

REPORT OF THE 11th BOARD MEETING

The 11th meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held from 21 to 22 November 2019, in Geneva, Switzerland. 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, congratulating all on the fifth anniversary of GCERF. The Chair welcomed all guests and thanked the Board for their five years of support for GCERF. She noted the reception on the occasion of the fifth anniversary, co-hosted by Ambassador Zellweger, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations Office at Geneva. The Chair also highlighted the art projects on display from Bangladesh and Kosovo, paintings and drawings by youth participants of GCERF-funded programmes.

2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Appointment of the Rapporteur

2.1 The Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Ms Selena Victor, Alternate Board Member for the Civil Society constituency, kindly agreed to take the role.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

BM.11/DEC.01: Ms Selena Victor of the Civil Society constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 11th Board meeting.

Approval of the Agenda

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.11/DOC.01), distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for any final comments and approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

BM.11/DEC.02: The agenda for the 11th Board meeting (BM.11/DOC.01) is approved.

Confirmation of new Board Members

2.5 The Chair welcomed new members to the Board, Mr Chitaru Shimizu as Board Member for Australia, Japan and New Zealand, Mr Adrien Frier as Alternate Board Member for the European Union and France, Mr Alexander Macario as Alternate Board Member for Tunisia and the Philippines, and Mr Tony Carroll as Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency. The Chair also announced Mr Maqsoud Kruse's resignation as Board Member for the Policy, Think and Do Tank constituency and noted the seat is currently vacant.

2.6 The Board took the following decision:

BM.11/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 10th Board meeting:

- **Australia, Japan and New Zealand:** Mr Chitaru Shimizu replaces Mr Daisuke Namioka as the Board Member;
- **European Union and France:** Mr Adrien Frier replaces Ambassador François Rivasseau as the Alternate Board Member;
- **Tunisia and the Philippines:** Mr Alexander Macario is the Alternate Board Member for this constituency;
- **Private Sector:** Mr Tony Carroll replaces Mr Tam Robert Nguyen as the Alternate Board Member; and
- **Policy, Think and Do Tanks:** Mr Maqsoud Kruse has resigned as the Board member and the seat is currently vacant.

3. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3.1 The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED), Dr Khalid Koser, to present his report (BM.11/DOC.02) and welcomed active participation from the Board.

3.2 The ED welcomed all to the Board Meeting and thanked them, the Chair, and the Secretariat. He thanked GCERF's grant recipients, noting the rigorous grants programme they undergo with enthusiasm and hard work. He noted the honourable mention of Rupantar, a grantee in Bangladesh, at the [2019 Global Pluralism Award](#). He thanked the Secretariat for their hard work and dedication. He introduced the report, to offer key topics on the minds of himself and the Secretariat.

3.3 The ED highlighted four key points from the report:

1) The ED offered a quick summary of the report. Modestly celebrating five years of preventing/countering violent extremism (P/CVE), the ED offered that GCERF: is active in seven countries, soon to be nine; has signed 45 grants across these with a conservative

estimated reach of 1.2M people who are vulnerable to violent extremism; has raised about \$85M; and has become a significant part of the global movement on P/CVE. There is momentum at the Secretariat, with progress towards being prospective rather than retrospective.

2) The ED reflected on the exciting progress made since the 10th Board Meeting. The scaled back Secretariat comprises motivated, excellent staff who are working hard and enjoying their work. They have become a proactive team, adapting to GCERF's realities to become responsive to fundraising and investment opportunities; one outcome of this is the consideration of taking a regional approach to P/CVE, e.g. working across the Western Balkans Six. In addition, and thanks to the Board Member from the United States for directly encouraging this, the Secretariat will be relaunching engagement with the private sector, with a goal of long-term engagement. The ED also thanked the Alternate Board Member from the Private Sector constituency for his insights and network, and for helping to set realistic goals and timelines. Finally, he highlighted the recent innovative work on P/CVE in universities, launched with the generous support of Japan.

3) The ED offered highlights from his pre-Board Meeting discussions with Board Members. Overall, the Board papers were well-received, with feasible and reasonable decisions and a welcome proactivity. There was emphasis on the need to focus on 'mission critical' aspects of GCERF's work: to raise money, invest it, and demonstrate results. The Board would like to see GCERF capitalise more on lessons learned, sharing its unique insights further. Finally, there was also mention of GCERF's opportunity; being young comes with risks and fragility but an advantage is the lack of bureaucracy, a young dynamic Secretariat, a supportive Chair, and an organisation that is ultimately set up to take risks.

4) Finally, the ED asked the Board to lift its eyes to bigger picture thinking and ideas. GCERF can enter where others can't, invest modestly, build capacity, and pass on successes to a combination of government and perhaps private sector financing. Many organisations are focused on scaling up but GCERF focuses on innovation, as it can be out scaled by other organisations with greater amounts of money and reach.

3.4 The Chair thanked the ED and made note of the great leap forward from early Board Meetings focused on Bylaws. She then opened the session to comments and questions.

Discussion

3.5 Speaking for the United States, the Representative of the Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway congratulated GCERF on hosting its 11th Board Meeting. He said the US remains very committed to GCERF and is actively seeking different sources of funding. He recognised the considerable progress made on securing additional

funding sources, welcoming Denmark and Spain as new donors, and offered full support of engagement with the private sector. He welcomed the Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency to the Board. Finally, he commended the ED and the Secretariat on its difficult restructure in order to sustain the organisation. He supports a new streamlined strategy that is structured but flexible and said it should include exit and transition options. He volunteered the US to represent its constituency in the Strategy Review Group. The ED thanked the US for its leadership and innovative efforts to support GCERF, including hosting meetings for the ED in Washington, D.C. He offered it as a strong example of what all Board Members could do to support GCERF.

3.6 Speaking for Nigeria, the Board Member for Mali and Nigeria congratulated GCERF on work that is not only new but challenging. He highlighted the momentum that is building and remarked that ambition for a five-year-old organisation should remain realistic. As GCERF considers expanding geographically and thematically, it should remember to exercise caution as the systems that support these programmes are still being built.

3.7 Speaking for the European Union (EU), the Representative for the Board Member for the European Union and France congratulated GCERF on its fifth anniversary and was encouraged by the momentum away from the initial pilot phase and towards implementation. He commended the progress made and said increased engagement with the development community is essential for the future. He said the ED report's focus on change rather than continuity reflects the responsiveness of the Secretariat to the Board and thanked them for that. He highlighted the proposed programme on Returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters and Families (RFTFs) (BM.11/DOC.03), regional approach (BM.11/DOC.03/ANNEX.01), and Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) in Sri Lanka as showing GCERF's evolution and attempts to adapt and change to new needs. He added that the knowledge and learning GCERF has offers a better collective understanding of PVE best practices and would like to better evaluate impact at the outcome level. He fully supported the Strategy Review Group and volunteered the EU to be a part of it.

