

## REPORT OF THE 3<sup>rd</sup> BOARD MEETING

---

The 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Governing Board (the “Board”) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (“GCERF”) was held from 1-2 December 2015 in Geneva, Switzerland. The approved agenda for the meeting is contained in **Annex 1**, and the attendance list in **Annex 2** to this report.

### 1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1 The Chair of the Board, Ms Carol Bellamy, opened the meeting, introducing herself and the Executive Director, Dr Khalid Koser. She stressed the critical and pivotal nature of the meeting for GCERF at which the Board would be considering approval of its first grants, important adjustments to funding model, options for growth, new beneficiary countries as well as the budget for 2016. The crucial role of Board members in all of these areas was highlighted.

1.2 The Chair welcomed the Board members and requested each of them to introduce themselves. The Chair also welcomed the Chair of the Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) and the many observers in attendance.

### 2. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

#### *Appointment of the Rapporteur*

2.1 As the first order of business, the Chair requested that the Board appoint a rapporteur for the meeting. Dr Timothy Docking from the Private Sector constituency had kindly agreed to act in such capacity and the Chair thanked him on behalf of the Board.

2.2 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.01**: Dr Timothy Docking from the Private Sector constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Board meeting.

#### *Approval of the Agenda*

2.3 The Chair introduced the agenda (BM.03/DOC.01), which had been distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting, for approval.

2.4 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.02**: The agenda for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Board meeting (BM.03/DOC.01) is approved.

### *Confirmation of Board Members*

2.5 The Chair stated that there had been some changes to Board membership since the last face-to-face Board meeting in April 2015. Pursuant to Swiss law, the Board was required to acknowledge these changes in writing.

2.6 She summarized the changes, and the Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.03:** The Board notes the following changes to its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 2<sup>nd</sup> Board Meeting:

- a. **Foundations:** Ms Angela Salt replaces Ms Charlotte Keenan as the Board Member;
- b. **Nigeria:** Ambassador Nonye Udo replaces Mr Umunna Humphrey Orjiako as the Board Member;
- c. **Private Sector:** Dr Timothy Docking is the Board Member for the previously vacant seat; and
- d. **Morocco:** Mr Hassane Boukili has resigned and Morocco is no longer represented on the Board.

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

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

3.2 Dr Koser welcomed the Board members and thanked them and the Secretariat team for their hard work and engagement throughout GCERF's first year.

3.3 In this first year, GCERF had successfully piloted the Core Funding Mechanism ("CFM") in three countries. Some of the achievements of the year included: becoming a fully functioning institution with a Secretariat; convening a Board meeting for the third time with attendance from senior representatives from around the world; securing USD 25 million in pledges; processing the first set of National Applications; attracting additional interest from three new countries to join as beneficiary countries, with additional interest from other countries; and raising GCERF's global profile.

3.4 The Executive Director highlighted the need for judicious and strategic expansion noting that a lot had been achieved in the first 18 months. However, much remained to be done if GCERF was to maintain the momentum and fully seize upon its considerable potential. He stated that whilst 2015 was GCERF's pilot year, 2016 should be its year of performance.

3.5 The Executive Director reiterated the need for urgent action. According to the Global Terrorism Index 2015, published by one of the Private Sector Board constituency members, terrorist activity had increased by 80% in 2014 to its highest recorded level, with more countries than ever before having high levels of terrorism. Private citizens are increasingly becoming the targets of

terrorist attacks, and the economic cost of terrorism is estimated at USD 53 billion a year. All countries where GCERF is currently working have suffered terrorist outrages this year, and other countries where GCERF hopes to be working next year, subject to the Board's approval, have had terrorist incidents. Equally important, many donor countries with which GCERF is working have experienced terrorism and its impact on their citizens and way of life.

3.6 2015 had been a pivotal year for raising awareness of preventing and countering violent extremism ("P/CVE"). Significant events included two Leaders' Summits that were led and chaired by President Obama, significant discussion on CVE at the UN General Assembly in September 2015, Global Counter-Terrorism Forum ministerial meetings, as well as numerous regional meetings. Whilst dialogues and summitry had been important and beneficial in putting CVE on global, regional and national agendas, it was now time for action, and GCERF should be known as an action-oriented organisation.

3.7 The Executive Director highlighted the importance of collaboration, indicating that GCERF is a part of a comprehensive international response to violent extremism. Its niche is in funding local communities and its focus on prevention. He stressed the importance of working with security and development actors, and the private and public sector, to avoid overlap and ensure that the international community as a whole has a coherent approach that is making a difference.

3.8 The Executive Director summarised some of the challenges that the Board and the Secretariat had faced during GCERF's pilot year. These included working in the nascent field of P/CVE with a relatively thin evidence-base to date; as well as the high level of political and security sensitivity in the pilot countries and among donors.

3.9 He thanked the Secretariat, the IRP led by its Chair Ms Humera Khan, the Country Support Mechanisms ("CSMs") of Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria, and the Board for their hard work and determination through short timelines and with limited human and financial resources.

3.10 GCERF's key achievements in its pilot year were summarised. During its pilot year, National Applications from Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria were submitted responding to the geographic, demographic and thematic foci approved by the Board in July 2015, providing access to the grassroots as intended and identifying innovative responses to violent extremism. Dr Koser stressed that it was critical to approve the National Applications and define quickly the process how to take them forward.

