, to provide some welcoming remarks.

1.3 H.E. Belhaj welcomed the Board members to Marrakech. He stated that his government applauded the efforts made to establish GCERF since it was announced at the Global Counterterrorism Forum Ministerial meeting in New York in September 2013. H.E. Belhaj conveyed Morocco’s strong support for GCERF and its mission. He stated that GCERF should respond to the requests of states based on their own realities, and in accordance with international rules and principles. He underscored that an international effort to counter violent extremism should not specify any religion but, rather, be based on equality and mutual respect for diversity. He described Morocco’s efforts to implement a national countering violent extremism (CVE) strategy, including strengthening of its legal framework, providing religious services to protect against ideological exploitation, elevating the role of women and girls, vocational training for youth, and preventing the use of internet and social media for radicalisation to violence. This experience and expertise has been shared with other African and Arab countries.

1.4 The Chair thanked H. E. Belhaj and requested each of the participants around the table to introduce themselves. She noted the presence of observers from Indonesia, the Russian Federation, and Turkey and the Chair of the international Independent Review Panel (“IRP”), Ms Humera Khan.

1.5 The Chair noted apologies for absence from representatives from the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks, and Private Sector constituencies, both of whom had expressed support for all the proposed decisions. In addition, the representatives from Nigeria had regrettably cancelled their attendance due to unforeseen circumstances.

1.6 The Chair expressed her appreciation for the Board members’ commitment to GCERF, including signing contribution agreements, facilitating fundraising, constituency-building and providing in-country support.

## 2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

### *Appointment of the Rapporteur*

2.1 As the first order of business, the Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Ms Sue Breeze from the Canada/UK constituency had kindly agreed to act in such capacity and the Chair thanked her on behalf of the Board.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.01:** Ms Sue Breeze is appointed the rapporteur of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Board meeting.

### *Approval of the Agenda*

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.02/DOC.01), which had been distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.02:** The agenda for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Board meeting (BM.02/DOC.01) is approved.

### *Confirmation of Board Members*

2.5 The Chair stated that there had been some changes to Board membership since the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting in November 2014. Pursuant to applicable Swiss law, the Board was required to acknowledge these changes in writing. She welcomed Ambassador Armitage representing Australia and noted that Mr Barrett who had represented the Private Sector had resigned in order to provide his expertise to GCERF as a member of the IRP.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.03:** The Board notes the following changes to its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting:

- a. **Australia:** His Excellency Ambassador Miles Armitage replaces Mr Ian McConville; and
- b. **Private Sector:** Mr Richard Barrett has resigned, and the seat is vacant.

2.7 The Chair asked the Board to approve the report from the last meeting held via conference call on 26 February 2015 (BM.02/DOC.02). The report had been previously distributed for comments, all of which had been incorporated into the final version.

2.8 One Board member noted that the additional footnote in the report on double-taxation was critical and should be closely monitored.

2.9 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.04:** The Board approves the Report of the Board Meeting via Conference Call (26 February 2015) attached as Annex 1 to BM.02/DOC.02 and requests the Secretariat to post it on the GCERF website.

### **3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

3.1 The Chair requested the Executive Director to present his report (BM.02/DOC.03).

3.2 The Executive Director started his presentation by thanking the Secretariat team for their hard work and welcoming Ms Brigitte Laude, the incoming Chief Financial Officer, who will be taking up her position in June 2015.

3.3 The Executive Director thanked Board members for their contributions to GCERF, both in terms of funds, as well as facilitating meetings and hosting introductions to Board members' colleagues and new partners.

3.4 The Executive Director and other members of the Secretariat had successfully engaged three pilot countries, and GCERF was well on its way to be able to fund grants by the end of 2015. The Secretariat was grateful to the Governments of Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria for their hospitality during country visits. He noted the significant investments being made by countries in which the Core Funding Mechanism was being piloted. In this regard, he suggested that the term "beneficiary countries" may not be appropriate, because they too were making significant contributions to the process – from human/logistical resources to generating required networks. In this regard, he suggested using the term "partner countries" instead. This suggestion was enthusiastically supported by the Board, which also pointed out that the entire board is 'benefiting' from GCERF.

3.5 The Executive Director reiterated the increasing need for CVE measures, as the situation and the challenge to address it had increased since the last face-to-face meeting in November 2014. GCERF is a small part of a comprehensive approach to a global challenge. He emphasized the need to ensure that the GCERF model, mission, and mandate are clearly comprehended across all sectors. With military and security responses at one end of the spectrum, and development and prevention at the other end of the spectrum, the role of community engagement and resilience must be part of the narrative that young people hear. GCERF alone is not the solution; but, without GCERF, there can be no solution. As GCERF operates at the international community's nexus of security and development, these two typically separate areas are becoming closer. This message is gaining traction among potential partners.