3.8 The Board Member for Qatar thanked the Chair and ED. He welcomed the new faces, member states, and felt that the fund was becoming more global. He said the success of GCERF is a shared responsibility and that without partnerships, GCERF will not make progress. He suggested a global fund ought to be global, including more donors and recipient countries. And he said there is a need for an exit strategy that enables current recipient countries to become partners. The Board Member expressed support for the RFTF proposal (BM.11/DOC.03) and is delighted to see a regional approach being considered (BM.11/DOC.03/ANNEX.01). He agreed with the ED that a main challenge is fundraising and how to measure success according to certain timeframes and benchmarks. He said partnerships with the private sector will be essential for success.

3.9 The Board Member for Switzerland thanked the ED and Secretariat for their hard work and motivation. He said that GCERF is a respected and relevant player in the ecosystem of P/CVE. He said that he welcomed the excellent feedback from Swiss offices in the field. He welcomed the new Strategy Review Group and volunteered to be a part of it. He would like to see more about outcomes and ensuring solid changes rather than demonstrating GCERF is responding to every crisis. As a donor, Switzerland is motivated by results, outcomes, and solutions. Regarding KPIs, the Board Member requested more information regarding the ratio between earmarked versus non-earmarked funding, and what it means in terms of the strategic orientation of GCERF. The ED replied that more than half of contributions to GCERF are earmarked. The Board Member said he has been working to build a multi-year commitment to GCERF so would like to hear more on benchmarks and KPIs. He congratulated GCERF on five years of achievement.

3.10 Speaking for Mali, the Alternate Board Member for Mali and Nigeria expressed his thanks and said he saw a lot of progress since the 10th Board Meeting in Ottawa. GCERF's work is special for not just Mali but the whole Sahel region because there is a lot of terrorism there; on 29 October 2019, the UN released a report that 1,500 civilians have been killed in the Sahel since January 2019. The Alternate Board Member was glad that the ED report felt proactive rather than retrospective and reiterated the fact that prevention costs less than countering terrorism. He thanked all donors and asked that they continue to strengthen their support. The ED thanked the Alternate Board Member and said there is currently around \$3M to invest in Mali, with the goal of reaching \$5M.

3.11 The Board Member for Kenya acknowledged the progress over GCERF's five years and thanked donors for their commitment to programmes in recipient countries. He appreciated that this support comes out of competing priorities and said that P/CVE is the key to peace and stability, especially in Kenya. He said the global demand for GCERF will only increase, and that the capacity being created will be in demand. Looking forward, he said a transition strategy is key and should be built into the initial programme proposals. This work is meaningful in the long-term only if capacity building is embedded in the programming and enables local partners to deal with issues. He offered that GCERF could include for itself an advisory role in the transition strategy, remaining relevant by supporting national structures with capacity building. The Board Member said the budget shortfall is made more critical by earmarking, reducing the flexibility of GCERF to plan and intervene. Understanding that resources are not endless, he asked to look into how much donors can reduce earmarking to give GCERF flexibility in its interventions.

3.12 The Board Member for Bangladesh congratulated the Chair for inspiring leadership, and the ED and Secretariat for working in an exemplary manner and producing excellent documentation. He said the statistics speak for themselves, and that GCERF is a small fund

that is reaching a significant number of people. He noticed in the programmes report (BM.11/DOC.06) that women participation seems to be an issue and asked if there is a reason why? He offered support for the transition strategy. He also said that the Strategy Review process will be useful and will help GCERF maintain its relevance. He requested that the first paragraph of BM.11/DOC.05/ANNEX.03 be removed where it cites the Global Terrorism Index 2019 (GTI) as describing Bangladesh as an emerging global hotspot of violent terrorism, as this is not an accurate reflection of the efforts being undertaken in the country to counter terrorism. The Board Member offered a positive reaction to the AFM in Bangladesh and said there is a need to sustain and consolidate efforts. Touching upon national ownership and through the CSM, he said beneficiary countries have been making their contribution and while they are recipients today, they should be able to deal with these issues on their own in the future. He was unsure what the criteria would look like for such a transition but suggested it will depend upon the local context. Finally, he reiterated his commitment to a meaningful partnership with GCERF.

3.13 Speaking for the United Kingdom, the Board Member for Canada and the United Kingdom thanked the Chair, the ED, and the Secretariat for their reports and good work. She wished GCERF a happy birthday and said it was great to see GCERF delivering on its mandate after five years. Its agenda is ambitious, challenging, and extremely important; P/CVE is as critical now as it was upon inception. She said the UK had a positive external review of GCERF, noting gold standard governance, strategy, and more. Looking ahead, she agreed GCERF should be bold, focus in on its value added, and use it to attract further support and interest from a variety of stakeholders.

3.14 Speaking for Australia, the Alternate Board Member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand thanked the Chair and the ED, and endorsed the themes of the ED report. He said there was much to celebrate over GCERF's first five years and GCERF shouldn't lose sight of its challenges. He said it was great to see momentum and an expanded range of partnerships including a growing donor footprint, welcoming Denmark and Spain. He commended the agile response of GCERF to the Easter Sunday events in Sri Lanka and said those who visited the country afterward were looking for the best solutions to this new issue and that GCERF was an entirely sensible part of the answer. He said he attended the CSM meeting in the Philippines the week prior with the representative for the Philippines and was struck by the vitality and enthusiasm of all in the room. He thought GCERF's first national advisor there was well integrated and impressive and would be an asset going forward. He highlighted GCERF's strong systems and said it provides confidence when dealing with the inevitable challenges that will come up. He was happy to support the innovative proposals on RFTFs and a regional approach. He volunteered for the Strategy Review Group.

3.15 The Representative for Spain thanked the ED for his report and thanked the Chair for her warm welcome. He said Spain was glad to join as a donor and hoped its contribution would be finalised soon. Spain followed GCERF's activity closely over the last five years and has great interest in contributing towards community resilience in Sahel and the Horn of Africa, where Spain is deeply involved. He made clear that Spain's involvement with GCERF does not include a recognition of Kosovo as an independent state, per UN Security Council Resolution 1244.

