

REPORT OF THE 10th BOARD MEETING

The 10th meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 11 to 12 June 2019 in Ottawa, Canada. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in Annex 1 and the attendance list in Annex 2 of this report.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, highlighting the 10th Board Meeting as a milestone. The Chair noted the importance of the meeting, to discuss business, reforms, and funding. The Chair welcomed all guests and offered condolences to Mali regarding the violence that took place days before the meeting.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. H.E. Mr Audu Ayinla Kadiri, Board Member for the West and Central Africa constituency, kindly agreed to take on the role.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.01: H.E. Mr Audu Ayinla Kadiri of Nigeria (West and Central Africa constituency) is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 10th Board meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.10/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval. The Chair noted that she did not have agenda items making an Executive Session necessary, however she invited Board members to advise if they wished to have an Executive Session.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.02: The agenda for the 10th Board meeting (BM.10/DOC.01) is approved.

Confirmation of new Board Members

2.5 The Chair welcomed new members to the Board, Mr Arnaud Pescheux as Alternate Board Member for the European Union and France, and Mr Fatos Makolli as Board Member

for Kosovo. The Chair noted that the constituency of Australia, Japan, and New Zealand had opted to rotate constituency leadership.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 9th Board meeting:

- **Australia, Japan, and New Zealand:** Mr Daisuke Namioka replaces Ambassador Paul Foley as the Board Member;
- **Australia, Japan, and New Zealand:** Ambassador Paul Foley is the Alternate Board Member;
- **European Union and France:** Mr Arnaud Pescheux replaces Ambassador François Rivasseau as the Alternate Board Member; and
- **Kosovo:** Mr Fatos Makolli is the Board Member for the previously vacant seat.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED), Dr Khalid Koser, to present his report (BM.10/DOC.02) and welcomed active participation from the Board.

3.2 The ED welcomed the Board Members and thanked them, the Chair, and the Secretariat. He thanked the Board Members for their support and for the constructive feedback provided during calls prior to the meeting and with regards to the proposed reforms. He thanked the Chair for her mentorship and support. He acknowledged the difficulty of the Secretariat restructuring and thanked the Board Members for their support and appreciation of this. He then introduced the New Leadership Team (NLT) of the Secretariat, present at the meeting.

3.3 The ED highlighted key points from the report. Offering condolences to Mali, he noted that GCERF is active in the affected area through dialogue activities, community policing, and a regional reconciliation commission. However, as the existing investment principle stands, although \$1.4 million is earmarked for Mali, the Secretariat must acquire \$5 million before presenting the National Application to the Board to continue work there. This restriction would be lifted should the Board approve the proposed reform.

3.4 The presented reform (BM.10/DOC.03) is designed to make GCERF more agile and flexible by proposing changes to the funding approval process. The ED highlighted the changing face of violent extremism (VE), including by university students, as seen during the 2016 Holy Artisan Bakery attack in Dhaka. The reform would allow the Secretariat the agility to respond in a timely manner to various and immediate crises in the field of countering and

preventing violent extremism (P/CVE). GCERF has built credibility in its partner countries, which feel GCERF is supporting them and adding value through its work.

3.5 The ED suggested that the Board examine what GCERF should be. GCERF has finished first round investments, has begun to reform, and now must replenish. The Secretariat seeks realistic expectations through its reform proposal, and would ask the Board for feedback and comments. The ED acknowledged the global resurgence of interest in P/CVE. He pointed to the recently-signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the United Nations Office of Counter Terrorism (UNOCT), the recent USIP report,¹ and OECD statements on the subject; the growing interest also seeks a set of standards and activities, an area where GCERF might provide guidance. The ED provided suggested areas for GCERF to lead, including as: an incubator, testing funding with new organisations after which they continue to grow with other donors; a pioneer, that gets involved fairly quickly in areas that are harder to reach by governments; an accelerator, investing in projects that do good work but need more innovation and risk taking; or, as a vehicle for building and sharing knowledge. In summary, accepting GCERF's limitations, what is GCERF's added value?

3.6 The ED again referenced the proposed reform, which calls for a common understanding, a meaningful strategy, and a proposed \$20-25 million in funding per year. The ED was grateful for conversations with most Board Members prior to the meeting and was able to compile key takeaways. There was agreement about supporting GCERF to find the right niche in the PVE arena. The ED noted general support for the reform, with some debate around the proposed formulation of committees and decision delegation. He expressed relief about the balanced budget on operating expenses, thanks to a few Board Members stepping in to cover the remaining 2019 expenses, combined with some significant cuts at the Secretariat. The ED noted the suggestion to appoint a national advisor in the Philippines, and to consider the same in Tunisia. The addition of a national advisor may attract more locally available funds and enable quicker, better grant management. The ED also mentioned the common comment that GCERF must do more to work with partners, especially donors, in countries of operation.

Discussion

3.7 All Board Members offered their condolences to Mali and acknowledged the need to provide further funding to boost GCERF's portfolio there. All Board Members would be pleased to see GCERF continuing to focus its programming away from general development and towards P/CVE-specific activities. All Board Members also acknowledged

¹ USIP Report on "[Preventing Extremism in Fragile States: A New Approach](#)", February 2019

and thanked the Secretariat for the difficult restructuring, which was a positive step for GCERF to adjust to current realities.

3.8 The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency said P/CVE activity should be GCERF's niche as an innovator and incubator. He pointed to the example of prisons, where other organisations can often not easily work, and therefore provides a good opportunity for GCERF to add value. The Board Member suggested GCERF is on the right track and should continue to adapt and show flexibility to current and adapting needs, all of which require strategic flexibility.

3.9 Speaking for Tunisia, the Board Member for the North Africa and Middle East constituency thanked the ED for the very complete report. He reminded the Board that the Tunisia National Application (BM.10/DOC.05), up for decision at this meeting, would fund only five of ten strong organisations that applied. The Board Member therefore proposed funding the five remaining (unselected) organisations, to increase impact and help Tunisia fight VE.

3.10 Regarding the reform, the Board Member suggested that GCERF and the Board are now well structured; the Board should take on strategic matters and the Secretariat should take on operational and technical matters. He expressed support for the suggestion to have coordinators or liaison officers on the ground, specifically in Tunisia to coordinate between government and organisations on the ground. The ED acknowledged all points made, and agreed the additional five organisations should be funded if possible, ideally through GCERF directly to develop a more holistic portfolio.