3.6 The Executive Director reviewed the achievements of the Secretariat since the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting, including promoting a robust governance structure, taking significant steps towards realising the Resource Mobilisation Plan 2015, paving the way for disbursing grants through the Core Funding Mechanism ("CFM") in three pilot beneficiaries before the end of 2015, raising global awareness of GCERF and its mandate and establishing financial and human resources policies as part of the development of the Secretariat.

3.7 With regards to resource mobilisation, the message was “cautious optimism”. To date, GCERF had firm pledges of approximately USD 24 million, with USD 2.1 million contributed. The Executive Director thanked those donors which had turned their pledges into contributions. The figure of USD 200 million that had been projected for GCERF for the next ten years is far from being reached. However, given GCERF’s work at the nexus of security and development, this is an opportunity to tap into different budgets within donor governments – as well as to access new potential donor governments.

3.8 Engagement with the private sector had been a challenge, and the Executive Director requested the Board’s support in increasing such support. Ensuring a lasting private-public partnership on CVE is one of GCERF’s core mandates.

3.9 The Executive Director also noted that there had been interest from Indonesia, Kenya Kosovo<sup>1</sup> and Myanmar to become pilot countries.

3.10 Finally, regarding the status of Morocco at the meeting, the Executive Director reported that there had been a very constructive meeting with Government representatives the previous day. It was agreed that Morocco would attend the meeting as the host. Morocco had contributed funds to GCERF, and was still considering whether it wishes to become a pilot country at some point in the future. The Chair and Secretariat will continue ongoing engagement with the Government of Morocco on this issue.

#### *Discussion*

3.11 Board members congratulated the Executive Director and the Secretariat on their efforts since the first Board meeting and thanked the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco for hosting the meeting.

3.12 Questions were raised about the scope of GCERF, both in terms of its mandate and geographical coverage. Some Board members cautioned GCERF growing beyond its initial three pilot countries and its niche in funding local communities for CVE prevention activities. Many stressed that the Secretariat should focus on getting funds disbursed in 2015 in order to begin to show result and raise funds for 2016. GCERF should use its potential as an incubator for trial and error as the CVE space becomes increasingly more populated.

3.13 One Board member suggested that GCERF develop a feedback mechanism by which stakeholders participating in the Country Support Mechanisms (“CSMs”), Principal Recipients, and Board constituency groups could be connected; and so that wider lessons learned in the pilot countries could be share elsewhere, including in wealthier countries that are not eligible to receive direct GCERF support.

3.14 The Executive Director thanked the Board members for their contributions, and noted again the engagement and success in the pilot countries. The idea of “judicious expansion” was

---

<sup>1</sup>Designation of Kosovo as a “country” is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

discussed, in the context of potential additional pilot countries. The Executive Director noted that GCERF will continue to be ambitious by adhering to the timeline that was proposed in order to begin to implement projects and demonstrate success to donors.

#### **4. LAUNCH OF THE CORE FUNDING MECHANISM**

4.1 The Chief Operating Officer (“COO”), Mr Jonathan Wood, presented on the launch of the CFM (BM.02/DOC.04).

4.2 The presentation covered the establishment of the international Independent Review Panel (“IRP”); establishment and initial meetings of the CSMs in Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria; and the timeline for the CFM in these countries up to the end of 2015. The timeline included next steps and highlighted points of engagement for the Board, in particular for a meeting via conference call in July 2015.

4.3 The COO requested the Board’s assistance with engagement of the private sector. He requested that the Board build into their schedules the notional timeline for consideration of applications for funding, obtain any necessary internal approvals and provide feedback to the Secretariat on the appropriateness of the timing as regards their own national strategies. Where appropriate, the Secretariat could make adjustments at the Board’s request.

#### *Discussion*

4.4 The Chair requested representatives from pilot countries to present an update on the progress of their CSM.

4.5 The representative from Bangladesh advised that the first CSM meeting took place on 8 April 2015, with representatives from 16 entities: half from the Government of Bangladesh, and half from civil society, think tanks, international development partners, and the private sector. The CSM had created a drafting group for the country Needs Assessment, and will be providing a draft to the Secretariat to share with the IRP by the second week of May 2015. He assured the Board that the timeline presented by the Secretariat will be adhered to.

4.6 The representative from Mali expressed the positive commitment of all stakeholders to the CFM process, noting that, even since the recent April 2015 inaugural visit to Mali by the Secretariat, the Government had catalogued some achievements. The authorities, technical experts, and civil society had demonstrated a high level of interest and GCERF’s mission and objectives have been understood very well. Malian media have also covered GCERF. It was crucial and urgent to support local initiatives in Mali.

4.7 The Government of Nigeria provided an update via email that the Executive Director read aloud at the meeting. In its update, the Government of Nigeria welcomed GCERF’s mission and looked forward to utilizing GCERF as a good avenue to synergise its CVE efforts. The CSM held its first meeting on 8 April 2015, with 15 attendees including representatives from government, civil society, private sector, and foreign government partners. The Government plans to engage more with the private sector to increase its participation in the process. At this first meeting, responsibility for the compilation of the Needs Assessment was assigned; a first

draft has been completed; and a final draft will be completed by early May 2015. The Government has created an online platform to facilitate communication among CSM members between meetings. Further, the CSM requested an avenue of interaction with the CSMs of other pilot countries. The Government thanked the Secretariat and the Board constituencies for sustaining the initiative.