3.16 The Representative for Norway thanked the ED for his report and for the Secretariat's hard work under his leadership. At his sixth Board Meeting, he reiterated Norway's support and acknowledged the positive direction and adaptability of GCERF during difficult times. He appreciated the increased realism, strategy, budget, and focus on accessible funding. He recognised that GCERF's modest size allows for agility and the ability to react quickly, with Sri Lanka as an example. He said the transition strategy is important after five years, and it is time to think about evolution.

3.17 The Representative for Denmark offered appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this meeting. Denmark's Foreign Minister announced a \$2M non-earmarked contribution during the Tenth GCTF Ministerial Plenary Meeting in September 2019, and he is working closely to finalise it. He mentioned the usefulness of making links to the highest political level, where additional contributions are signed off. He echoed the EU on the usefulness of GCERF demonstrating its impact at the outcome level. He said the annual report was very useful and hoped a future iteration will dwell more on achievements at outcome level.

3.18 The ED thanked all for their thoughtful and valuable comments. The Chair thanked all, and said that issues, questions and comments raised will drive the rest of the Board Meeting.

4. GCERF ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM (AFM) TO SUPPORT RETURNING FOREIGN TERRORIST FIGHTERS AND FAMILIES

4.1 The Chair introduced the next session on support for Returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters and Families (RFTFs). The ED introduced the concept for discussion. He explained its origins and suggested the paper as a proposed method, should the Board choose GCERF as the appropriate vehicle for this work. He reported that during his pre-Board Meeting discussions, several Board Members, including Canada and France, expressed general support but with a clear red line that GCERF does not become involved in repatriation, detention, etc., and that it respects human rights. He also heard general desire for a focus on already returned fighters, with the work around integrating them and their families back

into communities. He also said that the Chair of the IRP offered valuable feedback, and that she and the IRP would be involved should this work proceed.

4.2 The ED presented the initial proposal, based on good practices initiated by the UN Security Council Resolution 2396. He reiterated that GCERF does not support the work of rehabilitation and de-radicalisation as it is not part of GCERF's mandate; GCERF will support community-based, holistic approaches that ensure compliance with international standards and respect of human rights. He said GCERF is well placed for this work as a natural evolution of the work already being done, especially in Kosovo; GCERF has three years of experience there and strong relationships with community organisations and government structures. He said GCERF could ramp up this work in Kosovo and Tunisia in the short term, with expansion to additional countries in the medium term, and finally, could hand over longer term projects to the national governments, community-based organisations, etc.

4.3 The ED said the appropriate model for the work could be the AFM, CFM, or a combination of the two; GCERF would also ensure the CSMs have the appropriate expertise, as this work would require continuous risk assessments. He proposed funding this work through traditional GCERF mechanisms and believes a modest initial investment could serve to prove the concept in existing countries, with the opportunity to expand as needed.

Discussion

4.4 The Board Member for Qatar thanked the ED for the report and asked for more facts; an elaboration on what support GCERF would need from donors. To facilitate RFTFs and families for prosecution, rehabilitation, reintegration, etc. is unavoidable and a delay in this work would have negative consequences and a high price, resulting in increased support for violent extremism. Furthermore, he invited the ED to speak at the 2019 Doha Forum, where there will be a special session on FTFs.

4.5 The Representative for the United States thanked the ED for outlining GCERF's approach. He also thanked Qatar for articulating the problems well, reiterating that if GCERF does not support these efforts, the children of returning fighters will potentially pose a future security threat. The Board has a collective obligation to help the countries that are repatriating, and he mentioned Kosovo, Kazakhstan, and Bosnia as countries which may be accepting more RFTFs in the near future. He said there are three lines of effort to support RFTFs and GCERF is well placed to do the third, reintegration. He said that the US is ready to commit between \$500,000 and \$1M in joint funding from the U.S. Department of State Counter Terrorism Bureau and USAID but expects additional donors to come forward to partner in this

effort. Finally, he suggested that this work could offer a good opportunity to pilot a regional approach, with an expansion from Kosovo to the Western Balkans as an example.

4.6 Speaking for the Netherlands, the Alternate Board Member for the United States of America, the Netherlands, and Norway echoed points made by the US and said there is only one area of disagreement, which is repatriation from Syria; however, he agreed GCERF and the Board should be proactive and not do nothing. He said he received feedback from countries with RFTFs that agree GCERF is well placed to take this on. He mentioned that there are some actors working in the Western Balkans, such as IOM, so GCERF must avoid overlap. He reiterated that the Netherlands would happily contribute to this work for countries with RFTFs, rather than an incentive for countries to take back new returnees. To that end, the Netherlands announced a commitment of \$2.5M to this proposal for next year. He and the Representative for the United States also urged other Board Members to come forward with funding or risk losing their contributions.

4.7 The Board Member for Kosovo thanked GCERF and its donors for this engagement, saying that great work has been done already and has made a long-term difference among returnees in Kosovo. The work is a huge challenge and the successful first phase requires reintegration attention for longer-term success, including more involvement from civil society. GCERF has a capacity to do this that others currently do not, as it is sometimes easier for CSOs to work locally rather than institutions. He expressed support for the AFM proposal and was also interested in a concept paper on the benefits of a regional approach.

4.8 Speaking for France, the Alternate Board Member for the European Union and France thanked GCERF for taking all concerns into consideration. He acknowledged the points made by the US and Qatar, but also cautioned that repatriation is polarising and might bring disagreements into GCERF. The proposal shows GCERF's willingness to adjust to threats and he supported the idea of RFTF projects, including in regions like Southern Asia.

4.9 The Representative for the EU thanked the US and the Secretariat and welcomed a proposal to support countries with reintegration. As discussed in NY, he said there would be a need for strong coordination and asked if there would be additional staff recruited in each country. He agreed guiding principles needed to be developed and while he acknowledged the expressed preference for the Western Balkans as a pilot, said that the EU already has a lot of projects in the area and GCERF would therefore need to coordinate and deconflict with the substantial existing activities. He suggested considering other regions with less prior activity to engage with, and asked how flexible GCERF is geographically, giving the example of Central Asia.

4.10 Speaking for Tunisia, the Board Member for Tunisia and the Philippines said violent extremism is an important problem in Tunisia so they have a strategy against terrorism and extremism. He provided a detailed overview of the focus on terrorism and extremism within the ministries of the Tunisian government, and said they need outside help to work together towards a solution.

4.11 The Alternate Board Member for the Civil Society constituency was pleased GCERF is looking at this issue. It brings a whole new level of complexities and challenges, but these would vary depending upon GCERF's role, for example, at which stage in the process it enters. She asked if there exists a clear articulation of these anticipated risks and mitigation measures.