3.11 Speaking for the United States (US), the Representative of the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway constituency said the US is optimistic about GCERF; the reforms are taking GCERF in the direction they would like to see GCERF move and will also help other countries to contribute. He welcomed the opportunity to discuss additional reforms during the Board meeting, in order to see GCERF continue to move in an agile direction. The Board Member expressed support for holding Board meetings in partner countries, and suggested that the more donors get to see, the better insight and confidence they will have in GCERF. He would like to see a future Board meeting in Tunisia.

3.12 The US Representative echoed Tunisia's point about financing and assured that as the US is bullish about GCERF's direction, it has every intention to continue supporting. He recognised the current financial constraints and encouraged other countries to contribute and help GCERF meet its desired \$25 million operating budget. The ED thanked the US for the series of important sessions in DC held the week prior.

3.13 The Board Member for Qatar expressed optimism about GCERF. He offered condolences to Mali and pointed out the ramifications of instability in Somalia on Kenya. He then reiterated his request for GCERF to include Somalia as a partner country. The Somali Prime Minister submitted a formal letter to GCERF, and the Qatar constituency asked for an urgent decision to include Somalia. He pointed out that Myanmar was proposed as a partner in 2014 and has since been unresponsive and inflexible; he therefore proposed to remove them from GCERF's partner countries. The Board Member said that he would like to see more coordination with Qatar embassies in GCERF partner countries and proposed to copy them on all relevant communications in these countries. Finally, he was pleased with the UNOCT agreement, as partnerships, will help GCERF move forward.

3.14 The ED reminded the Board that GCERF has a \$3 million shortfall for Mali and, after 2019, just \$9 million confirmed for GCERF through 2022. Strategic decisions will need to be made about how best to invest GCERF's limited funds to achieve PVE impact. With regards to Somalia, GCERF is moving forward with discussions. GCERF has a report from a security firm on the feasibility of programmes. He also said the Secretariat regularly reaches out to donors' Embassies in partner countries, including Qatar's representatives, but does not systematically receive responses, so will recommend to the Secretariat to copy the Board Members to incentivise this.

3.15 Speaking for Nigeria, the Board Member for the West and Central Africa constituency mentioned the horrendous series of attacks in Nigeria and commended GCERF on its second round of funding there. He made two comments on the reform proposal: he agreed with the desire to be agile and cost effective and would like GCERF to use caution as it decides how to respond to challenges; and, he requested an accelerated start to Round 2 activities in Nigeria, and acknowledged the reforms may help this request.

3.16 Speaking for France, the Representative of the Alternate Board Member for the European Union and France constituency stressed the results section of the report. He stressed a need to share lessons and generate learning around PVE. He said the reforms presented are a good step towards this. More than a funding mechanism, he also wants to see GCERF engaging in global debates.

3.17 Speaking for the European Union (EU), the Representative of the Board Member for the European Union and France constituency said he sees GCERF as an entity which still needs to show its relevance and deliver on its mandate to be a global actor. He requested full support on engaging in Somalia and Northern Mozambique and would welcome the ED to Brussels to discuss. The Chair said she welcomed direct feedback regarding consideration of Somalia and Northern Mozambique throughout the meeting. He would like

to see GCERF engage in more countries, and move away from those with no traction, such as Myanmar.

3.18 The Alternate Board Member for the Policy, Think, and Do Tanks constituency echoed the comments by the Board Member for the Civil Society constituency, that GCERF moving towards the forefront of the P/CVE space gives it an edge; he added that local representatives will help this and provide better representation. He recognised the need for change at the Board level based on lessons learned.

3.19 Speaking for Kenya, the Representative of the Board Member for the Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa constituency said GCERF must have the flexibility and agility to respond to new challenges, as each will continue to evolve. He said Kenya recognises Somalia as a source of terrorism in Kenya and would support the Board considering engagement there. He expressed gratefulness to the Board for approving grant advances to three PRs in Nairobi, Mombasa, and Lamu. He echoed the Board Member for Nigeria's desire to expedite the process of grant making. He assured GCERF and the Board of his support and will monitor work in his country closely to ensure the programme is implemented as expected.

3.20 Speaking for Australia, the Alternate Board Member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency would like to see GCERF as a flexible, innovative, agile actor in PVE. He highlighted two particular areas of progress from the report: the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) work presented was impressive and commendable; and the Philippines programme is an innovative example of specific funding for a partner country generated by interested countries.

3.21 The Board Member for Switzerland requested that the ED convey his appreciation to the Secretariat for the restructure. He said he had contacted Swiss Embassies prior to the Board meeting and has seen an increase in enthusiasm and knowledge on GCERF, compared with previous years. He stressed the importance of the CSM process and said GCERF must take the proper time to identify the right partners and grantees on the ground. He welcomed the agile disbursement of funds but does not want to see GCERF spread thin trying to be everywhere.

3.22 The Representative of the Board Member for Bangladesh said it was an honour and pleasure to attend this Board meeting. She asked the Board to renew their commitment to PVE worldwide and to reflect on the challenges facing GCERF. PVE remains a top priority for Bangladesh, and she recognised GCERF's local capacity building there. She said the Board visit to Bangladesh incited positive enthusiasm for the programmes locally. She was happy to see GCERF projects focusing on youth, women, and girls, all of whom can play a significant role in PVE.

3.23 The Representative for UNOCT said he was proud to be an observer to the Board meeting; UNOCT is committed to the MOU and wants to work closely with GCERF. He thanked Qatar for their contribution to UNOCT. He expressed interest in learning from GCERF research; UNOCT doesn't work in research but works with many organisations who do, so would like to see sharing both ways. UNOCT is starting to develop a field presence and would like to liaise with GCERF in that regard. They also consider the same questions, such as investing in one place or spreading funds across many, so he appreciated hearing the Board Member views.

3.24 Speaking for Mali, the Representative of the Alternate Board Member for the West and Central Africa constituency thanked all for their compassion in the wake of the recent horrors in Mali. He said GCERF's approach is current and relevant, as many including Mali see extremist groups trying to encourage violence by pitting locals against one another on ethnic and religious grounds. He asked that the Board continue funding in Mali, and thanked GCERF for the work it is doing. He expressed support for the reform presented.