4.8 The Executive Director noted the benefit of CSMs communicating with each other. He stated that the Secretariat could facilitate an electronic meeting for the primary CSM points of contact in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria to exchange views and expertise.

4.9 The Board recognized the early success of GCERF's operations in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria which have provided an opportunity for different stakeholders to discuss CVE, the extent of which is unprecedented. In this way GCERF is already achieving concrete results.

4.10 Concerns were raised by some Board members that the timeline was too ambitious and that Board would not have an opportunity to provide feedback on the Needs Assessments and the selection of Principal Recipients. It was important that the Board's ability to decide whether or not to fund projects was maintained. The COO encouraged all Board member governments to engage with CSMs, including contributing to the development of Needs Assessments. He also advised that the Board will receive a summary of the Needs Assessments when they are asked to allocate funds to each pilot country.

4.11 Some Board members raised the importance of providing debriefs to in-country donors on GCERF missions. The Secretariat advised that it had been systematically reaching out to donor representatives in-country, and encouraged Board members to facilitate this process for future visits.

4.12 There were suggestions that GCERF involve itself more in areas of research and mapping of CVE projects, as it is a relatively new field. The Executive Director advised that the Secretariat will share with the Board its successes and failures in piloting the CFM. By posting appropriate documents on the GCERF website, it is already sharing relevant research on community engagement, resilience, CVE, Needs Assessment methodology, and performance monitoring and evaluation, with CSMs, future pilot countries, the global CVE community of interest, as well as the general public. However, conducting and disseminating research is not a core component of GCERF's mandate; rather, this is the mandate of Hedayah, the International Center of Excellence for CVE. GCERF will work with Hedayah to contribute to this research.

4.13 One Board member commented that GCERF's purpose should not be to fund fully any local community projects in their entirety but, rather, to contribute to existing local community initiatives. In reply, the Secretariat clarified that GCERF will not fully fund particular entities or organisations but may fund specific initiatives or projects.

4.14 In addition, Board members noted the importance of balancing the composition of CSMs between government and non-government members as far as possible to be de-politicised.

4.15 The Executive Director highlighted some lessons learned from the process thus far: that there is a high level of commitment and engagement from all stakeholders regarding GCERF's



work; there is sometimes a challenge of communication between pilot countries' permanent missions in Geneva and the designated GCERF points of contact in capitals; the private sector has been challenging to engage locally; and there is need for a feedback mechanism to connect civil society in GCERF pilot countries to the Board constituency.

4.16 The Chair reiterated that GCERF would not be a substitute for domestic or international resources in the field of CVE. GCERF seeks to fill a funding gap by providing small grants to support local, community-level initiatives, in such cases where resources are scarce.

## **5. REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

5.1 The Chair introduced the Chair of the IRP, Ms Humera Khan. Ms Khan presented the report of the IRP (BM.02/DOC.05).

5.2 The ten members of the IRP were appointed by the Board in January 2015. The Secretariat convened the first meeting of the IRP in February 2015 in Washington DC.

5.3 Ms Khan highlighted the IRP's roles and responsibilities. The IRP is an independent, impartial group of experts that serve the Board, CSMs, and the Secretariat in an advisory capacity. They contribute to the CFM process, from the Needs Assessment, to selection of Principal Recipients, to providing the Board with recommendations for funding.

5.4 Ms Khan reviewed the Needs Assessment criteria that had been agreed by the IRP and the next steps in the process.

5.5 She underscored the preference of the IRP for GCERF to fund projects that are CVE-specific, rather than CVE-relevant, due to the difficulty in demonstrating CVE impact in a project repurposed from a development or other types of programming. In addition, CVE is an underfunded area of practice.

### *Discussion*

5.6 One Board member highlighted the importance that Needs Assessments take into account the role of women in CVE, which is a priority for some donors.

5.7 Some discussion took place around whether GCERF should engage with rehabilitation and reintegration of former violent extremists/returning foreign fighters. It was concluded that GCERF should focus on preventive efforts but allow flexibility to consider project proposals in these and other areas when appropriate.

5.8 One Board member suggested that the Needs Assessment criteria be augmented to include a reference to safety/operational security.

## **6. ELIGIBILITY POLICY FOR THE CORE FUNDING MECHANISM**

6.1 The Executive Director presented the proposed Eligibility Policy for the Core Funding Mechanism (BM.02/DOC.06), requesting Board approval.

6.2 He noted that pilot countries that had already been approved by the Board included Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria. The Policy will not be applied retroactively to these countries. Some other countries that had expressed informal interest included Indonesia, Kenya, Kosovo<sup>1</sup> and Myanmar.