3.11 The CFM had been successfully piloted and achieved what was intended, whilst acknowledging the feedback from stakeholders in particular on transparency, response loops, short timelines and the role of the IRP in the process. GCERF's pilot year demonstrated its global value, exposed funding gaps, proved that grassroots organisations can produce innovative initiatives, and demonstrated how engaging communities and building resilience are part of national strategies on P/CVE.

3.12 The Executive Director noted the tension between projects in the National Applications that were CVE-specific as opposed to CVE-relevant. He requested the Board to reflect on the two concepts, and provide guidance on whether GCERF funding should be focused on CVE-specific projects only, or whether to allow communities to identify projects that best serve their community's CVE needs, regardless of whether they are CVE-specific or relevant.

3.13 Finally, the Executive Director emphasised that in order to realise its potential, GCERF would increasingly look to partnership with the Board in fundraising, political positioning, and raising awareness to ensure GCERF is recognised as *the* global fund on P/CVE. Its strategic niche is fundamental in promoting its unique selling proposition, and the Secretariat will continue working with the Board on this issue. He underlined the need for substantial investment in order for GCERF to fully realise its potential.

#### *Discussion*

3.14 Board members congratulated the Executive Director, the Secretariat, the IRP and the CSMs for their hard work and success in launching the CFM in its pilot year.

3.15 Board members acknowledged that the CFM application process had been quite effective, but had set a very tight timetable, which had potentially affected the quality of the information provided in the National Applications.

3.16 Board members agreed that the pilot year had exposed a tension between the keenness of the Board and Secretariat to issue GCERF's first grants swiftly, and the quality of the key products, such as the Needs Assessments and National Applications. The Board acknowledged the continued need to balance action and results with the responsible disbursement of funds.

3.17 The importance of GCERF maintaining its niche and unique perspective in the increasingly populated P/CVE space was also discussed. One of GCERF's key strengths is that it is a multi-stakeholder mechanism, exemplified best by the CSMs, which are in themselves key outcomes of the GCERF CFM. One Board member stressed that it was essential for GCERF to begin the establishment process of the CSM in any potential beneficiary countries as soon as possible.

3.18 The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal ("SDG") 16 was identified as a key priority for the international community and GCERF. One Board member emphasised the importance and benefits of GCERF framing its work in the wider context of the new development agenda.

3.19 Questions were raised regarding whether contributions to GCERF could be considered as Official Development Assistance ("ODA"). The Executive Director confirmed that funding contributed to GCERF could be reported as ODA, and that GCERF would apply to be included on the OECD DAC's international organisations list as soon as a positive outcome was likely.

3.20 Board members agreed that there was an inherent element of risk in GCERF funding, and acknowledged that some projects may fail. One Board member noted the importance of the Board balancing risk against the size of the funding provided.

3.21 The Board Member from the European Union officially confirmed his formal appointment representing the European Union on the Board and confirmed that the European Union's pledge of EUR 2 million to GCERF would be signed imminently and therefore be counted as a contribution.

3.22 The representative from the Netherlands confirmed that the finalisation of Netherlands' unrestricted financial contribution for 2016 was in its final stages. He thanked the Secretariat and the Board for inviting the Netherlands to be represented at the meeting, and confirmed they would join one of the Board's constituencies moving forward.

3.23 The Board member for Switzerland offered praise to GCERF as an enriching member of the Geneva international community, given Geneva's strategic position as a hub for conflict transformation, peacebuilding and human rights.

3.24 The Executive Director reiterated that GCERF's added value in the P/CVE space was manifold. This included providing a multi-stakeholder platform through the CSMs, the Board, the Secretariat, and the IRP; working at the nexus of security and development; bringing together the public and private sectors around the CVE priority; filling an evident funding gap at the community level; focusing on prevention at a community level; and offering access to donors that they do not normally have, on a bilateral basis via a neutral, pooled fund specialised in managing small grants.

3.25 The Executive Director committed the Secretariat to developing a strategy for GCERF over the next six months for the Board's consideration.

3.26 The Executive Director thanked the Board members from Switzerland for the active engagement and participation of the Swiss Federal Councillor Didier Burkhalter, Head of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, who had been an active champion and campaigner for GCERF nationally and globally in 2015. The Chair encouraged all Board members to engage in the same way and continue to champion for and raise the profile of GCERF.

#### **4. NATIONAL APPLICATIONS FROM BANGLADESH, MALI AND NIGERIA: FUNDING DECISIONS (PART 1)**

4.1 The Executive Director introduced the paper on National Applications from Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria (BM.03/DOC.03). He stated that the purpose of the paper was to inform the Board's decision on the allocation of funding to the National Applications, including on the maximum amount of funding to each, and the conditions that must be satisfied before GCERF enters into a grant agreement with each Principal Recipient. He reminded the Board of its decision in July 2015 to pre-allocate USD 4.8 million to each country for a three-year period from 2016, as well as the demographic, geographic and thematic foci identified for each country's funding. He summarised the Secretariat, IRP and CSMs' activities since that decision, which included the issuance of national Calls for Expressions of Interest, the receipt of 102 such expressions, the selection of 17 potential Principal Recipients ("PPRs"), the development of Consortium Grant Applications ("CGAs") from each PPR, preliminary due diligence and risk assessment undertaken on each PPR, and the submission of completed National Applications from Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria.