4.12 Speaking for Japan, the Board Member for Australia, Japan, and New Zealand echoed his support and welcomed a formal proposal on AFM for RFTFs. He said GCERF's experience and approach would be well received at all levels.

4.13 Speaking for Canada, the Representative of the Alternate Board Member for Canada and the United Kingdom echoed her support in principle and welcomed further discussion to see the evolution of the concept before making a funding commitment.

4.14 The Board Member for Switzerland said this important debate must include donors and countries accepting RFTFs. He echoed the Alternate Board Member for Civil Society constituency's comment that moving forward must be rigorous and look at principles and guidelines. He requested clarity around the idea of ring-fencing the funding, to ensure the Board still maintains oversight of all GCERF activities and the ring-fenced funding does not also ring-fence decision making.

4.15 Speaking as an observer, the Representative for the UNOCT reiterated support for GCERF's work, including this proposal. She thanked the Secretariat for mentioning the importance of coordination with the UN.

4.16 The Chair of the IRP expressed support and offered expert insights into the need for programming to prevent reengagement of returnees. She also warned that GCERF should manage its risks in the space.

4.17 The Head of the Portfolio Management Unit thanked all for their comments and thanked her team at the Secretariat for their efforts on the proposal. She acknowledged all comments and said next steps will be to analyse risk levels, ensure safeguarding, and continue discussions with organisations in the space. She said they will explore working in additional countries but also cautioned that it is important to follow process and work where there is a need and a request.

5. GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE REPORT

5.1 The Chair introduced the report of the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) and invited the Chair of the GEC to present via video. The Chair of the GEC presented the report, focusing on two areas: the selection process for the position of Chair of the Governing Board and the Ethics update. The Chair of the GEC suggested the Board commence the search for candidates for the Chair of the Governing Board, proposing candidates to the GEC by the end of April 2020.

5.2 The Chair of the GEC announced that per the Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest, no incidents linked with ethical issues were reported during the period through the Integrity Line since the 10th Board Meeting.

Discussion

5.3 The Alternate Board Member for the Policy, Think, and Do Tank constituency requested that the GEC consider the potential need to transition the role of constituencies that operate in ways, on topics, and in countries similar to GCERF, from a voting member to for example an advisory member. The Chair accepted the request and offered that Board Members may address Board reform issues to her to take to the GEC as needed.

5.4 The Board Member for Switzerland said there is no need to completely overhaul the governance system, as it is functioning. He suggested there may be minor tweaks that could improve processes, e.g. in supporting the financial governance of GCERF.

5.5 The Board took the following decision:

BM.II/DEC.04: The Board requests the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) to implement the process on the selection of the Chair of the Governing Board as described in the report of the GEC (BM.II/DOC.04) sections 3.4 - 3.9.

6. RESULTS

6.1 The Chair opened the session and introduced the Head of Performance & Impact to present. He introduced his team, present at the meeting, and thanked Canada for its M&E support. He presented the key points from the report, including programme reach, disbursements, and lessons and insights. He said that GCERF places value on working with research institutions, and highlighted GCERF's active part in the index on vulnerability to violent extremism, hosted by Qatar University's SESRI.

Discussion

6.2 The Board Member for the Foundations constituency highlighted driving best practices through M&E as a key benefit of GCERF, and said it has the opportunity to offer unique long-term, sustainable insights on this. He said it was good to always bear in mind GCERF's end goal. He expressed concern regarding smaller grants, asking about their impact on the work of the Secretariat.

6.3 The Representative for the United States echoed the importance of considering an end goal and suggested smaller grants may drive up programmatic and overhead costs. He asked for visibility on cancelled programmes, and said it was good to see under-achieved or cancelled programmes because it is useful to acknowledge and take lessons learned. The Head of Performance & Impact said no full grants were cancelled but rather elements of a grant, e.g. if a technical component had to be downscaled.

6.4 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency echoed the question about the burden of administrative costs on lower grants. Regarding the measurement of resilience, he asked if the Secretariat enters programmes with an understanding of what metrics to focus on, or if it considers what is easily measurable and proceeds accordingly. The Head of Performance & Impact said there is an inventory of indicators (metrics) for grant design that is increasingly applied and would allow consolidation of data.

6.5 The Representative for New Zealand asked how the Secretariat takes lessons learned and builds them into future projects. The Head of Performance & Impact offered a brief overview of steps taken, including workshops to inform the design of proposals between Rounds 1 and 2, baseline studies, and GCERF's annual Learning Event.

6.6 The Representative for the European Union expressed appreciation for GCERF's efforts in improving its M&E systems, commended the reports annexes, and offered a few observations. He noticed a reduction in sub-recipients (SRs) and asked about the implications; in support of GCERF's goal of supporting small CBOs who may not have received prior funding, he would like to see less support going to larger, well-known organisations who may be able to receive funding elsewhere. He also supported a balance between short- and long-term approaches, welcoming efforts to focus on direct beneficiaries. Finally, he congratulated GCERF on the joint event at UNGA and said the high participation at the event showed a commitment to engaging university students. The Head of Performance & Impact said some small grants are directly given and larger amounts are typically managed by consortia, each working with several CBOs. He also said that small grants are good for niche areas but GCERF also needs to show credibility and impact so some grants being managed by one larger beneficiary supports this.

6.7 The Representative for Nigeria commended the report and said the success of programmes should be taken into consideration during the discussion on GCERF's approach to transition (BM.11/DOC.10). He particularly noted the collaboration between GCERF and Nigerian civil society, leading to the establishment of the Youth Development Commission.

6.8 The Board Member for Bangladesh commended all Board documents and specifically highlighted the lessons learned as clear and improving from years past.

6.9 The Representative for Tunisia said five CSOs were involved in the first round of grants in Tunisia, a great start. He mentioned two of them had a slight issue because of the exchange rate from USD to DT (Tunisian Dinar). The ED thanked him for his transparency and for offering this example of a learning experience.

7. UPDATE ON GCERF PROGRAMMES AND IRP REPLENISHMENT PROCESS

7.1 The Head of the Portfolio Management Unit presented an update on GCERF programmes. She highlighted GCERF's engagement with local authorities on county action plans in Kenya. She said the Somalia proposal for funding is open and welcomed Board engagement. She also said the Sri Lanka AFM will take the same approach as the AFM in Bangladesh.

Discussion

7.2 The Representative for the Netherlands asked if it was possible to receive information about donor trips to beneficiaries earlier and expressed interest in Kenya. He also asked if the programmes in Kenya might warrant a national advisor based there, to which the Head of the Portfolio Management Unit replied that it is being considered pending resource availability.