3.25 The ED thanked all for the discussion. He said GCERF needs to adapt to lower funding than planned, but also to the changing global landscape; GCERF should be a responsible, active member of the global PVE community

4. BOARD FEEDBACK ON COUNTRY VISITS

4.1 The Chair invited participants in the March 2019 trip to Bangladesh to share their feedback, including Australia, Switzerland, Japan, and the European Union.

4.2 Speaking for Australia, the Alternate Board Member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency attended the day trip to Cox's Bazar and was impressed by Young Power in Social Action (YPSA)'s work. He was struck by the range of programmes and interventions, and thought they were impressive, well thought out, and to have taken root in the communities. He thought the interventions were genuinely building community resilience. He said women's empowerment in the courtyard meeting was also extremely impressive. He noted there was a lot of competition for staff and resources now in Cox's Bazar, and was impressed by the young, local, committed staff he met. The integrated interventions being made by strong local partners he saw was heartening and worthwhile.

4.3 The Board Member for Switzerland had a separate trip to Bangladesh and was able to take colleagues from the local Embassy with him to visit Nawabganj. He appreciated that local security respected their request for discretion, in order to have genuine interactions with the locals. He was impressed to watch an inter-generational dialogue, where he saw lots of parallels with generational issues globally. He also saw a complementarity between Rупantar and the local police work after a discussion with the police who track radicalised

locals who are detaching from their communities. The Board Member wondered how best to recognise the stages of sensitisation to VE? In conclusion, he said he would like to visit GCERF projects in any other countries he visits.

4.4 Speaking for Japan, the Board Member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency said it was good to see how the Japanese grant was spent and recommended other donors join these visits in the future.

4.5 Speaking for the EU, the Representative of the Board Member for the European Union and France constituency received very good feedback from his colleague who attended the field visit in Bangladesh. His colleague said it was a great opportunity to see results. He reiterated the discussion from the 9th Board meeting about increasing local visibility to attract local donors.

4.6 The ED thanked Canada for supporting GCERF's communications efforts, which funded this trip. The Bangladesh visit took place shortly after the attack in Christchurch, New Zealand, and the ED said his preconceptions about how Australia might be viewed in the wake of the Christchurch terror attacks were unfounded. He invited the Board Members to contact the Secretariat when they have visits to partner countries, and they will be happy to arrange visits.

5. GCERF 2.0: REFORM

5.1 The ED highlighted three key points from the paper. The first was the need to adjust to current realities: the Secretariat has been restructured, in response to prior requests from the Board; and the 2017-2020 strategy was ambitious but unrealistic for funding realities, so GCERF needs to adjust to funding but also to modalities, to be a bit more adaptable and to respond more quickly. The second was learning lessons: GCERF is four years old and completing its first round of grants, so all should be proud; the reform paper is partially based on lessons learned and GCERF's analysis of the first-round results. The final key point was a platform for growth: the ongoing changes do not undermine the Secretariat's efforts to deliver, but the ED can't imagine further cuts to the Secretariat without an impact on its work.

5.3 The ED addressed the Secretariat changes and said that GCERF was originally structured for assumed funds which have not materialised. He acknowledged, for instance, that operating expenses (OpEx) were too high for donors to sustain and are now down to lower than 15%. He presented the new configuration, with an emphasis on financial oversight, country management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and communications and partnerships. He spoke about the restructure process of the Secretariat, its difficulties, and the strong team now ready to take GCERF forward. Regarding GCERF's operating model, the

ED asked the Board to approve the proposed changes such as a threshold under which the Secretariat may take on decisions. He proposed approving these changes under a pilot period through 2020, during which the Secretariat will offer regular reporting, and after which the Board can assess the model's effectiveness.

5.4 The ED said the reform offers a more attractive investment model, more immediate impact, and allows GCERF to be more responsive.

5.5 The Chair opened to the Board DEC.04, DEC.05, DEC.06, DEC.07, and DEC.08 for discussion and decision.

Discussion

5.6 Speaking for Canada, the Alternate Board Member for the Canada and United Kingdom constituency applauded GCERF's efforts to make the Secretariat more fit for purpose, and she does not underestimate the challenges confronted. She is impressed with some of the reform proposals, and consulted with fellow Board Members when preparing her comments. She said GCERF must keep a balance between operational risks and the needs and realities of donors. She asked three questions with regard to the National Applications: How are the reform proposals working to make sure human rights are respected? How will they measure impact? And what is the communications feedback loop? With that said, she applauded the request to make decisions based on strategic value. The ED invited the Alternate Board Member to talk with the Head of the Portfolio Management Unit about the processes in place to address her concerns. The Alternate Board Member mentioned that her comments incorporated feedback from others, and concluded by saying the programme strategy must consider risks to GCERF, the Board, and beneficiaries.

5.7 The Board Member for the West and Central Africa constituency offered some highlights from the 9th Meeting and reiterated relevant points found in the reform. He agreed with the reform proposal about delegating approvals based on a threshold, and he would be comfortable with anything below \$1.5 million. He asked if the number of Board meetings would be reduced, particularly if proposed reforms do go through. The ED said he's glad the Board Member is satisfied with GCERF delivering on decisions that were promised. He noted that an additional proposal was for the establishment of a Governance and Ethics Committee, which may wish to consider the frequency of Board and Committee meetings.

5.8 The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland expressed gratitude for efforts undertaken by the ED and GCERF to make the Board strategic and the Secretariat operational. He acknowledged that the Board began GCERF with ambitious expectations, and that a restructure risks weakening Secretariat morale, but agreed a more focused staff

is important. The restructure was transparent and clear, and he wishes the best to the new team. He said that from inception, the Board wanted to know exactly what was happening because PVE is delicate and the operating model was new; Switzerland understands the need to revisit now that less money than anticipated is coming in.

5.9 The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland inquired where the \$1.5 million threshold came from, and asked if there are prior instances where the Board reviewed a similar amount? The ED provided a breakdown of decisions taken previously. The Alternate Board Member asked about the risk analysis, should GCERF approve a faster response time to its programme implementations. The ED agreed that it was necessary for the Board to be heavily involved from the start and to remove itself from some aspects as the Secretariat builds its confidence, noting the good evolutionary perspective. The existing Board structure matches that of the Global Fund, but it must now adjust to current realities. Under the new proposal, any investments would have the same due diligence, including consulting in-country donor representatives, the CSM, and the IRP, so there are no additional risks there. Regarding existential risks, GCERF might avoid becoming too opportunistic, as it diverts from its fundamental mission.