6.3 The Eligibility Policy included three elements: eligibility for Official Development Assistance, the existence of a challenge of radicalization to violent extremism in the country; and government commitment to address the issue and provide an enabling environment.

6.4 The Executive Director noted the importance that GCERF judiciously expand, and requested the Board approve the policy and decision, and provide guidance at a later time on its implementation.

#### *Discussion*

6.5 Some Board members raised concerns about the Secretariat's capacity to expand beyond the three pilot countries already in place. Moreover, some urged caution about enlisting new countries without any predictable timeline for when funding would be available for that country.

6.6 Support for various proposed pilot countries were expressed by Board members, and the Kyrgyz Republic was also raised as a potential pilot. The European Union noted that, due to its member states' differing political positions on Kosovo, they would be unable to confirm support for it to become a pilot country.

6.7 The Executive Director explained that pilot countries are self-selecting, and that all potential new pilot countries had approached the Secretariat or Board members.

6.8 The Board took the following decision:

#### **BM.02/DEC.05:** The Board:

- a. approves the Core Funding Mechanism Eligibility Policy attached as Annex 1 to BM.02/DOC.06; and
- b. requests the Secretariat to present for Board approval in 2016 an updated policy incorporating good practices and lessons learned.

### **7. UPDATE ON THE ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM**

7.1 The Executive Director presented an update on the Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) (BM.02/DOC.07). The purpose of the AFM is to facilitate rapid, coordinated and coherent responses to the recent escalation in violent extremism worldwide and its current manifestations, including but not limited to ISIL

7.2 The Executive Director reported that the Government of Norway's contribution of NOK 1,850,000 (approximately USD 230,000) was the only contribution made to date to the AFM. The Executive Director noted that despite significant efforts made by the Secretariat to mobilise



resources for the AFM, the current amount raised is not enough for its launch. He urged donors to contribute to the AFM, and facilitate meetings for the Secretariat to other departments within their governments that may be more appropriate for this stream of funding. He also noted that discussions were ongoing with the Swiss Government to provide a secondee to both fundraise and manage the AFM.

7.3 The Executive Director reiterated that funding for the AFM should not draw from any funding allocated for the CFM but, rather, should come from additional contributions.

#### *Discussion*

7.4 Whilst there was some confusion on whether this mechanism's focus was solely to respond to ISIL threats, this was clarified by reiterating the purpose of the fund as outlined above.

7.5 Some Board members stressed the importance of differentiating between the two funding mechanisms, and placing priority on the CFM.

7.6 Some Board members saw the AFM as an opportunity to work in areas like refugee and internally displaced persons camps where such programs are needed.

7.7 The Executive Director agreed to provide an update on the AFM at the next face-to-face meeting.

### **8. RESOURCE MOBILISATION**

8.1 The Executive Director provided an update on resource mobilisation activities, which is discussed in BM.02/DOC.08. He stated that the Secretariat had reached out to traditional donors with some success and looks forward to Board members' support to reaching out both to other agencies within their own governments, as well as to the newer donors. In-kind contributions had been made by the private sector. The Secretariat had not yet reached out to high-net-worth individuals.

8.2 As committed at the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting, by the end of 2015, the Secretariat will be presenting a Resource Mobilisation Strategy for 2016-18; and the recruitment of a resource mobilisation officer to assist with implementing the strategy was underway. The Secretariat was ambitious for GCERF's future as a significant fund and look forward to raising a lot more money and 'aiming bigger' than the initial US 200 million that was suggested at inception.

8.3 The Chair emphasised that the role of the Board members in resource mobilisation is not to raise funds themselves, but to identify possibilities for funding; raise the profile of GCERF nationally and internationally; and support efforts by the Chair and Secretariat to mobilise resources by facilitating introductions and meetings, and providing expertise.

## *Discussion*

8.4 Board members took positive note of the Secretariat's efforts at resource mobilisation. Some urged Board members that had already made pledges to realise them as soon as possible.

8.5 Board members emphasised that fundraising would be facilitated by showing progress, including disbursing existing funds. The hiring of a good resource mobilisation officer was essential and should be prioritized. Some offered to facilitate engagement with private sector companies already engaged in CVE work, both at the headquarters level and the country level.

8.6 Questions were posed about the idea of establishing a trust fund. The Executive Director noted that at this point no donors were requesting that one be established; but that he maintains contact with the World Bank in this regard.

8.7 The meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in October 2015, which would include many CVE-related events, was discussed as an important opportunity to raise GCERF's profile. The Secretariat will focus on having a strong and effective presence with the possibility of hosting side events during the week.

8.8 The Chair emphasised GCERF's work with international development agencies and requested the Board's assistance in facilitating meetings with relevant points of contact.

8.9 The Chair reminded participants that at its first meeting, the Board took the decision to establish a Contributions Committee. Due to a lack of nominations for membership, this had not occurred, and the Chair urged Board members to nominate members.