4.2 The Chair invited comments from the representatives on the Board of each of GCERF's pilot countries. The representatives from Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria thanked the Secretariat for their work throughout the year, and acknowledged that the quality of the National Applications had been compromised due to the short and strict deadlines imposed upon the CSMs. All three also reiterated

the increasing threat of violent extremism in their respective countries, which highlighted the growing need for initiatives at a grassroots level to complement their national strategies on P/CVE.

4.3 The Alternate Board Member for Bangladesh praised the Bangladesh National Application for covering a wide geography, its focus on empowering women, engagement of the media, faith leaders and civil society organisations among others, and its focus on counter narratives and building resilience. He requested that during the grant agreement development process, the CSM should be kept informed of the consultation between the Secretariat and the PPRs while re-working the National Application.

4.4 The Alternate Board Member for Mali focused on the need to engage with young, unemployed adults, vulnerable to radicalization, through Quranic schools and leaders of different communities to change their social behaviour and increase their resilience to violent extremist influences. He noted the optimistic political atmosphere in Mali, and emphasized that the projects as described in the Malian National Application were in line with established local development plans to address resilience to violent extremism.

4.5 The Board member for Nigeria described the political climate in Nigeria over 2015, including a successful democratic election, but an increase of violent extremism and terrorist attacks by Boko Haram on an unprecedented scale. She observed that the National Applications could not have been expected to be perfect, given the recent rise in other urgent matters, such as the flow of foreign terrorist fighters and migration. She described the Nigerian CSM as complex and diverse, generating enriching and vibrant discussions, including a private sector presence on the CSM in Microsoft. She explained that the CSM had reluctantly accepted it would not be able to interface thoroughly with the PPRs, given the short deadline, and that raised an issue of transparency. She also stated that the Nigerian CSM had requested an extension on the deadline for the National Application, which was not granted. She described the CSM's satisfaction that the PPRs had basic knowledge on difficult to reach communities, however that they had hoped to see greater CVE content and relevance in the CGAs. On a similar note, she requested that the Nigerian CSM be provided with further CVE expertise and guidance. Finally, she encouraged the Board members not to delay the GCERF funding process any further, and reiterated the urgent and immediate need for implementation of the proposed projects in the three countries.

4.6 The Chair thanked all three countries for their engagement. She called on the Chair of the IRP, Ms Humera Khan, to present a summary of the IRP's recommendations to the Board on the National Applications from Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria.

4.7 Ms Khan's presentation summarised the IRP's review of each country's National Application, identifying strengths and areas for improvement. The IRP recommended approval of the three National Applications, subject to the detailed conditions and feedback presented in their report (Annex 33 to BM.03/DOC.03). The IRP Chair noted in her presentation that all three applications had the potential to make significant contributions to P/CVE in their respective countries, and that some specific projects and PPRs had been identified as 'gems'.

4.8 The Executive Director continued by presenting the strategic, operational and financial considerations to be made by the Board in approving the proposed decision. He noted the decrease in available funding from the USD 14.540 million ceiling approved by the Board in July 2015, to the

current level of USD 13.416 million. This represented a shortfall of USD 1.124 million; readjusting each country's funding ceiling to USD 4.472 million as opposed to USD 4.848 million. He explained this was due to delays in the process of finalising contributions from several donors and that the earlier number included some expected values that differed from the final values of the agreements.

### *Discussion*

4.9 One Board member noted that it would have been useful for the CSMs to have been afforded the opportunity to receive the IRP's feedback and incorporate any changes into their National Applications before submission. This was not possible due to the compressed timeline. At the same time, the Board acknowledged the progress made in the short timeline, and noted the need for the grant making and management process to carry on as swiftly as possible.

4.10 Some Board members made reference to the importance of performance monitoring and evaluation in the grant implementation and management phase. It was noted that the Secretariat intended to make further dedicated investment on in-house expertise to ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of GCERF's funding.

4.11 The Board member for the Private Sector encouraged the Nigerian CSM and the Secretariat to review the role and intervention of the private sector in Nigeria, particularly that of Chevron in the Niger Delta.

4.12 One Board member requested feedback from the IRP on its deliberation process regarding the National Applications, including whether they had numeric ranking or other specific indicators of the strengths and weaknesses of individual PPRs. One Board member was disappointed that an international NGO was included on the list of PPRs, noting that this organisation already received funding from donors on the Board. There were also concerns raised over the substantial amount of overhead funds suggested in some instances and budgeted at the level of the PRs rather than distributed to the SRs.

4.13 Board members noted some concerns over the composition of the CSMs, and there was a clear need for greater understanding of the role and responsibilities of Board representatives, in particular from donor constituencies, on the national CSMs.

4.14 One Board member noted that he had received very good feedback from missions in-country on the selection process for the PPRs, noting real potential among projects and consortia members.

4.15 The Board member from the European Union noted that GCERF must have a full and strong commitment to human rights, and compliance with human rights principles in any of its grant agreements and processes. In response, the Secretariat noted that this is addressed in the Code of Conduct for Recipients.

4.16 Discussion ensued about whether the Board decision could be approved as drafted, given some concerns about the quality of the National Applications. The Chair requested that the Secretariat work with Board members to revise the language to incorporate the Board's concerns and they would return to the discussion later in the meeting.