5.10 As the current Chair of the Ethics Committee, the Alternate Board Member for Switzerland said it is important that Ethics are separated from Governance in decision-making. He agreed that the safeguards written into the existing Government and Ethics Committee proposal paper should cover these concerns. This one committee should be sufficient under the current model but if the Secretariat is delegated more responsibility, there may be a need for additional committees such as for Finance. Any new committee would require expertise, time, and commitment to support the GCERF mandate. The ED was pleased to hear the Alternate Board Member is happy with the proposed safeguards. He reiterated that committees are not intended to make more work, so if some are created, the Board Meetings could be reduced to once per year. He added that Terms of Reference for two additional committees are drafted, but the Governance & Ethics Committee may determine the need.

5.11 The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency said the role of the Board should be the consequence of the professionalism of the fund, so if the Secretariat is successful, the Board can ease control. Regarding the threshold, the Board needs input in areas of innovation or high risk, whether physical or political. It isn't just a question of money, but of risk level. He said the Board is unusually large from a civil society perspective. He is pleased with GCERF's progress since inception and said it is hard for the Board to take a view on their own effectiveness and role; they must consider from a distance, what is needed from a GCERF board?

5.12 He appreciated the Swiss Board Member's ideas on committees and the possibility of shifting to one annual Board Meeting. The ED agreed the threshold must consider risks and that certain issues would need to be brought before the Board. He also agreed it is hard to judge yourself as a Board, and the Governance and Ethics Committee should be responsible for assessing the Board's efficiency and effectiveness. He noted the challenges of a multi-stakeholder Board; in an ideal world, the Foundations constituency would provide funding, the Civil Society constituency would provide networking, etc., so there is a need for reflection on how current constituencies can further their value.

5.13 Speaking for the US, the Representative of the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway constituency expressed appreciation for the restructure process the Secretariat had undergone. In general, he supports the goals of the reforms with caveats. He would agree to loosen the requirement that all National Applications are approved, but ensure a mechanism is in place for some level of Board review; his main concern is de-conflicting. He agreed small grants below an agreed threshold should be delegated to the Secretariat, but said the proposed \$1.5 million is high; \$500,000-700,000 might be agreeable but he said the number requires a collective decision by the Board. Agreeing with the proposed pilot period, he said the threshold could then go up as confidence in the process increases.

5.14 The Representative would still like to see a list of NGOs to consider eligibility, as the local US Embassies have good insights into their activities and risks. Regarding the 2017-2020 strategy, he agreed the goals set are unrealistic and require re-examination. He said the US is in favour of strategically positioning GCERF to address immediate global crises, pool resources, and allow the Secretariat to use resources strategically based on urgent need; he suggested this might be by theme, i.e., Foreign Terrorist Fighters (FTFs), repatriation, refugee, and internally displaced persons (IDP) issues. He asked where the existing money for Mali is held and what is the rate of the return, while awaiting reaching the threshold for disbursement? If GCERF is strapped for cash, it can still generate interest to cover some costs. He suggests considering the creation of an endowment. The ED replied that the current investments are in safe, risk-free products that earn about 2% per year.

5.15 Speaking for Norway, the Constituency Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway took great interest in the document, and said that while it doesn't necessarily give all the answers, it raises important questions. He said significant work has been done and GCERF must make sure it doesn't diversify too much and too fast without the proper finances and staff in place. Norway will continue to soft-earmark its contributions because it needs to ensure a geographic balance within Norway's larger portfolio. Regarding the prior discussion on threshold and risk, he wants to consider size, allocation, and potential political risk. He would like to focus on GCERF's investments, because while

smaller, short term grants are possible, PVE is a long-term issue and not many entities are working on it so GCERF has this as a comparative advantage. On a similar note, he asked if it is worthwhile for GCERF to work on prisons, IDPs, and refugees, since others are already working on them. Where is the added value? If shown, then yes, but he would like to see a short concept note.

5.16 Speaking for the EU, the Representative for the Board Member for the European Union and France constituency welcomed the reform process, launched at the 9th Board meeting. He said GCERF has accumulated experience and results, so it is important to capitalise on them and improve. He agreed with the need to make the operational model more agile, especially regarding small grants and time-consuming processes that may be an obstacle to new resources. He asked how the threshold would be applied, as programmes may be manipulated to remain under a threshold. He expressed appreciation of the Secretariat restructure and the difficulties associated. The Board structure has been discussed previously and he would be happy with any solution, as long as the EU remains on the Board. He sees the potential to explore an increased use of the AFM to engage in certain countries. He emphasised the importance of engaging CSMs to define priorities in respective countries, and to involve the locally present donor communities in these discussions – a necessary step in order to consider loosening Board involvement.

5.17 The Representative for the Board Member for the European Union and France constituency echoed Norway's comments about quality and interest in the reform paper. He said there is a need to develop an exit strategy, and potentially a transition to the local governments working with GCERF. He doesn't think GCERF should be too opportunistic but said GCERF needs to be realistic about how it can get resources, and that earmarking is a reality GCERF will have to live with; for example, the EU has a different funding model than some others, so if the Board is deciding to work in a country only after funding is acquired, the EU would not provide funding. EU earmarking is purely a procedural issue, requiring that resources be committed to specific countries; it is not necessarily negative. He suggests a different model could better support sustainable funding, one which sees the Board point to a new country, the Secretariat to work on commitments, and then the Board will find the money. However, he appreciates that others will have different views.

5.18 The Board Member for Qatar expressed agreement with several comments from the US Representative, particularly that a \$1.5 million threshold is high. While he found the document interesting, he said he had a few issues to discuss. The Board and the Secretariat need to have a clear and strategic decision on when to reinvest and when to exit; the Board Member requests a strategic decision on this, as it was previously proposed that two cycles be the maximum allowance. He said the primary responsibility for these initiatives lies with the partner country, so GCERF cannot remain for undefined periods. He said VE is a long-

term issue that won't be solved in one or two rounds of investment, but again iterated that it is the responsibility of the partner country to continue the work. Regarding National Applications, he agreed to reduce the length of time and steps involved, but recommended it be in strict compatibility with recommendations by the IRP and human rights assessments. The ED said GCERF will bring an options paper to the next Board meeting with options for reinvestment, exit plans, etc.