## **9. PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

9.1 The COO and Ms Amanda Fazzone, Senior Community Engagement and Resilience Advisor, presented the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation ("PM&E") Framework set out in BM.02/DOC.09.

9.2 The COO emphasised that the framework was still in the midst of a consultation process and thanked the Board members who had already provided detailed feedback. He highlighted the background, purpose and intent of the PM&E Framework, which covers the programmatic and financial aspects of the CFM. The Framework was designed to correspond appropriately to the characteristics of the CFM, including engagement with Principal Recipients, and making allowances for grant and sub-grant size. The Framework reflects and acknowledges the anticipated capacity of grantees and the related issues of accountability. It also recognizes that the funded activities are in a sensitive area with genuine security concerns and that implementation may occur through informal structures.

9.3 In keeping with GCERF's mandate to reach community-level initiatives, the Framework builds on 'traditional' monitoring and evaluation methods, in order to support innovation, risk-taking, and adaptation based on lessons learned.

9.4 The purpose of the PM&E Framework is to report on progress made in-country to the Board and donors, as well as provide a robust, practical framework that the Secretariat can use to monitor performance at any point in the grant cycle, and make improvements as necessary.

9.5 The Secretariat will provide the Board an annual consolidated report, including programmatic and financial reporting on each pilot country reflecting all grants made to Principal Recipients. It will include GCERF's audited financial statements and will be available no later than 30 June following the year-end.

9.6 The COO requested feedback from Board members regarding the time frame as proposed in the document, and whether this would be in keeping with each of their needs.

### *Discussion*

9.7 Some Board members highlighted the principle of "Do No Harm". The framework's flexibility was welcomed, and Board members cautioned against it becoming too rigorous, as this could lead to over-burdening the Principal Recipients who should be focused on results. A more desirable strategy would be an evaluation in two to three years to inform whether a stricter system needs to be applied.

9.8 'Capacity building' and providing support Principal Recipients was emphasised. In addition, ensuring that funds are not diverted to terrorist groups was stressed.

9.9 There was some concern raised regarding the separation of duties between Principal Recipients and sub-grantees, which could merit a greater extent of external oversight from the Secretariat over sub-grantees. Others stressed that more emphasis should be placed on tracking project outcomes, rather than tracking the accountability of Principal Recipients and their sub-grantees.

9.10 Some Board members offered to provide the Secretariat with their own monitoring and evaluation templates as guidance.

9.11 The Chair reiterated that this document was put before the Board for input only, and not for decision.

## **10. GCERF STRATEGY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING**

10.1 The Chair opened a discussion session to consider GCERF's strategic position within its wider environment. There was no document associated with this topic,<sup>2</sup> which provided an opportunity for the Board to discuss the development of a written strategy for GCERF's future.

---

<sup>2</sup> The presentation is posted on the website at <http://www.gcerf.org/wp-content/uploads/STRATEGY-PRESENTATION.pdf>.

10.2 The Executive Director presented some initial thoughts for discussion. These included whether GCERF should be providing a definition for CVE; the role of the private sector; the boundaries of GCERF's mandate; and the scale of ambition.

10.3 The Secretariat would be developing the Strategy over the next few months and present a first draft at the next in-person meeting. It would welcome the Board's input during this development stage, including as members of an informal reference group.

#### *Discussion*

10.4 One Board member suggested that a theory of change would inform the strategy.

10.5 The Board discussed whether GCERF should define CVE. The discussion concluded with the proposal to leave it purposefully vague, in order to maintain flexibility and allow space for pilot countries and communities to identify their own culturally appropriate definitions of violent extremism, as well as to allow GCERF to innovate.

10.6 To avoid duplicating existing work, GCERF should provide feedback on best practices and lessons learned in the field of CVE. The tracking of successes and failures of funded projects was essential. GCERF should be considered a "petri dish" to experiment on what works and what does not. If all the experiences of this unique Board are combined and captured, it can make a difference. However, the CVE space is becoming crowded and GCERF needs to define its niche carefully, but in a simple manner.

10.7 The Executive Director thanked the Board for their inputs and stated that with the input at the country level and the expertise on the IRP, defining which initiatives actually comprise CVE should become apparent. He noted the agreement of the Board that a strategy was required, and that the Secretariat would begin to work on one over the next few months.

10.8 The Chair reiterated that this was the beginning of an ongoing discussion regarding GCERF and its strategy for the future. She encouraged those Board members who would like to serve as a reference group for the Secretariat while it develops its strategy to advise her and/or the Executive Director.

### **11. AMENDMENT TO HUMAN RESOURCES POLICY**

11.1 The Senior Legal and Policy Advisor, Ms Tal Sagorsky, presented an amendment to the Human Resources Policy approved at a Board meeting via conference call on 26 February 2015 (outlined in BM.02/DOC.11). She advised that the proposed amendment was requested by the Swiss government, following a meeting at the Swiss Mission to the UN and other International Organisations in anticipation of signing the Headquarters Agreement. The addition was requested to avoid the misinterpretation of the Human Resources Policy to permit illegal work in Switzerland by foreigners.