## 5. CORE FUNDING MECHANISM: COUNTRY FUNDING CYCLE

5.1 The Executive Director presented on the Core Funding Mechanism: Country Funding Cycle (BM.03/DOC.05).

5.2 The Secretariat proposed a detailed country funding cycle based on lessons learned in the pilot year; and framed GCERF's expansion plans. The Country Funding Cycle is guided by the recognition that GCERF has a unique opportunity to contribute to the prevention and countering of violent extremism, and the importance of adhering to development principle of sustainability which requires the provision of predictable, multi-year commitments based on the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and 2008 Accra Agenda for Action.

5.3 The Country Funding Cycle established an eight-year funding cycle including three rounds of investment in each country, and the introduction of three new beneficiary countries each year. It anticipates two Board decisions in June 2016 to pre-allocate funding for a second round of investment in the current pilot countries and for a first round in the new wave of countries.

### *Discussion*

5.4 There was some concern among Board members that the length of time between annual rounds was not long enough to accurately capture and apply lessons learned from previous rounds. It was important that the funding cycle operate at a viable and sustained pace.

5.5 Concerns were also raised about the lack of pledges and contributions to fund the funding cycle according to the plan presented.

5.6 The Secretariat noted that it would ensure that during the three-year funding cycle, recipients receive simultaneous capacity building and strengthening to ensure they are able to absorb funding from other sources once GCERF funding has ceased. GCERF funding should always aim to ensure that CVE projects and initiatives can have long-term, sustainable impacts among vulnerable communities where there is a continued need.

5.7 One Board member questioned why the document referred to an eight-year funding cycle when funding was only being provided for five years. It was clarified that the eight years covers the entire period for which GCERF is engaging with a beneficiary country, including the country pre-selection process, the grant making year ahead of each round of funding allocation in which the CSMs are established, and the evaluation year at the end of the implementation of the grant.

5.8 The Board took the following decision:

#### **BM.03/DEC.04:** The Board:

- a. approves, and requests the Secretariat to implement, the proposed multi-year country funding cycle of the Core Funding Mechanism ("CFM") presented in BM.03/DOC.05, including the decision-making timetable set out in Table 3 of such document; and

- b. calls on all existing and potential donors to make financial contributions required in early 2016 for the immediate implementation of the CFM country funding cycle.

## **6. NATIONAL APPLICATIONS FROM BANGLADESH, MALI AND NIGERIA: FUNDING DECISIONS (PART 2)**

6.1 Revisiting the agenda item on National Applications, the Chair noted various changes that had been made to the draft decision language based on the Board's previous discussion. These changes were proposed to allow for the grant agreement development process to commence and the Board's approval of funding would occur as the negotiations were completed and the grant agreements ready to sign and implement. The Secretariat agreed to provide updates on progress to interested Board members.

6.2 The Board took the following decision:

### **BM.03/DEC.05:** The Board:

- a. welcomes the work of the Country Support Mechanisms ("CSMs") in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria (the "Pilot Countries"), and notes the commitment of each of them to proceed with the process of the Core Funding Mechanism ("CFM");
- b. thanks the international Independent Review Panel ("IRP") for its assessment and recommendations on the National Applications of the Pilot Countries, as detailed in Section 4 of BM.03/DOC.03;
- c. requests the Secretariat to develop grant agreements with potential Principal Recipients in the Pilot Countries of a value of up to USD 4.472 million for each country and ensuring that:
  - i. the proposed grant agreements:
    - reflect the emphasis and priorities identified in the relevant National Application; and
    - take into account:
      - the Summary Recommendations and Recommended Conditions of the IRP on the National Application, as detailed in Section 4 of BM.03/DOC.03;
      - the detailed feedback provided by the IRP including its recommended prioritisation of potential Principal Recipients ("PPRs"), as detailed in Section 4 and Annex 33 of BM.03/DOC.03; and
      - the feedback of the Board made at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Board Meeting; and
  - ii. the PPRs have the essential capabilities to fulfil the role of a Principal Recipient, based on the Secretariat's due diligence and risk assessment; and

- d. requests the Secretariat to present reports summarising the changes to the Consortium Grant Applications for the Board's approval of a final allocation of up to USD 4.472 million for each country for grant-making purposes under the CFM once the related process described in paragraph c. above is complete, and no later than 30 April 2016.

## **7. CORE FUNDING MECHANISM: REFINEMENTS**

7.1 The Chief Operating Officer ("COO") presented the Core Funding Mechanism: Refinements (BM.03/DOC.06). He noted that the Secretariat had invited, identified and internalised a range of feedback from GCERF's stakeholders, and compiled lessons learned (Annex 1 of the document). The outcome of the lessons learned was a series of easy-to-implement improvements in operation procedures to be made by the Secretariat, as well as more substantive improvements within the funding model.

7.2 The first improvement is the introduction of a country pre-selection assessment ("CPA") process that includes assessment of eligibility of a country under the CFM Eligibility Policy; an externally commissioned country needs assessment ("CNA"); and consideration of other implications for the Secretariat.