5.19 The Representative of the Board Member for the Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa constituency said an efficient Secretariat is in the best interests of all, and that the reform proposals are based on lessons learned and are therefore adapted to current needs. Regarding the disbursement of funds, the Board Member strongly supported agreeing on a threshold, below which the Secretariat can manage programmes, and he is flexible as to what that threshold is. If this moves forward, he would like accountable, transparent systems in place as the Board may wish to intervene in certain scenarios. If committees are created, they, too, must be transparent and report frequently to the Board. Some 80% of funds are currently earmarked and while he isn't necessarily opposed to this, he thinks GCERF should be as independent as possible from funders in its decision making. Finally, he said that GCERF needs to ensure in-country ownership, and to view countries not just as beneficiaries but as partners. The governments are also putting funds into these initiatives, so this is critical. The ED agreed that the notion of beneficiary countries as being partners is important.

5.20 Speaking for Japan, the Board Member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency supported the reforms overall. He offered comments on the general direction they propose. Regarding national capacity, it is important not to limit the scope of work and decisions; the Christchurch attack is a fresh memory, so the Board must think how GCERF can tackle 'traditional' PVE while also addressing new clear and present dangers, including FTFs, etc. He also said that diversity matters, and noted the Secretariat has no Asian nationalities on its staff. The ED noted that he is a dual national (UK/Pakistan), but agreed and offered a previously considered proposal to begin a Young Professionals Programme with partner countries.

5.21 The Board Member for the Foundations constituency asked the Board to lift their sights, following all his colleagues' comments. GCERF should be a global fund with considerable flexibility and agility to intercept PVE issues initially. The Secretariat was developed with that in mind and has made exceptional progress benchmarked against other organisations. He said GCERF should not become another think tank; its responsibility lies with donor and partner countries to explore PVE issues and programme opportunities. He said GCERF has been responsive to the Board's aspirations and its new Secretariat is ready to go; the operational model must support future growth.

5.22 Speaking for Mali, the Representative of the Alternate Board Member for the West and Central Africa constituency said he has attended GCERF's past three Board meetings and is passionate about its interventions. He said it seems GCERF suffers from too many levels of control; an agile, fit-for-purpose GCERF is encumbered by earmarked funds, and the Secretariat should be given flexibility and confidence in their work and expertise. He said CSMs are critical to the implementation of activities, but there should be more country and local ownership. The donor countries are more represented than the partner countries on the Board, which makes GCERF less flexible to changing realities. He said it is good to have checks and balances but more than that, he would like to see more flexibility given to the Secretariat; if 80% of funds are earmarked, why not trust the Secretariat with the remaining 20%?

5.23 The Chair of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) said country strategies are important and set the tone for all the work. Given additional flexibility, the Secretariat would not be making decisions themselves, they would operate within the country strategies. The IRP looks at human rights across all aspects; safety for implementers, participants, and beneficiaries; and risk mitigation plans. The IRP members are allocated to different countries, so they offer to follow up on the life cycle of projects from start to finish, in addition to reviewing applications. She said the checks and balances exist, mechanisms are in place, and grantees are very responsive. If there are changes to the themes GCERF invests in, the IRP must know so they can ensure functional expertise in the proper areas, to make informed decisions and recommendations.

5.24 The ED was grateful for all contributions to the discussion and said there seems to be a belief in GCERF, yet there still remains a reluctance to let it fly. He asked the Board to invest confidence in the Secretariat, and to be reassured that its robust processes will deliver. He would like the Board to help GCERF become agile, responsive, and to increase impact; he said everyone seems to agree, with some issues on how to get there.

5.25 The ED agreed the document has more questions than answers and reiterated that the Board must provide the answers. He said he understands that donors must justify to their taxpayers how money is spent and reiterated the Chair of the IRP's point that a robust process is in place. There is national ownership through CSMs, local consultations, 11 PVE experts on the IRP, and a Secretariat with five years of experience; all of these points should enhance the Board's trust in the Secretariat. With regards to the CFM and AFM, if the reform proposals are passed, the delegated authority would allow the Secretariat, in consultation with the IRP and CSMs, to determine which mechanism is appropriate. He again thanked the Board for their support of GCERF's restructure; he stressed that the Secretariat has done its part, so now too must the Board. The existing governance structure was created for a multi-billion-dollar fund, so it must adjust and balance accordingly. He is comfortable living with

soft earmarking, and asked that the Board keep their requests soft, rational, and manageable.

Decision

5.26 The Board took the following decisions:

BM.10/DEC.04: The Board acknowledges the restructuring of the Secretariat towards a more cost-effective and efficient operation.

BM.10/DEC.05: The Board looks forward to regular updates against the identified Key Performance Indicators on GCERF's performance.

BM.10/DEC.06: The Board approves the proposed revisions to the operating model for an initial period to the end of 2020, specifically:

- a. reinforcement of the Board's strategic role in approving new beneficiary countries, re-investment and exit decisions;
- b. removal of the requirement for a National Application;
- c. delegation of authority over the amount and modalities of individual grants less than USD 1m to the Secretariat, subject to risk assessment and in consultation with the CSM, IRP, and in-country donor representatives; and
- d. requests the Secretariat to inform the Board of the names of potential grantees at least two weeks prior to signing grant agreements.

BM.10/DEC.07: The Board:

- a. approves the terms of reference of the Governance and Ethics Committee attached as Annex 2 to BM.10/DOC.03;
- b. requests the Executive Director to re-appoint an Ethics Officer in the Secretariat; and
- c. requests the Chair to consult with Board members interested in joining the Governance and 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.

BM.10/DEC.08: The Board recognises the imperative of mobilising more resources, and commits to support this goal.

6. SOMALIA: FUNDING DECISION

6.1 The Chair brought forth for discussion and decision DEC.09, on the acceptance of Somalia as a partner country.

Discussions

6.2 The Board Member for Qatar reiterated Somalia's interest in becoming a partner and welcomed the forthcoming decision. He sought clarification on a condition that would require a minimum of \$3 million in funding obtained prior to accepting Somalia; Mali echoed his concern. The Board Member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand noted that for the Philippines proposal, interested Board countries agreed to bring the required funding commitments to ensure the decided action could be implemented.