7.3 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency said that with the exception of Somaliland, Somalia is a war-ridden land that needs a lot of work on the ground. He suggested there could be an opportunity for South-South collaboration, e.g. with Kenya which has invested a lot in Somalia and has valuable knowledge. The Head of the Portfolio Management Unit agreed that South-South collaboration is extremely important, and that cross-border programming is of interest to both countries. He also mentioned two international actors, Dahabshiil and the World Bank, as having investments there so agreed the time is right to begin programming.

7.4 The Observer from Sri Lanka thanked all for their interest in Sri Lanka. He offered a brief recap of the ED visit to Sri Lanka and said it facilitated an interactive discussion among government agencies. He said livelihood must be assured when radicalised youth are

rehabilitated and reintegrated, noting the success of a similar programme in Sri Lanka focused on LTTE cadres after the conflict ended in 2009.

7.5 The Board Member for Kosovo suggested the existing beneficiary selection process could include more collaboration with local authorities, depending upon the community and its vulnerabilities.

7.6 The Board Member for Qatar reiterated the importance of working in Somalia and thanked all for supporting programming there. He said the role and interests of Kenya and Somalia regarding border security are important, and the political sensitivity between the two must be considered when originating the project.

IRP Replenishment

7.7 The Head of the Portfolio Management Unit provided an overview of the currently 11 members of the IRP, along with the proposed changes to its Terms of Reference (ToR) and replenishment in an effort to reflect GCERF's thematic direction. She proposed expanding thematic areas, including into FTFs. The IRP requires diversity of expertise as GCERF diversifies its areas of focus.

7.8 The Chair of the IRP echoed these points and said the IRP has made huge improvements since it started, with processes becoming refined over time. She would like the IRP to continue to shift in a strategic manner.

Discussion

7.9 The Board Member for Qatar suggested an interaction between the Board and the IRP. The Chair for the IRP responded that the IRP responds to the needs of GCERF so it would be up to the Board to arrange such an engagement. The Representative for the United States said the full IRP was present at the beginning of GCERF but it became cost prohibitive, so the Chair of the IRP became the representative at the Board Meetings. The Board Member for Switzerland expressed appreciation for the IRP and highlighted the crucial link they play between the Board and the work on the ground. The Chair acknowledged the suggestion and said she will look into including the IRP in a future Board Meeting, perhaps electronically.

7.10 The Board took the following decision:

BM.11/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of Mr Richard Barrett as a member of the Independent Review Panel (IRP) and thanks him for his service;

- b. approves the revised IRP Terms of Reference;
- c. extends the present term of eight of the ten current IRP members until 31.12.2020, as per revised IRP Terms of reference:
 - 1. ALLAMIN, Ms Hamsatu
 - 2. EVANS, Sir Malcolm
 - 3. KHAN, Ms Humera
 - 4. MUEMA, Ms Phyllis
 - 5. QADEEM, Ms Mossarat
 - 6. SAINAZAROV, Mr Keneshbek
 - 7. SCHIRCH, Dr Lisa; and
 - 8. WUCHTE, Mr Thomas.
- d. requests the launch of a replenishment of the membership of the international Independent Review Panel by June 2020, to be managed as set out in the IRP Terms of Reference.

8. BOARD FEEDBACK ON NIGERIA VISIT

8.1 The Chair welcomed Board Members who attended the Nigeria high-level visit to offer their reflections. She invited Board Members who are traveling to programme countries to reach out to GCERF to see programmes while there. The ED echoed this invitation.

8.2 The Representative for the United States thanked the Secretariat for facilitating the visit and encouraged other Board Members to take advantage of this offer, as it brings to life GCERF's work. He offered five points of reflection. First, GCERF is working in the right places, as evidenced by the cancellation of a project visit for security reasons. Second, the programmes are genuinely community-based and involve the right people. However, he expressed some doubt about the peace ambassadors programme and will be interested to see the results of the programme once it finishes. Third, he was pleasantly surprised by the meeting with the private sector and in particular, their enthusiasm and interest in getting involved; he said their interest also came from business operations that are affected by violent extremism, giving the example of IHS Nigeria's telecommunications infrastructure. Fourth, he noted the active role of women in GCERF's work and suggested that while gender parity may not have been reached, lots of women were actively participating and representative in the programmes. Finally, he recommended continuing to pursue hosting one Board Meeting a year in a beneficiary country, and said he was looking forward to Tunisia.

8.3 The Representative for Norway echoed the points by the Representative for the United States. He said the youth peace camp would have been interesting to participate in but was the one area they could not get to. He said the visit was a positive experience and showed very good gender parity, which is high on Norway's agenda. He is looking forward to seeing results.

8.4 The Representative for Nigeria expressed thanks to all who made the trip and said he would have liked to attend, as well. He said following the report of the 10th Board Meeting on lessons learned (BM.10/DOC.09), he received very positive feedback, especially on the peace camps. He welcomed the development of private sector engagement and offered additional connections to strengthen the initial steps taken.

9. FINANCIAL MATTERS

Funding Situation & Other Financial Matters

9.1 The Chair introduced the session and the Finance and Compliance Manager. He offered a brief introduction, including an overview of the Secretariat's Finance team. He confirmed the GCERF budget presentation in line with the previously approved structure as following: (a) Portfolio Management & Social Mission comprised of Grant Commitments and Other Portfolio Management Expenses and (b) Operating Expenses consisting of Secretariat and Governances costs.

9.2 He then presented the funding situation, including a total of \$83M in contributions since GCERF's inception and the confirmed funding of 32% of the 2020 budget. Including pledges and confirmed funding, that leaves 53% of the projected 2020 budget unfunded. He highlighted an operating expenses gap of approximately two-thirds, as well as the gap around grant commitments with only \$5.7M confirmed, and portfolio management and awareness raising which has just over \$1M confirmed. He explained that it is normal to have a funding gap at the beginning of the year but that the desire for a sustainable impact in the field should be reflected through a sustainable level of funding.

2020 Budget

9.3 The Finance and Compliance Manager presented the objectives for 2020. \$22.77M was approved for 2019, and the proposed budget for 2020 is \$24.48M. This reflects a reasonable increase of 7.5% with new commitments using the same level of human resources.

9.4 He highlighted that GCERF is in the business of risk and therefore must have a flexible budget that reflects this. He also mentioned the impact of earmarked funding, which reduces some flexibility of allowing funds to go where the need is greatest.

Discussion

9.5 The Representative for New Zealand expressed thanks for a transparent and understandable budget and financial report. He said some risks are similar to previous years, but some seem new and asked for further explanation surrounding these, particularly for the 2020 budget.