7.3 The second improvement was proposed at the grant-making phase, including the responsibility of the national CSM to undertake a national consultation on P/CVE in order to contribute to the CNA. Other changes in this phase included earlier due diligence and risk assessment undertaken by the Secretariat after the Expressions of Interest are received and before the selection of PPRs by the CSM, IRP and Secretariat. This change also entails the reimbursement of expenses of PPRs in undertaking community assessments during the CGA development process.

7.4 Other additions to the grant implementation phase that did not previously exist included clarifications on flexible consortium membership, grant reprogramming and high-performance reinvestment.

7.5 The COO presented the phased implementation of these refinements for each of the present and next two waves of countries. Wave 2 countries will undertake an accelerated version of the CPA process to include a national consultation on P/CVE as well as the grant agreement development ("GAD") process. The revised country pre-selection assessment will begin in 2017 with Wave 3 countries.

### *Discussion*

7.6 Board members welcomed the refinements proposed to the CFM, and congratulated the Secretariat for collecting the feedback and distilling it into lessons learned.

7.7 One Board member encouraged the CSMs to promote participation of the private sector in order to enhance GCERF's mandate of a public-private partnership. The Executive Director stated that he welcomed the advice and expertise from all Board members who have successfully engaged with the private sector, on a global and local level.

7.8 Some Board members welcomed the addition of an externally commissioned CNA, however cautioned that national ownership should continue to be a cornerstone of GCERF's work, and remain a core value. The role of the CSM in the CNA process was emphasized. The COO reiterated the importance of the CSM throughout the CPA and grant-making processes.

7.9 Concerns were raised about the funding of the CSMs. The Board discussed the possibility of greater participation on the CSMs from donors or the private sector who could potentially assist with these costs. The Chair stated that the Secretariat would, at the next in-person Board meeting, provide the Board with various options and solutions on funding for the CSM, and it would be reserved as an agenda item.

7.10 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.06:** The Board:

- a. approves, and requests the Secretariat to work alongside beneficiary countries to implement the refinements to the Core Funding Mechanism presented in BM.03/DOC.06; and
- b. authorises the Secretariat to reimburse potential Principal Recipients' Secretariat-approved costs incurred for community needs assessments undertaken to inform the design of Consortium Grant Applications, as proposed in BM.03/DOC.06.

## **8. NEW BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES**

8.1 The Chair began by acknowledging the presence of representatives from Kenya and Kosovo<sup>1</sup> at the Board meeting as observers, and regretted the inability of a representative of Myanmar to attend.

8.2 The Executive Director presented the paper on New Beneficiary Countries (BM.03/DOC.07). He reviewed the eligibility of Kenya, Kosovo and Myanmar under the CFM Eligibility Policy. He noted the benefits of the addition of these countries, including expanding GCERF's geographical scope; testing the refined CFM in new contexts, and among unique populations, communities and ethnic/religious groups susceptible to radicalisation to violent extremism in the three countries.

8.3 If the Board were to approve the decision, the three new countries would be invited to designate a representative to join or occupy one of the five beneficiary seats (of which two are currently vacant) on the Board.

---

<sup>1</sup> Designation of Kosovo as a "country" in this document is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence. It was noted that the governments of Bangladesh, Nigeria and various European Union member states do not recognise Kosovo as an independent state.

## *Discussion*

8.4 Board members welcomed the addition of the three countries. A few noted that it would increase the work of their colleagues in these countries.

8.5 One Board member urged the new countries not to delay the process of creating and establishing their CSMs, as this is an early added value of the CFM process, regardless of availability and decision on funding.

8.6 There were some concerns raised about whether GCERF should be focusing its funding on Myanmar at this stage in its funding cycle, given the current political climate. The Secretariat stated that it would seek confirmation of the transitional government of Myanmar's commitment to GCERF.

8.7 One Board member urged the government of Kenya to broach the potential for GCERF funding in their national P/CVE strategy by focusing on domestic populations in their CVE interventions as well as foreign populations.

8.8 It was agreed that existing beneficiary countries should confer with incoming countries to exchange best practices and lessons learned in order to create a cycle of learning among country members.

8.9 The Executive Director clarified that the equal allocation of funding to GCERF's pilot beneficiary countries in 2015 was exceptional, and that there would be no expectation in future that the funding available from GCERF would be equally allocated within beneficiary countries.

8.10 The Executive Director, in agreement with Board members, advised that in future considerations for additional beneficiary countries will be made on a more strategic basis to align with the Board's priorities.

8.11 Following a number of comments, it was emphasized that approval of Kosovo as a beneficiary country would not equate with recognition of the independence of Kosovo by any government or international organisation sitting on the Board.

8.12 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.07:** The Board:

- a. approves Kenya, Kosovo and Myanmar as beneficiary countries;
- b. invites each of Kenya, Kosovo and Myanmar to occupy or join one of the five beneficiary country seats on the Board upon adjournment of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Board Meeting, and requests the Chair of the Board to manage the process; and
- c. requests the Secretariat to work with Kenya, Kosovo and Myanmar to implement the Core Funding Mechanism.

8.13 The Chair invited comments from the representatives of Kenya and Kosovo observing the Board meeting. Both representatives outlined the growing problem with violent extremism in their respective countries, and welcomed their new partnership with GCERF.

## 9. NEXT STEPS IN THE PROCESS: GRANT AGREEMENT DEVELOPMENT

9.1 The Executive Director presented the Next Steps in the Process: Grant Agreement Development (BM.03/DOC.04), which is the process in which the Secretariat works with the PPRs to develop grant agreements that address the various issues and conditions referred to in the Board decision on National Applications.