11.2 No comments on the proposed decision were made. However, one Board member requested an addition to the "Note on Secondments" in the document to include reference to

secondments from international organisations as well as governments. The Secretariat agreed to make this addition in the final version of the document posted on the website.

11.3 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.06:** The Board approves the following addition to paragraph 1.9 of the Human Resources Policy (approved at the meeting via conference call on 26 February 2015 (CC.02.15/DOC.02)):

1.9 Employees may undertake work, whether paid or unpaid for another organisation, or serve on the Board or Advisory body of another organisation directly or indirectly related to GCERF, or hold public office, if to do so is compatible with and does not conflict with the proper discharge of their duties for GCERF **and, if the work is within Switzerland, the employee has the legal right to undertake such work.** Employees must obtain the prior written consent of the Executive Director before doing so, and in the case of the Executive Director, the consent of the Chair of the Board. Any such activity or engagement must be undertaken on the employee's own time, unless explicitly approved otherwise.

## 12. COMMUNICATIONS GUIDELINES

12.1 The Executive Director presented GCERF's Communication Guidelines (BM.02/DOC.10) with the assistance of Ms Amy Cunningham, GCERF's Community Engagement and Resilience Officer.

12.2 The purpose of the proposed guidelines are to guide the Secretariat and Board members, both of which are expected to engage in external communications activities to support GCERF's mission and mandate. The Secretariat has strived to ensure that GCERF maintains a transparent and active external communications profile since its launch. It leverages online, print, television and radio platforms to promote GCERF and maintains a transparent, comprehensive and regularly updated website. It undertakes targeted outreach at public events. When appropriate it is active on social media (Twitter, Facebook).

12.3 The Guidelines outline how the Secretariat and Board should use communication tools to engage existing and potential pilots, communities at risk, existing and potential donors and other partners, as well as the general public. They contain guiding principles and prohibited activity.

### *Discussion*

12.4 A Board member expressed concern over GCERF's modest presence on social media, given the fact that violent extremists are very active in the medium. The Secretariat replied that their approach in this initial stage is to take a balanced and cautious stance.. An overtly active social media presence at this stage could have more negative repercussions on GCERF's credibility and ability to function than benefits.

12.5 A Board member offered his constituency's political and diplomatic assistance in the future, should GCERF experience negative press coverage.

12.6 Requests were also made for access to documents for all stakeholders. The Secretariat reiterated that the website will be used as a resource; and that relevant documents are made available there.

12.7 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.08**: The Board:

- a. notes the efforts of the Secretariat to engage in communications activities to establish transparency and increase recognition of GCERF, as described in BM.02/DOC.10; and
- b. requests the Secretariat to continue to implement communications engagement and activity consistent with the Communications Guidelines, as described in Annex 1 of BM.02/DOC.10.

### **13. GOVERNANCE**

#### *Amendment to the Bylaws*

13.1 The Senior Legal and Policy Advisor presented an amendment to the Bylaws (BM.02/DOC.12). The amendment to include the appointment of Board members as an “inalienable” duty of the Board had been requested by the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations, but it does not affect the right of the constituencies to appoint their Board members.

13.2 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.02/DEC.07**: The Board approves the following addition to Article 2.1 of the Bylaws approved at the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting:

#### **2.1 Functions**

The Board is the supreme governing body of GCERF. The Board as the supreme body shall exercise all powers not expressly delegated to another organ of the foundation in the Statutes or these Bylaws. The inalienable duties include appointment of the right to sign and represent the foundation, appointment of the Executive Director, **appointment of Board members**, appointment of the auditors and approval of the annual financial statements.

#### *Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest*

13.3 The Senior Legal and Policy Advisor presented on the Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest (BM.02/DOC.13).

13.4 The policy had been distributed prior to the 1<sup>st</sup> Board meeting, but was not discussed due to a request that the annual declaration form be included. An ethics policy is an essential part of good governance and was referred to in the Bylaws. All Board members have conflicting

institutional interests and some Board members and Secretariat members have conflicting personal interests. Not managing them properly is a reputational risk for the organisation.

13.5 The Policy applies to Board members, Alternate Board Members, committee, task force, review panel members (including IRP members) and professional-level Secretariat staff members. It does not apply to grantees; they will be subject to the ethics provisions in their grant agreements.

13.6 The disclosure procedure was reviewed, including the filing of an annual declaration form and the involvement of an Ethics Committee, whose membership needed to be approved by the Board. The provisions on gifts, outside activities, and one-year “cooling off” periods were also reviewed.

13.7 The Chair urged Board members to nominate members to serve on the Ethics Committee, which would not be a large time commitment.

#### *Discussion*

13.8 A question was asked regarding the acceptance of gifts in certain contexts that were culturally-specific. The Secretariat pointed to the exception in Article 6.2a of the policy. It was also clarified that the Secretariat would develop internal policies for the handling of gifts when accepted.