9.6 The Representative for Japan appreciated the efforts to cut down operating expenses. He said that since Japan has restrictions on its funding system that require some earmarking, they try to provide high contributions where possible and they pay in USD. The Finance and Compliance Manager thanked him for his explanation.

9.7 The Representative for Norway said he is happy with many elements of the report but still felt that only 32% funded was not a situation GCERF should be in. He suggested setting targets gradually to bring down this level of risk, for instance, a goal of 40% funded next year, 50% the following year, etc. The Finance and Compliance Manager thanked him and agreed he hoped to fill the funding gap by the end of Q1 2020. There is a KPI against which to measure the budget deficit year on year. The Chair echoed this and encouraged multi-year commitments, allowing that this is not always possible.

9.8 The Representative for France thanked the Finance and Compliance Manager. He asked what the funding status for 2019 was, if the gap was filled yet, and the typical experience in previous years. He also asked how the Secretariat designs the budget for each year. The Finance and Compliance Manager said the revised budget presented at the 10th Board Meeting reflected the current situation and helped to make sure the funding gap was covered, so he doesn't expect additional gaps in 2019. He said looking into 2020, a fluctuation in the exchange rate could work in GCERF's favour. However, he advised not to undermine the capacity of the Board to make contributions that will reduce this risk. He added that adding two new countries represented around 30 percent increase in the portfolio of countries. Even with economies of scale an increased budget is required for expansion.

9.9 The Representative for the European Union agreed and congratulated the Secretariat on its improved financial achievements, acknowledging that around 60 percent unfunded is not optimal. He recognised the risks linked to GCERF's work but also highlighted the challenges in obtaining funding for projected ambitions. He echoed the question posed by his colleague from France on how the funding situation has been handled in previous years. He requested to see the budget approved and budget executed for previous years.

9.10 He also expressed appreciation for the lowered operating expenses costs and asked that more efforts are focused on finding resources from new sources. He thanked the US for covering a large part of GCERF's operating expenses, acknowledging that this allows other donors flexibility in their earmarked contributions. If the US was ever unable to cover it, he said the EU would be able to allocate an increased percentage of its grant funding to operating expenses. He also asked the Board if they would rather approve an ambitious underfunded budget or one with a greater proportion of costs already covered. He noted EU commitments to Mali and called on the Board to increase funding for Mali to ensure a credible impact there. He also asked how to make sure each constituency contributes, e.g. GCERF's original goal of obtaining private sector funding, and expressed interest in seeing how the new Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency becomes more active.

9.11 The Board Member for Switzerland expressed full satisfaction with GCERF's work and performance and supported the approval of the budget. On behalf of Switzerland, he proposed a reflection on the creation of a Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) to assume oversight duties and provide a channel for these discussions before and in support of Board Meetings, in addition to offering some support for the Secretariat in preparing these resources. The Chair responded that a ToR for the FAC is available and an FAC could make sense for GCERF.

9.12 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency acknowledged that the activities of GCERF include administration of grants, but suggested the work brings knowledge that can be shared more broadly so an earmark could be limiting in this regard. He suggested a percentage of each grant be dedicated to the research function as a precondition to support the unique insights GCERF can provide. He also requested to look into how other global funds have a mechanism in place to dedicate a portion of grants to knowledge dissemination.

9.13 The Representative for Australia said he was open minded regarding the FAC creation and suggested that if the GEC is considering a slight Board change regarding the Policy, Think, and Do Tank constituency, it might also consider this request.

9.14 The Representative for Nigeria, indicating BM.11/DOC.07/PAGE.10/PARAGRAPH.4.8, pointed out the divergence between two key achievements, the high level of grants being signed and the limited funding available. He also reminded the Board of the Young Professionals Programme, which could provide an opportunity for co-funding between constituencies. The Finance and Compliance Manager agreed that these achievements showed the potential for accomplishment but that the funding gap could jeopardise these

operations. The ED reiterated this and offered his confidence that these challenges can be overcome with the support of the Board.

9.15 The Representative for the Netherlands asked if a condition of joining the Board should be some level of financial participation each year. The ED replied that there is no specific condition but as GCERF matures, it will have to think about that and significant donors on the Board might raise this point. For constituencies such as the Civil Society constituency, the ED suggested they should not be expected to provide funding since they contribute knowledge and advice.

9.16 The Board took the following decision:

BM.11/DEC.06: The Board:

a. approves the 2020 budget as follows:

- Revenue: USD 23.936M
- Expenses, including “portfolio management & social mission” and “operating expenses”: USD 24.476M; and

b. notes that 32% of the proposed 2020 budget is funded at this time. Confirmation of announced contributions, as well as new funding is needed for both grant commitments and operating expenses.

Resource Mobilisation Update, including Private Sector Engagement

9.17 The ED provided a brief update on Resource Mobilisation, stating that he would like to see GCERF reach a place with more money to invest and more budget confirmed coming into Board Meetings. He said that resource mobilisation (RM) takes an enormous amount of effort with no guarantee of success, so GCERF needs to balance input and projected output. He also reminded the Board that there would be a new global strategy by the end of 2020. The ED suggested that showing GCERF’s performance and results through communications will aid in its RM efforts.

9.18 The ED discussed the main updates. He said GCERF has taken a deliberate change in its RM approach, based on the reality of its situation. He suggested the best way to get funds is to offer facts and explain the reasoning behind GCERF’s work. The ED reiterated that government donors remain the primary funding source; the Secretariat can and will seek development funding; large global funds are able to leverage money through political influence but GCERF is not yet at that level; the private sector will be engaged more but it will

not match government donor contributions; and, social impact bonds are interesting to consider but again, will not replace the core reliance on government funding.

9.19 The ED said he will work with current donors to continue and increase existing contributions. He said he will target GCTF countries that could become donors, and that he will try to pursue other organisations such as development banks.

9.20 The ED offered a brief update on the private sector, including that a Secretariat staff member is now focused 50 percent on this engagement. He said that a private sector partnership is expected in Nigeria in 2020 and that the Board will remain updated as this progresses. The ED and staff have a strong relationship with the World Economic Forum, opening the door to many new potential partners. He also expressed thanks to the new Alternate Board Member from the Private Sector constituency, who has shown consistent interest and support, and to the Representative for the United States for driving these efforts.

Discussion

9.21 The Alternate Board Member for the Private Sector constituency said natural resource companies have great exposure to violent extremism and they can help with community outreach and connections to governments; he offered to arrange further meetings for the ED with relevant companies. He also suggested that regional development banks are eager to gain creditworthiness with producers on the ground where GCERF works. He mentioned the creation of a new US-based development finance group with significant that could be a good partner. Finally, he raised the idea of crowdfunding as an innovative resource mobilisation option.