9.2 The key aspects of the GAD process include: development of grant agreement documents; refinement of projects based on organisational capacity; and strengthening their P/CVE focus. The Executive Director noted that where the Secretariat finds capacity gaps among the PPRs, then the risks will be assessed, and if deemed unmanageable or where there is a breach of the Code of Conduct, it can decline to continue the GAD process with a particular PPR.

### *Discussion*

9.3 One Board member requested further information on how recommendations from the CSMs and the IRP would be incorporated into the GAD process.

9.4 It was also requested that the CSMs provide the Board with more real-time feedback, and suggested that this could be accomplished through Board representation on the national CSMs and/or by establishing more systematic contact between the CSMs and Secretariat.

9.5 The Chair noted that the process will be accelerated if Board members can quickly inform the Secretariat of their availability for conference calls to take a Board decision on funding as the GAD process concludes satisfactorily in each case.

9.6 There was a question from one Board member on the allocation of funds in the event that the GAD process is discontinued with a PPR. The Secretariat clarified that in such cases, their allocated portion of funding can be redistributed to other PRs, or held back for the next round of funding within that country.

9.7 One Board member raised concerns about the proposal to reimburse potential Principal Recipients for costs incurred during the GAD. GCERF funding should seek, as far as possible, to directly reach the Sub-Recipients and avoid overhead costs at a PR level. The Secretariat clarified that the costs incurred would be consistently pre-approved and only be for costs related to managing a consortium such as transport and travel of PRs to locally-based SRs and their communities.

9.8 Following its discussion and a small amendment to the draft decision language, the Board took the following decision:

### **BM.03/DEC.08:** The Board:

- a. endorses the Grant Agreement Development (“GAD”) process, and authorises the Secretariat to reimburse expenses not exceeding an established funding ceiling, incurred by potential Principal Recipients during the GAD process, as detailed in Section 2 of BM.03/DOC.04;

- b. welcomes the Code of Conduct for Recipients of GCERF Funding establishing the principles and standards of conduct required of all recipients or potential recipients of GCERF funding, as detailed in Section 2 and attached as Annex 1 of BM.03/DOC.04; and
- c. requests the Secretariat to continue to consult with the Country Support Mechanisms and Independent Review Panel during the GAD process.

## 10. FINANCIAL MATTERS

### *Objectives of Financial Management*

10.1 Following introduction by the Executive Director, the Chief Finance Officer (“CFO”) summarized the paper on the Objectives of Financial Management at GCERF (BM.03/DOC.09).

10.2 The CFO referred to the statement in the Financial Management Policy, that it is “premised on the principle that GCERF funds shall be used in accordance with sound financial management principles, and in accordance with principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness”.

10.3 The proposed financial management objectives had been developed in consideration of stakeholders’ expectations. Defining these objectives was important to establish GCERF’s financial systems, policies and procedures both for general and grant financing. They would enable the Secretariat to provide necessary reporting and meaningful data to the Board. The ultimate purpose behind a financial management system is to ensure that entrusted public funds are invested in the right projects, with the right partners and address the right issues, while taking appropriate level of risk.

10.4 The CFO asked the Board to provide its feedback on the proposed objectives. Once these objectives are agreed upon, then critical success factors and indicators will be defined for each of them, allowing the tracking of progress in a systematic way.

### *Discussion*

10.5 The Board welcomed the development of financial management objectives and expressed gratitude to the Secretariat for developing them.

10.6 One Board member asked about the investment of funds to generate income. It was explained that a provision on investment is included in the Financial Management Policy, and any investment of funds held at the Secretariat level will have to be made very conservatively to avoid any loss.

### *Proposed Budget for 2016*

10.7 The CFO presented the proposed budget for 2016 (BM.03/DOC.10). The budget, for the first time presented with proposed grant expenses and revenues, was prepared on the basis of several assumptions, including the proposed plan for expansion of funding to existing and new beneficiary countries; related implications for resource mobilisation efforts, activities and staffing, and further organisational and system development; implementing the proposed modifications to the CFM; and the receipt of additional contributions in-kind, especially in terms of experts for the Operations team. No contingency provision was included.

10.8 The CFO noted that the Governance and Secretariat expenses were below the minimum 15% on contributions set in the Policy on Contributions. A three-year rolling forecast was used as a framework. The budget is results-based to the extent possible, and the Secretariat expenses were based on work plans elaborated by each function. Work plans, travel and other costs have been looked at carefully taking into consideration best value for money. The budget does not include a capital budget. The presentation of the budget was based on the accounting policies GCERF follows.

10.9 Overall, the proposed expense budget (USD 19.251 million) consisted of 95% cash and 5% in-kind contributions, and 75% of expenses were grant-related. Restricted expenses represented 37% of the proposed budget. The budget for grants was fully funded while half of the Secretariat budget was funded. 15% of the proposed expense budget was unsecure. The proposed revenue budget (USD 21.560 million) was 57% unsecure.

### *Discussion*

10.10 Board members expressed concern about the real availability of funding and the ambitious Secretariat budget. Board members cautioned against expansion in an environment when potential fund availability was uncertain.