13.9 One Board member requested that clarification on the Policy’s application to the IRP and why it was not listed in paragraph 3.8 of the cover note. The Secretariat clarified that the Policy specifically includes IRP members as a “Covered Individual”. In addition, the IRP terms of reference include additional provisions regarding conflict of interest, including prohibiting members from reviewing proposals in which they had any part in developing or from which they would benefit. IRP members are also requested to sign an acknowledgment that have read and understood the terms of reference, including the conflict of interest provisions contained in them. This additional information would be added to the cover note.

13.10 The Board took the following decision:

#### **BM.02/DEC.08:** The Board:

- a. approves:
  - i. the Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest attached as Annex 1 to BM.02/DOC.13; and
  - ii. the terms of reference of the Ethics Committee attached as Annex 2 to BM.02/DOC.13;
- b. requests the Executive Director to appoint an Ethics Officer in the Secretariat who should proceed with distributing the Declarations of Interest to Covered Individual as soon as possible; and



- c. requests the Chair to consult with Board members interested in joining the Ethics Committee, and present a recommendation on the committee's membership for Board approval, using the no objection procedure set out in Article 2.9 of the Bylaws.

### *Constituency Management*

13.11 The Senior Legal and Policy Advisor presented the paper on constituency management (BM.02/DOC.14). She highlighted the need to separate governance and management responsibilities, and the fact that constituencies are self-governing, and therefore what was being presented were not rules but suggested good practices.

13.12 The presentation covered the manner in which constituencies grow, the selection of Board members, the qualities of a successful Board member and representing the views of constituencies.

### *Discussion*

13.13 As the civil society constituency is the largest and most diverse, it was proposed that a mechanism could be developed whereby civil society organisations can coordinate and discuss issues before the Board. This could be electronic, via conference call, an interactive website, etc., and then fed into a pyramid structure for feedback to the constituency. The Civil Society Board Member appealed to the Board to raise funds to support a communication channel that provides for the robust engagement of the constituency.

13.14 The Board requested that substantive matters related to GCERF be reserved for face-to-face meetings, and procedural ones decided via conference calls or using the no objection process, whenever possible.

## **14. FINAL REMARKS**

14.1 The Chair opened the floor for any final remarks, in particular inviting the observer countries to comment off the record.

14.2 Following these remarks, the Executive Director reiterated his thanks on behalf of all participants to the Kingdom of Morocco for its hospitality. He thanked the Chair on behalf of the whole Secretariat for the meeting and for her ongoing engagement with GCERF. He thanked the Board members for their constructive engagement with the Secretariat and GCERF as a whole. He encouraged Board members to visit the Secretariat offices. Finally, he emphasised the importance of not failing the local communities that are relying on GCERF for resources.

14.3 The Chair thanked the host, the Board, the Chair of the IRP, the interpreters and technicians. She noted the very tight timeframe for the next steps, but emphasised that moving forward is important in order to make a difference. There may be failures, but lessons should be learned from them.

14.4 The Chair adjourned the meeting

**Annex 1: AGENDA**

**MONDAY 20 APRIL 2015**

**Palmeraie Conference Center, Circuit de la Palmeraie, Marrakech, Morocco**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
08:30 - 09:00	<b>Registration</b>		
09:00 - 09:15	<b>Welcoming remarks</b>		
09:15 - 09:30	<b>Preliminary Matters</b>		Board Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of Rapporteur</li> </ul>	DOC.01	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of Agenda</li> </ul>	DOC.02	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome new Board members</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of Report of Board Meeting via conference call (26 February 2015)</li> </ul>		
09:30 - 10:30	<b>Report of the Executive Director</b>		Executive Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities and achievements of the Secretariat</li> </ul>	DOC.03	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on operating expenses</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next steps and challenges</li> </ul>		
10:30 - 10:45	<b>Coffee</b>		
10:45 - 11:45	<b>Launch of the Core Funding Mechanism</b>	DOC.04	Chief Operating Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress report for pilot beneficiary countries</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable for consideration of applications for funding</li> </ul>		
11:45 - 12:30	<b>Report of the international Independent Review Panel (IRP)</b>		IRP Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for needs assessments</li> </ul>	DOC.05	
12:30 - 14:00	<b>Lunch</b>		
14:00 - 14:45	<b>Eligibility for the Core Funding Mechanism</b>		Executive Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligibility Policy for the CFM and potential new pilots</li> </ul>	DOC.06	
14:45 - 15:15	<b>Accelerated Funding Mechanism</b>		Executive Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status update</li> </ul>	DOC.07	
15:15 - 15:30	<b>Coffee</b>		
15:30 - 17:00	<b>Resource Mobilisation</b>		Executive Director
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat fundraising activities</li> </ul>	DOC.08	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on pledges and contributions</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implications for funding model</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next steps</li> </ul>		
19:30	<b>Reception</b>		