9.22 The Board Member for Qatar said Qatar is still committed to supporting GCERF's unique value added and would like to see GCERF seeking funding from new donors, particularly from GCTF countries that initiated GCERF. He also said there was an equal responsibility on beneficiary countries to contribute, and that co- or blended financing options are worth exploring. The ED added that RM is everyone's responsibility, with him and the RM Specialist leading at the Secretariat.

9.23 The Representative for the United States reiterated the US commitment to GCERF, including bringing in USAID as a potential co-donor for the RFTFs proposal (BM.11/DOC.03). He reiterated that this requires funding from more than just the US and the Netherlands.

9.24 The Representative for Denmark said Denmark's contribution is multi-year and unearmarked. He appreciated that there was no magic solution to RM and echoed the Board Member for the European Union and France's comment that he welcomes GCERF's flexibility

to accept different types of funding. He supports ambitions to target GCTF countries and encouraged Board Members to encourage this funding, as well.

9.25 The Representative for Kenya said RM is key to GCERF's success. He agreed that communicating and sharing lessons learned was important. He also suggested quantifying the efforts put in by beneficiary countries, as they dedicate national resources and support to PVE. He also placed an emphasis on capacity building, particularly as the Board discusses transition options.

9.26 The Board Member for Kosovo thanked the donors for their continuous contributions. He expressed appreciation for the interest in supporting RFTFs and their families and said Kosovo will write to the EU to ask them to contribute funding to this initiative.

9.27 The Representative for Nigeria echoed the points made by the Board Member for Kenya on the possibility for co-funding initiatives. He welcomed efforts by the Secretariat to seek alternative funding and said driving public-private partnerships is a huge undertaking requiring resources and individual networks. He encouraged the Board to check Nigeria's public budget records, which show its investment into PVE efforts.

9.28 The Representative for the European Union expressed enthusiasm around the impetus to generate resources from the private sector and foundations. He reiterated that GCERF should be a vehicle to 'reach the unreachable', allowing donors to engage at the local level.

9.29 The Representative for Sri Lanka offered another example of GCERF's added value in Sri Lanka, saying they provided the missing link after Easter Sunday regarding the social aspect of rebuilding society, where there was plenty of support for other initiatives, e.g. capacity building of law enforcement.

10. GCERF SUPPORT FOR COUNTRIES: ELIGIBILITY, RE-ASSESSMENT AND TRANSITION

10.1 The Head of Performance and Impact offered an overview of the proposal for discussion. He emphasised discussion around co-funding and co-financing. He also pointed out that this does not imply that GCERF does not recognise the resources partner countries are already putting into their own programmes, it simply aims to ensure impact for the longer term. He introduced the six questions proposed to re-assess a partnership with a country in order to inform its future relationship with GCERF. He requested to explore the Board's comfort with these questions during the discussion.

Discussion

10.2 The Board Member for Bangladesh suggested the reason for entry into a country is clear but regarding an exit, there must be an element of learning on the job and adjusting. He did not foresee having to confront an exit strategy but understands that resource constraints may require it. He suggested the proposed questions be answered in consultation with the partner country, and in later discussion with the Board. The Board Member added that the primary source of funding is the Board and cautioned against discussing initiatives like the private sector as solutions to the current resource mobilisation issue. The Head of Performance and Impact agreed that this process would be undertaken through consultation rather than remotely from Geneva.

10.3 The Board Member for Qatar thanked the Secretariat for the interesting proposal. He agreed that recipients are not seeking just funding but the value and expertise of GCERF. He suggested the end goal must be practical, and it will be difficult to expect concrete results within the timelines discussed.

10.4 The Head of Performance and Impact said setting a time limit offers the foresight of preparing for something like co-financing. The BM acknowledged this but also said due to the constraints, a timeframe could lessen the burden on resources. The ED agreed resource mobilisation is a challenge but said GCERF's impact should not be risked by shortening programmes. The Board Member for the European Union and France agreed impact is crucial but so is resource mobilisation so they must be balanced. He suggested the Board consider that if it wants the capacity to engage in new countries, it must have a frank discussion about when to leave existing countries.

10.5 The Representative for France expressed support for the approach and said it required flexibility based on results. He asked if, upon seeing good activity and progress, GCERF would continue programming or limit it to three years.

10.6 The Board Member for Switzerland expressed support for the proposal and said prevention is clearly a long-term effort from a development perspective and he is happy with the need for time enough to measure results. He said he was happy with a proposal to look at criteria but also wanted to see flexibility based on results.

10.7 The Representative for the Philippines offered a brief overview of GCERF's programmes in the Philippines. He said that developments in the country since programming began have transitioned into a new phase of terrorism, e.g. suicide bombers, and that continued work is required.

10.8 The Representative for Australia commended the Secretariat on the proposal, which provided positive insights into options. He mentioned that capacity building is expensive and that in the absence of grant making, it could actually cost more to exclusively build capacity. GCERF and its peers may never fully eradicate violent extremism, but their goal is to reach a point where it becomes a manageable issue.

10.9 The Representative for New Zealand said GCERF has a 'purpose' question that must be answered in order to help determine the direction of a transition strategy.

10.10 The Head of Performance and Impact said he sees the discussion continuing through the Strategy Review Group. He said that the proposed transition phase is similar to what other funds do. The ED agreed and said it was worth considering that there are different stages in each place and GCERF can serve different roles.

10.11 The Representative for the United States suggested considering the terrorist threat level in a country as part of the criteria, for if the threat level is high enough it could render P/CVE work ineffective. The Head of Performance and Impact agreed and gave the example of GCERF not working in north-eastern Nigeria for that reason. Perhaps the assessment could include the consideration of shifting regions within a country as part of the transition.

10.12 The Representative for Nigeria suggested considering the idea of GCERF as a catalyser and using the transition as an opportunity to introduce other vehicles into the programming. He said all options require further research and discussion.

10.13 The Board Member for Kenya said the paper proposed strong questions, and said it is the prerogative of donor countries to decide where to put their resources. He said impact needs to be assessed, including determining the desired achievement at both the national and local level.

10.14 The ED thanked the Board for their comments and agreed this discussion was a great start to the process of developing a transition strategy. He said it was an ongoing discussion and the Secretariat would continue to welcome insights from the Board.