Decision

6.3 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.09: The Board:

- a. welcomes the request by the Federal Republic of Somalia to become a partner country,
- b. requests the Secretariat to develop a Country Strategy; and
- c. requests the Chair of the Board to manage the process of the Federal Republic of Somalia joining the Board.

7. BANGLADESH NATIONAL APPLICATION: FUNDING DECISION

7.1 The Chair noted that while the Bangladesh National Application was intended for review and decision, the application was still undergoing internal review by the CSM. As such, it will be left off the agenda.

8. TUNISIA NATIONAL APPLICATION: FUNDING DECISION

8.1 The Head of Portfolio Management introduced the Tunisia National Application (BM.10/DOC.05), including five innovative proposals for the first round. She introduced the two speakers on the subject, the Board Member for Tunisia, and the Chair of the IRP, and said that after they speak, DEC.10 will be put forward.

8.2 The Board Member for Tunisia said his government and GCERF launched a joint call for proposals in November 2018. They received 26 applications, ten of which were selected as strong and corresponding to the joint strategies. Five organisations were selected, four direct grantees and one consortium including youth leaders, religious leaders, and religious

associations. He asked that the Board approve the application, as long as the IRP report's key points are taken into account.

8.3 The Chair for the IRP recommended all organisations receive funding, subject to considerations and recommendations included in the IRP report. She offered the IRP's key observations: application includes a high number of innovative new tools so there is potential risk that initial plans are not feasible; proposals should better define final users of the tools and how they will be disseminated; all should ensure appropriate gender balance; funding should be based on time and proposal specifics; and all should strengthen their theory of change and M&E plans.

8.4 The Chair of the IRP offered brief comments on each of the organisations: Applied Social Science Forum (ASSF) has ambitious new tools that may not be feasible, and they should strengthen their theory of change; Forum El Jahedh (FEJ) should include female religious leaders in its engagement, and should develop a toolkit; Mobdium – Creative Youth has a sustainable proposal, but needs to strengthen its beneficiary selection criteria and its M&E framework; Tunisia Plus offers peer-to-peer engagement, one of the most effective PVE tools globally, but it should also strengthen its M&E framework; and We Love Sousse must verify its follow-up mechanism as there is a risk that the newly engaged population, without follow up, will increase frustrations.

Discussion

8.5 The Board Member for Switzerland said that detailed comments from the Swiss Embassy in Tunisia will be shared with the Secretariat for follow up and action. He said that the IRP's key points are the ones that concern Switzerland, as well. He called out gender sensitivity as an important point by the IRP. In general, he said there is a growing interest in, and more actors addressing, PVE in Tunisia, so GCERF must be sharp and cutting edge, addressing real PVE issues and staying away from topics that may be damaging to local organisations, like counter terrorism, identifying groups, informing police, etc. He advised that GCERF not just sell social inclusion projects as PVE projects. He will approve the financing of the project.

8.6 The Alternate Board Member for the Canada and UK constituency said her constituency supports the proposed decision and the IRP's recommendations. She would like to see robust M&E processes in place. The Representative of the Board Member for the Canada and UK constituency suggested linking with the UK Embassies in Tunisia regarding existing PVE programmes they are working on. The Alternate Board Member thanked the presenters and said Canada supports the National Application. She is in agreement with the IRP findings, particularly on gender sensitivity. She noted that the ASSF hotline might be

causing concern, and asked if it is meant for reporting people for radicalisation or online hate speech.

8.7 Speaking for the US, the Representative of the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway constituency asked why the IRP mentioned a need for gender balance. He appreciated that GCERF is not mainstreaming gender for the sake of mainstreaming, and rather engage with women when there is a need and when it adds value to P/CVE. Targeting vulnerable males and females is fine, but he would like to make sure GCERF isn't trying to ensure it reaches a statistic without good reason. The Chair for the IRP replied that FTFs include women and families, therefore programmes include women to ensure access to the vulnerable populations; this won't happen solely through male FTFs. The ED directed attention to page four of the Tunisia National Application, where the demographic focus does not specify the breakdown but does state that where relevant, it is important to reach both.

8.8 The US Representative would like to see programmes involving reintegrating FTFs, as this is an important issue in Tunisia and a glaring omission from its National Application. The ED noted that one grantee works with released prisoners, and said that once Tunisia gains confidence in GCERF, GCERF will gain more access. The Board Member for Kosovo offered that Kosovo has an issue with FTFs in Syria, as they are the subject of investigation and persecution; it is therefore important to find out the expertise of organisations dealing with FTFs, particularly with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), women, and children.

8.9 The US Representative would like clarity on the proposed skills training, as the US wants GCERF to support PVE programmes rather than jobs programmes. The Chair for the IRP replied that skills training depends on the geographic region, and a lack of skills in this location may become a PVE driver. She also confirmed that the IRP would push back in cases where skills training was not a specific driver of VE. With regards to Tunisia's request to have a local coordinator, the US Representative said he was impressed with Tunisia post-Arab Spring and asked how to ensure GCERF's money is de-conflicted? The ED replied that GCERF has consulted widely to de-conflict, and agrees that it would add considerable value to have a local presence.

8.10 Finally, the US Representative asked why PVE and counter terrorism (CT) must be separated, as they seem to match. The Chair for the IRP said that PVE and CT frameworks at the local level are important and it becomes a protection issue, e.g, participants in PVE should not be automatically registered for surveillance. She added that community policing programmes encourage collaboration and safety.

8.11 The representative for UNOCT asked to make a point on coordination, as the UN is quite active in Tunisia and has programmes related to PVE. He noted the importance of collaboration and offered to put GCERF in touch with the Resident Coordinator there. The Head of the Portfolio Management Unit said that GCERF has been coordinating with the UN office locally, and they will engage local donors as much as possible.

8.12 The Board Member for Qatar supported the application. He said Qatar has pledged \$1.250 billion to Tunisia and is doing a lot of work there. He said GCERF is the only fund with knowledge and experience in PVE, and asked how all can utilise this in partnership with national partners. The Board Member for Tunisia said the work done by different countries is welcome, but there is also a distinction between projects and the budget from Qatar is specifically allocated. After 2012, there are a large number of youth leaving for conflict zones and Tunisia needs specific funds to address this with civil society.