10.11 The Board member from the European Union requested that the record note that approval of the budget, where projected revenue and expenses are indicated, does not presume any future funding decisions from the European Union.

10.12 The Executive Director confirmed that with the signing of the contribution agreement, the pledge of 2 million euro from the European Union had been converted to secured funding, and that this had been taken into account in the presentation.

10.13 The Board member for the Civil Society constituency offered to work with the Secretariat to further mobilise this constituency, and was grateful for the provision made for civil society in the governance portion of the budget.

10.14 The CFO noted that the Secretariat would take action if it sees a confirmed funding gap in 2016, however reminded the Board of the Secretariat's careful and cautious approach to expenditure in developing the budget for 2016. She reiterated the need for GCERF to spend cautiously.

10.15 The Secretariat urged the Board to consider secondment requests that were circulated in order to provide the Secretariat with specific expertise, noting that a position for PM&E specifically would be a full-time staff member contained within the Operations Unit.

10.16 There was discussion on the long-term growth strategy of GCERF, and whether it would be consistent with the initial proposal of raising USD 200 million within 10 years of existence. The Executive Director noted that GCERF's fundraising plan exceeds this goal, recognizing at the same time the need for judicious expansion.

10.17 Board members agreed that GCERF's success in continuing to raise funds would be depend on showing results from its grant portfolio.

10.18 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.09:** The Board:

- a. approves the 2016 budget contained in Table 1 of BM.03/DOC.10; and
- b. notes that the expense budget is only partially funded because a large proportion of the revenue presented in the budget has not been mobilised to date, and calls on existing and new donors to ensure that this occurs.

*External Audit Arrangements*

10.19 The CFO presented the paper on External Audit Arrangements (BM.03/DOC.11). She advised that the first external audit will be conducted at the end of March 2016 by PricewaterhouseCoopers, confirmed by the Board at the 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting.

10.20 The Board's decision confirming the appointment of the auditor expired on 31 March 2016, and an extension was required to allow the firm to present to the Board the results of the audit at the next face-to-face Board meeting in the second quarter of 2016.

10.21 Since external auditors report to the Board directly, it was important that the Board is satisfied with its performance and to the extent necessary, in future auditor's selection will follow an open competition. Large firms with a global reach will be approached; and as good governance a rotation system for auditor firms will be put in place. The performance of the external auditor will be evaluated on a yearly basis by GCERF. The audit term will be limited to 4 years.

10.22 One Board member noted their appreciation for an open tender competition for a future auditor.

10.23 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.10:** The Board:

- a. extends the mandate of PricewaterhouseCoopers as auditor for the period necessary to deliver and report to the Board on the 2015 audited financial statements; and
- b. endorses the principles for audit arrangements outlined in BM.03/DOC.11.

## **11. RESOURCE MOBILISATION STRATEGY 2016-2018**

11.1 The Executive Director presented GCERF's Resource Mobilisation Strategy for 2016-2018 (BM.03/DOC.12). He noted the challenging fundraising environment, highlighting the critical role of the Board in supporting the Secretariat's efforts. Support from the Board members is essential not only in providing financial support but also in identifying other potential sources of funding within their governments and introducing GCERF to potential donors.

11.2 The goal for 2016 is to raise USD 35 million to allow re-investment in Bangladesh, Mali, and Nigeria; a first round of investments in the new three countries; and coverage of the governance and Secretariat expenses.

11.3 The Executive Director noted that P/CVE is rising on the international political agenda, the increase in development assistance globally with non-OECD DAC members becoming increasingly important, a lack of dedicated funding on P/CVE, and a need to explore the potential to tap finances from the private sector.

11.4 The guiding principles of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy were highlighted, including political support, diversification of funding, accountability, transparency, and flexibility. Three strategic objectives were highlighted, namely strengthening relationships with existing donors, increasing and diversifying the donor base across both governmental and non-governmental funding sources, and developing internal capacity to mobilise resources and manage donor relations.

### *Discussion*

11.5 Board members praised the Secretariat for a comprehensive strategy, and agreed that the Board has an important role in resource mobilisation. At the same time, demonstrating the success of GCERF would be critical to ensure continued support from the existing donors.

11.6 Some Board members agreed that a bigger potential lies in development funding when dealing with government donors although there is a lot of pressure already on these funds. The ongoing discussion at the DAC on the nexus between security and development is important, and there was a suggestion to position the GCERF in the context of SDG 16 in reaching out to the development community.

11.7 The Board Member for Switzerland informed that Switzerland is planning to organise a conference in Geneva on the United Nations' Plan of Action on Preventing Violent Extremism, and this will be a good opportunity for GCERF to demonstrate its activities and try to mobilize financial support.

11.8 Several Board Members put forward ideas to increase support for GCERF for example by strengthening its branding; increasing the advocacy for the Fund through the creation of a P/CVE alliance; creating a strong networking mechanism to attract new donors; highlighting some concrete projects demonstrating GCERF's added value, and an overall focusing on better marketing.

11.9 GCERF needs to establish a truly viable private-public partnership by actively engaging the private sector and private foundations. Equally there was concern expressed about a growing fragmentation of CVE-related actors.

11.10 The Executive Director assured the Board that GCERF will develop a more systematic engagement with foundations and a strategy for engaging the private sector well as continued engagement with governments. He also stated that demonstrating impact is a long term challenge but next year GCERF will be able to show results by signing grant agreements, funding local initiatives that will make a difference, and demonstrating lessons learned.