**TUESDAY 21 APRIL 2015**

**Palmeraie Conference Center, Circuit de la Palmeraie, Marrakech, Morocco**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>09:00 - 10:00</b>	<b>GCERF Strategy and Strategic Planning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Defining strategic intent</li><li>• Formation of Board working group</li></ul>		Executive Director
<b>10:00 - 11:00</b>	<b>Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&amp;E)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation of PM&amp;E Framework</li></ul>	DOC.09	Chief Operating Officer
<b>11:00 - 11:15</b>	<b>Coffee</b>		
<b>11:15 - 12:15</b>	<b>Communications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Communications Guidelines</li><li>• Discussion on publicity and transparency</li></ul>	DOC.10	Executive Director
<b>12:15 - 12:30</b>	<b>Amendment to Human Resources Policy</b>	DOC.11	Senior Legal and Policy Officer
<b>12:30 - 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>		
<b>14:00 - 15:00</b>	<b>Governance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amendment to Bylaws</li><li>• Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest</li><li>• Constituency management</li></ul>	DOC.12 DOC.13 DOC.14	Senior Legal and Policy Officer
<b>15:00 - 15:15</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>		

**Annex 2: ATTENDANCE LIST**

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Title and Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Ahsan	M. Shameem	Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the United Nations in Geneva	Alternate Board Member, Bangladesh
Al-Qahtani	Mutlaq	Director of International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Qatar	Board Member, Qatar
Armitage	Miles	Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia	Board Member, Australia
Belhaj	Mohammed Amine	Directeur des Questions Globales, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Bellamy	Carol	Chair	Chair of the Board
Bourita	Nasser	Ambassadeur, Secrétaire Général, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Breeze	Sue	Head of Equalities and Non Discrimination Team Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Human Rights and Democracy Department, United Kingdom	Board Member, United Kingdom
Chekkori	Ismail	Chef de la Division des Questions Globales, Ministère Affaires Etrangères, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Cunningham	Amy	Community Engagement and Resilience Advisor, GCERF	Secretariat
Di Giammatteo	Valerio	Associate, GCERF	Secretariat
Dogan Grajover	Esra	Head of Department, Deputy Directorate General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey	Observer
Errhouni	Said	Directeur de la Coopération, Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Fassi Fihri	Nassiba	Chef de Division de la Coopération et de la Communication, Délégation Générale à l'Administration Pénitentiaire et de la Réinsertion, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Fazzone	Amanda	Senior Community Engagement and Resilience Advisor	Secretariat
Ferdous	Lhoucine	Chef de la Division de la Gouvernance, Ministère chargé des Relations avec le Parlement, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco

Last Name	First Name	Title and Organisation	Role
Freyer	Harald	Policy Adviser and Judicial Expert, European External Action Service	Alternate Board Member, European Union
Gregorian	Raffi	Director for Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Department of State, United States of America	Alternate Board Member, United States of America
Hamilton	Graeme	Chief, Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, Canada	Constituency Member, Canada
Husy	Stephan	Ambassador and Coordinator for International Counter-Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Switzerland	Board Member, Switzerland
Infansayah	Fanfan	Deputy Director for Regional Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency, Indonesia	Observer
Jamison	Ian	Head of Education and Training, Tony Blair Faith Foundation	Constituency Member, Foundations
Jendoubi	Wahiba	Programme Advisor, GCERF	Secretariat
Kardoudi	Khalid	Substitut du Procureur Général du Roi près la Cour d'Appel de Rabat, Ministère de la Justice, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Khan	Humera	Executive Director, Muflehun	Chair of the Independent Review Panel, Presenter
Koser	Khalid	Executive Director, GCERF	Secretariat
Labiad	Wiam	Chef du Service des Questions Globales à caractère Sécuritaire Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Royaume du Maroc	Morocco
Laude	Brigitte	Incoming Chief Financial Officer, GCERF	Secretariat
Mamaev	Ruslan	Vice-Consul, Embassy of Russian Federation in the Kingdom of Morocco	Observer
Sagorsky	Tal	Senior Legal and Policy Advisor, GCERF	Secretariat
Sanchez	Maria	Programme Manager, European Commission	Constituency Member, European Union
Sudradjat	Herry	Director for Regional and Multilateral Cooperation National Counter Terrorism Agency, Indonesia	Observer
Thiam	Amadou Opa	Ministre Conseiller, Permanent Mission of Mali to the UN in Geneva	Constituency Member, Mali
Van der Meer	Adriaan	Head of Unit, Instrument Contributing to Stability and Peace – Global and Transregional Threats, European Commission	Board Member, European Union <sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Mr. van der Meer noted that he was participating in the meeting on an informal basis, because official procedures to appoint him as the European Union representative on the GCERF Board have not yet been finalized.

Last Name	First Name	Title and Organisation	Role
van Deventer	Fulco	Vice-Director, Human Security Collective	Board Member, Civil Society
Wintermeier	Kristina	Associate, GCERF	Secretariat
Wood	Jonathan	Chief Operating Officer, GCERF	Secretariat
Zria	Yassine	Ministry of Interior of Morocco	Morocco