Decision

8.13 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.10: The Board:

- a. welcomes the National Application submitted by the Tunisia Country Support Mechanism (“CSM”) and the recommendations and feedback provided by the Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) as detailed in BM.10/DOC.05;
- b. approves the National Application of the Tunisia CSM as presented in Annex 8 “Signed Tunisia National Application in full” of BM.10/DOC.05;
- c. requests the Secretariat to proceed with the finalisation of grant agreements with the selected Potential Principal Recipients (“PPRs”) as described in Section 7 “Next Steps” in BM.10/DOC.05; and
- d. authorises the Secretariat to enter into grant agreements with the selected PPRs as identified in BM.10/DOC.05 for a total of not more than USD 5 million.

9. FINANCIAL MATTERS

9.1 The Finance and Compliance Manager introduced the session and presented the current financial situation, including the existing budget and the projections for the following years. He said that annual funding of \$20–25 million a year would be sufficient to make GCERF financially viable.

9.2 The auditor from BDO presented the conclusion of their audit. They said that all legal requirements have been met, and confirmed that the 2018 financial statements present a true and fair view of GCERF’s financial position and income. They provided details of their process, and said they have no new recommendations.

9.3 The Chair and the ED reiterated the funding situation and asked the Board to have a serious discussion about it. The ED said that GCERF could meet its projections with \$2 million per year from each donor, or \$4-5 million per year from each donor constituency.

Discussion

9.4 Speaking for the US, the Representative of the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway constituency supported the ED's comments and conveyed the US commitment to GCERF; the US has requested \$1.5 million from Congress for 2020 and is exploring additional funding from the CT Bureau and USAID. He asked fellow donors to come to the next Board meeting with firm commitments. He inquired how long GCERF has used BDO as their external auditor and was satisfied with the answer, three years.

9.5 The Board Member for Qatar reiterated his support for GCERF and said funding is a shared responsibility, including for partner countries, foundations, and civil society. He asked the Chair and the ED to bring to the Board ideas to incentivise funding, such as a Board membership fee; the Board Member for Switzerland agreed. He also asked to what extent the MOU with UNOCT can support GCERF through CVE partnerships in partner countries?

9.6 The Representative of the Board Member for the European Union and France constituency confirmed a \$4 million annual contribution for 2019-2023, and is working on other funding sources in the EU to complement existing grants. He said that previously, other donors covered Secretariat costs but expressed a willingness to include them within their grants going forward. He asked about the process to engage in Sri Lanka, and the ED said a letter may be submitted so GCERF can quickly develop and approve a country strategy.

9.7 The Board Member for Switzerland said he will seek approval for three years' funding by September, at a minimum \$1 million per year. He said the ED's proposed \$2 million a year is reasonable, and he will work to see how Switzerland can meet it. He asked how the Secretariat deals with operating costs on earmarked funds. The Finance and Compliance Manager replied that GCERF charges 15% for operating costs when possible on all contributions. If a lower percentage is required on certain earmarked funds, the Secretariat makes up for the difference by negotiating specific budget lines in the contribution for programme management costs, including staff costs.

9.8 The Board Member for the Foundations constituency reiterated GCERF's points and applauded the Board's investments to date. He said that for the Secretariat to be effective, and particularly to retain staff, funding cannot be a year-to-year plea. He thinks private sector engagement will be difficult and asked the Board to be realistic about this, while still pursuing it.

9.9 The Board took the following decisions:

BM.10/DEC.11: The Board:

- a. approves the financial statements prepared in US Dollars and in accordance with IFRS for SMEs and the statutory financial statements presented in Swiss Francs (CHF); and
- b. confirms the appointment of BDO as GCERF's External Auditor for the 2019 financial year.

BM.10/DEC.12: The Board endorses the internal control measures currently in place. It requests the Secretariat to continue developing and operating the internal control system on the basis of the principles and approach described in document BM.10/DOC.08.

10. RESULTS

10.1 The Head of Performance and Impact (P&I) presented the Results report (BM.10/DOC.09). He thanked Australia, the EU, and others who provided positive feedback and shared their insights. He said there is more to do to improve the robustness of GCERF's M&E practice and capacity in partner countries. In 2019–2020, the grant portfolio is going through changes which are explained in the report. He intends to do more forecasting internally and invited the Board to consider the relevant annexes for further information. The Grant Performance Assessment (GPA) was recently revised and launched. The report includes the assessment of 19 grants as of December 2019.

Discussion

10.2 The Board Member for Switzerland asked if M&E efforts can move further towards quantification? The Head of P&I said the annexes show some results and that quantification is mostly at the output and outcome levels, such as the specific data that is collected by surveys. While GCERF will make additional efforts to quantify if feasible, he also alerted to the fact that quantification of impact is often very costly.

10.3 Speaking for Australia, the Alternate Board Member for the Australia, Japan, and New Zealand constituency reiterated GCERF's important work in M&E and said to the Board that if people can be persuaded it works, funding will come much easier.

10.4 The Alternate Board Member for the Canada and United Kingdom constituency echoed Australia's remarks and acknowledged the significant M&E progress in the past year and a half. She said the Board recognises that prevention is difficult to measure. She asked where GCERF would like to take its M&E, pointing to digestible information such as charts and

numbers. The Head of P&I said he would like to increase third-party evaluations, evaluations and visualisation of data.

10.5 The Board Member for the Civil Society constituency said the impact of PVE work should be measured on the level of state and citizen. GCERF begins the work within a couple of rounds, and it should then be mainstreamed into the government.

10.6 The ED said GCERF's work is an important part of a comprehensive approach. He reminded the Board that current M&E activities are funded by contributions from the UK and Canada, both of which run out soon.

11. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE

11.1 The Chair of the Ethics Committee thanked his fellow committee members and presented the report. He advised that at present, there are no situations of concern. He reiterated the commitment to zero tolerance to fraud of any kind. Since the 9th Board meeting, two issues were reported through the Integrity Line and no conflict was found in either case. He noted that CSMs are not covered by the Integrity Line and called upon the Secretariat to closely monitor them based on guidance from the Ethics Committee. The current Ethics Committee memberships are through 30 June 2019; the committee offered to extend its membership until members of the new Governance and Ethics Committee are selected.

11.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.13: The Board extends the mandate of the current members of the Ethics Committee until the members of the newly established Governance and Ethics Committee are appointed.