11. CONCLUDING REMARKS

11.1 The Chair thanked all for their active participation at the meeting. She noted that due to the engaging discussions, the Board Self-Assessment session would not take place as planned but also that the survey only garnered a 50 percent response rate, so she hopes for a higher response rate in the future. She also said the key issues were touched upon in the results of the survey and encouraged all to read the report (BM.11/DOC.11).

11.2 The Chair asked that the Board save the dates 9-11 June 2020 for the 12th Board Meeting in Tunisia. She then invited the Board Member for Tunisia to speak.

11.3 The Board Member for Tunisia invited all to Tunis for the 12th Board Meeting. He thanked all donors and recipients for their support, and the Secretariat for their hard work on PVE. He then presented the Chair with a book on the history of Tunisia by the Musée du Bardo, dedicated to the victims of terrorism in Tunisia.

11.4 The Chair thanked the Board Member for Tunisia. She invited the ED to make any closing remarks. The ED thanked Switzerland, the Board, and the Secretariat. He asked for support for the funding proposals discussed.

11.5 The Chair thanked all for their thoughtful interventions. She invited Board Members and Alternate Board Members to remain for a brief Executive Session. She closed the meeting.

ANNEX 1

BM.11/DOC.01: AGENDA

THURSDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2019

Location – Conference Room “Lausanne”, Varembe Conference Centre (CCV), 9-11 Rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 08:30 – 09:30 | Orientation Sessions for new Board members (all Board members are welcome) | | Board Chair / Executive Director / GCERF Team |
| 09:30 – 10:30 | Donors’ meeting | | |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Welcome Coffee | | |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Welcoming Remarks | | Board Chair |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Preliminary Matters | DOC.01 | Board Chair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of new Board members | | |
| 11:15 – 12:30 | Report of the Executive Director | DOC.02 (for information) | Executive Director |
| 12:30 – 13:30 | Buffet Lunch | | |
| 13:30 – 14:30 | GCERF Accelerated Funding Mechanism (AFM) to Support Returning Foreign Terrorist Fighters and Families | DOC.03 (for discussion) | Executive Director |
| 14:30 – 15:00 | Governance and Ethics Committee Report | DOC.04 (for information / decision) | Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee (via Skype) |
| 15:00 – 15:15 | Coffee Break | | |
| 15:15 – 16:45 | Results | DOC.05 (for information) | Executive Director / Performance & Impact |
| | Update on GCERF Programmes and IRP replenishment process | DOC.06 (for information / decision) | Head / Head of Portfolio Management |
| 16:45 – 17:30 | Board Feedback on Nigeria Visit | | Board members |
| 17:30 – 19:00 | Reception – Celebrating GCERF’s 5th Anniversary | | |

FRIDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2019

Location – Conference Room “Lausanne”, Varembe Conference Centre (CCV), 9-11 Rue de Varembe, 1202 Geneva

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| 09:00 – 10:15 | Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding Situation & Other Financial Matters • 2020 Budget • Resource Mobilisation Update, including Private Sector Engagement | DOC.07 (for information) DOC.08 (for decision) DOC.09 (for information) | Executive Director / Finance & Compliance Manager Executive Director |
| 10:15 – 11:00 | GCERF Support for Countries: Eligibility, Re-assessment and Transition | DOC.10 (for discussion) | Executive Director |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:15 – 11:45 | Board Self-Assessment | DOC.11 (for discussion) | Board Chair |
| 11:45 – 12:15 | Any other business | | Board Chair/ Executive Director |
| 12:15 | End of the Meeting | | |
| 12:15 – 13:15 | Buffet Lunch | | |
| | Donors’ meeting (if needed) | | |

ANNEX 2

11th GCERF BOARD MEETING

21–22 November 2019

Geneva, Switzerland

PARTICIPANTS LIST

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Ms Carol Bellamy

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan and New Zealand

Board Member: Mr Chitaru Shimizu, 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:

Mr Stuart Dymond, Special Adviser (UN agencies and Environment), New Zealand Permanent Mission to the United Nations in Geneva

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

Ms Thuy Nguyen, Policy Officer, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

Bangladesh

Board Member: H.E. Mr M. Shameem Ahsan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva on behalf of H.E. Mr Md. Shahidul Haque, Senior Foreign Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

Constituency Members:

Mr Md. Emdadul Islam Chowdhury, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Mr Md Baky Billah, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Canada and United Kingdom

Board Member: H.E. Ms Miriam Shearman, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations and Other International Organisations in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: Ms Dorota Geissel, Deputy Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa on behalf of Ms Michelle Cameron, Director, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Constituency Members:

Ms Alex Bowe, PREVENT & RICU International, Office for Security and Counter Terrorism, UK Home Office, London

Ms Katherine North, Counter-Terrorism and Anti-Crime Capacity Building Programs (IDC), Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

Civil Society

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

Denmark

Mr Adam Ravnkilde, Chief Adviser / Counterterrorism Coordinator, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

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 Adrien Frier, Head of the Suppression of Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

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, Executive Director, Tony Blair Institute for Global Change, London

Kenya

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

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

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: H.E. Mr Mamadou Henri Konate, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Constituency Member: Mr Adama Coulibaly, First Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mali to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Private Sector

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

Qatar

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

Constituency Member: Mr Talal Al-Naama, Third Secretary, Permanent Mission of the State of Qatar to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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

Constituency Members:

Ms Barbara Affolter Gómez, Senior Policy Advisor Fragility, Conflict & Human Rights, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Mr Derek Müller, Head of Division Middle East and Northern Africa and Fragility, Conflict & Human Rights Unit, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

Tunisia and the Philippines

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

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

Constituency Members:

Mr Sami Nagga, Minister Plenipotentiary and Chargé d’Affaires a.i., Permanent Mission of the Republic of Tunisia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Ms Mouna Mcharek Hadiji, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Tunisia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

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.

OBSERVERS

GCERF Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Ms Humera Khan, IRP Chair; President, Muflehun

Italy

Mr Valerio Negro, Head of Desk, Directorate General for Political Affairs and Security, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Rome

Singapore

Ms Nitya Menon, Deputy Permanent Representative (United Nations), Permanent Mission of the Republic of Singapore to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva

Spain

Mr Juan Manglano, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Sri Lanka

H.E. Mr A.L.A. Azeez, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office in Geneva on behalf of Foreign Secretary Ravinatha Aryasinha, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Ms Mahesha Jayawardene, Acting Deputy Director, International Security and Counter Terrorism Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombo

Turkey

Mr Erdal Onat, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva and other international organizations in Switzerland

United National Counter-Terrorism Office (UNOCT)

Ms Annick Hiensch, Europe Liaison Officer, Brussels

GCERF Secretariat