12. 2018 ANNUAL REPORT FOR SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

12.1 The Chair presented DEC.14 for discussion and decision.

12.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.10/DEC.14: The Board approves the 2018 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.10/DOC.11 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

13. CONCLUDING REMARKS

13.1 The Chair concluded with two points; she will obtain feedback and confirm dates for the 11th Board meeting in the coming weeks. She thanked all for participating in the Board meeting.

13.2 The Chair for the IRP said some IRP member terms are ending and she would like to begin the replacement of members now. She will share a list of members ending their membership.

13.3 The Representative for Bangladesh expressed gratitude and thanks for an enriching experience, where she learned a lot. She asked the Board to please continue GCERF's good work.

13.4 The ED concluded with thanks to all participants, and special thanks to donors for their commitment and efforts to support GCERF. He thanked Canada for hosting the 10th Board meeting and thanked the Chair for her diligence. He reiterated the success GCERF has had in its first four years and expressed gratitude for the Board's solidarity regarding the restructure. He respectfully reiterated the realistic goal of \$20–25 million per year, and asked Board Members to actively help GCERF succeed.

13.5 The Chair thanked all participants again and asked the Board for increased engagement. She closed the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
BM.10/DOC.01: AGENDA**

TUESDAY 11 JUNE 2019

Location – 9th floor Conference room, Global Affairs Canada, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 – 10:30	Induction for new Board members (all Board members are welcome)		Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team
10:30 – 10:45	Welcome Coffee		
10:45 – 11:00	Welcoming Remarks		Board Chair
11:00 – 11:15	Preliminary Matters		Board Chair
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members 	DOC.01	
11:15 – 12:30	Report of the Executive Director	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
12:30 – 13:30	Buffet Lunch		
13:30 – 14:00	Board Feedback on Country Visits		Board members
14:00 – 15:30	GCERF 2.0 Reform	DOC.03 (for information & decision)	Executive Director
15:30 – 15:45	Coffee Break		
15:45 – 16:45	Executive Session		Board Chair Board members only
17:00 – 19:00	Reception hosted by Global Affairs Canada	All Board members are invited	9 th floor at Global Affairs Canada

WEDNESDAY 12 JUNE 2019

Location – 9th floor Conference room, Global Affairs Canada, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa

Time	Topic	Document	Presenter
09:00 – 10:00	Bangladesh National Application: Funding Decision Tunisia National Application: Funding Decision	DOC.04 (for decision) DOC.05 (for decision)	Executive Director/ IRP Chair/ CSM representatives
10:00 – 10:15	Coffee Break		
10:15 – 11:00	Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018 Audited Statements • Funding Situation & Other Financial Matters • Update on the Internal Control System 	DOC.06 (for decision) DOC.07 (for information) DOC.08 (for decision)	Finance & Compliance Manager
11:00 – 12:00	Results: Lessons Learned after 3 years	DOC.09 (for information)	Executive Director / Performance & Impact Head
12:00 – 12:30	Report of the Ethics Committee	DOC.10 (for information)	Chair of the Ethics Committee
12:30 – 12:45	2018 Annual Report for Supervisory Authority	DOC.11 (for decision)	Board Chair
12:45 – 13:00	Any other business		Board Chair/ Executive Director
13:00	End of the Meeting		
13:00 – 13:45	Buffet Lunch		
13:45 – 15:00	Donors' Meeting		Board Chair/ Executive Director



ANNEX 2

10th GCERF BOARD MEETING

11-12 June 2019

Ottawa, Canada

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

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

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

Constituency Members:

Ms Fiona Hoggart, Director, Counter-Terrorism Multilateral Section, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Canberra

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

Bangladesh

Board Member: Ms Farhana Ahmed Chowdhury, Counsellor and Head of Chancery, Bangladesh High Commission in Ottawa on behalf of H.E. Mr Md. Shahidul Haque, Senior Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: Ms Natalie Hearn, Head of the Political Team, the British High Commission in Ottawa on behalf of H.E. Ms Miriam Shearman, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent

Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations and Other International Organisations in Geneva

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

Constituency Members:

Ms Alexandra Fortier, Project Manager, Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program (CTCBP), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Ms Dorota Geissel, Deputy Director, Counter-Terrorism Capacity Building Program (CTCBP), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

European Union and France

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr Romain Calvary, Desk Officer, Counter-terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris on behalf of H.E. Mr François Rivasseau, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Switzerland

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

Foundations

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

Kenya (Horn of Africa, East and Southern Africa)

Board Member: H.E. Mr John Lanyasunya, Ambassador and High Commissioner, Kenya High Commission, Ottawa on behalf of H.E. Dr Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Constituency Member: Mr Dume Wanda Odhiambo, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Kosovo

Board Member: Mr Fatos Makolli, National CVE Coordinator of the Republic of Kosovo, Pristina

Mali and Nigeria (West and Central Africa)

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr Adama Coulibaly, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva on behalf H.E. Mr Mamadou Henri Konate, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

The Philippines

Mr Alexander Macario, Assistant Secretary, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Peace and Security, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Republic of the Philippines, Manila

Policy, Think and Do Tanks

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

Qatar

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

Constituency Members:

Mr Homoud Saleh Al-Saadi, Counsellor, Embassy of the State of Qatar, Ottawa

Mr Mohammed Alnasr, Second Secretary, Embassy of the State of Qatar, Ottawa

Switzerland

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

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

Tunisia (North Africa and Middle East)

Board Member: Mr Mokhtar Ben Nasr, President of the National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Constituency Member: Mr Riadh Nouri, Minister and Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Embassy of the Republic of Tunisia, Ottawa

United States of America, the Netherlands and Norway

Board Member: Mr Chris Harnisch, Deputy Coordinator, Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, U.S. Department of State on behalf of H.E. Mr Nathan Sales, Ambassador and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: Mr Huib Mijnders, Head Counterterrorism & National Security Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, The Hague

Constituency Members:

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

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

PRESENTER

Ms Humera Khan, IRP Chair; Executive Director, Muflehun; Adjunct Professor, The George Washington University Elliott School of International Affairs

OBSERVERS

Mr Steven Siqueira, Deputy Director, United Nations Counter-Terrorism Office (UNOCT), New York

Ms Larissa Adameck, Political Affairs Officer, United Nations Counter-Terrorism Office (UNOCT), New York

GCERF Secretariat