## **12. REPORT OF THE ETHICS COMMITTEE**

12.1 One of the members of the Ethics Committee, Mr Daniel Frank, Alternate Board Member for Switzerland, provided the Board with the update on its activities (BM.03/DOC.13).

12.2 Following the approval of the Policy on Ethics and Conflict of Interest at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Board Meeting, the membership of the Ethics Committee was approved by the Board following a no objection process on 27 June 2015.

12.3 Mr Frank noted that declaration of interest forms had been submitted by all individuals covered by the Ethics Policy, and no conflict of interest had been declared and/or brought to the attention of the Ethics Committee. New declaration of interest forms will be sent out to the Board in January 2016 by the Ethics Officer.

### *Approval of Ethics Committee Chair*

12.4 The Terms of Reference of the Ethics Committee required the Board's approval of the Committee's chair. The committee requested the Board's approval of Ms Shawna Wilson of the United States constituency, who had been serving as acting chair.

12.5 The Board took the following decision:

**BM.03/DEC.11:** The Board appoints Ms Shawna Wilson of the United States constituency as chair of the Ethics Committee, until expiry of her term in accordance with the terms of reference of the committee.

## **13. UPDATE ON ACCELERATED FUNDING MECHANISM**

13.1 The Executive Director presented the Update on the Accelerated Funding Mechanism ("AFM") (BM.03/DOC.08), for which USD 920,000 in funding had been secured to date. The Board decision made at the 1<sup>st</sup> Board meeting requires USD 3.5 million to launch. The Executive Director presented the options for the AFM included in the paper, including the Secretariat's preferred option to re-orient the AFM.

13.3 The Executive Director suggested targeting AFM funding on displaced and mobile populations vulnerable to radicalization and recruitment. He urged the Board to take advantage of the current political climate, and expressed his belief that traditional and non-traditional donors would be interested in this approach.

#### *Discussion*

13.4 Opinions among the Board members on this issue were divided. Some expressed a preference to postpone any decision on the AFM and to focus on CFM implementation. Some raised concerns about the practical implementation of working in refugee camps and with mobile populations including interaction with the authorities and major international organisations. An alternative might be to inject AFM funding into the CFM in order to assist its full implementation.

13.5 Other Board members welcomed the proposal of AFM re-orientation towards displaced and mobile populations as an innovative response. There is strong evidence that such people are vulnerable and susceptible to radicalization. This focus would demonstrate that GCERF is topical and responsive, and could help with fundraising. Some suggestions included reframing AFM as a rapid response fund; initiating some cross-border work in the future if beneficiary countries share borders; and working on trauma healing in refugee camps.

13.6 The representative from the European Union noted that the funds from the European Union can only be used for projects outside the EU. Although the link between migration and violent extremism is a politically sensitive, this mechanism may have potential.

13.7 The Executive Director thanked Board members for their input and expressed his intention to continue developing the idea of the new focus for the AFM.

## **14. FINAL REMARKS**

14.1 The Executive Director thanked the Board for its work and decisions taken at the meeting allowing GCERF to begin negotiating grants agreements, delivering results and providing a better basis for fundraising. He thanked the Board Chair for her continuous support in fundraising, networking and political guidance. The Executive Director thanked the Secretariat for their hard work.

14.2 The Chair reminded the Board that according to Bylaws, the performance of the Executive Director should be reviewed by the Board on an annual basis. She advised that she will be contacting Board members about forming a small reference group for this task.

14.3 The Chair thanked the Board for their support as well as for its increased ownership and engagement; the Secretariat; the Chair of the IRP and all IRP members; observers; and the interpreter.

14.4 The Chair adjourned the meeting.

## BM.03/DOC.01: AGENDA

**TUESDAY 1 DECEMBER 2015**

**Location – Hotel N’vY, Sausalito Salles A+B, Rue de Richemont 18, Geneva, Switzerland**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
08:30 - 09:00	<b>Registration</b>		
09:00 - 09:15	<b>Welcoming Remarks</b>		Board Chair
09:15 - 09:30	<b>Preliminary Matters</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointment of Rapporteur</li> <li>• Approval of Agenda</li> <li>• Confirmation of new Board members</li> </ul>	DOC.01	Board Chair
09:30 - 10:15	<b>Report of the Executive Director</b>	DOC.02 (for information)	Executive Director
10:15 - 10:30	<b>Coffee break</b>		
10:30 - 12:45	<b>National Applications from Bangladesh, Mali and Nigeria: Funding Decisions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations and Decisions on National Applications</li> <li>• Next Steps in the Process: Grant Agreement Development</li> </ul>	DOC.03 (for decision) DOC.04 (for information and decision)	Executive Director / IRP Chair /Chief Operating Officer
12:45 - 14:00	<b>Lunch</b>		
14:00 - 15:30	<b>Proposed Modifications to the Core Funding Mechanism (CFM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Funding Mechanism: Country Funding Cycle</li> <li>• Core Funding Mechanism: Refinements</li> </ul>	DOC. 05 (for decision) DOC. 06 (for decision)	Executive Director / Chief Operating Officer
15:30 - 15:45	<b>Coffee break</b>		
15:45 - 17:15	<b>Growth Plans</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of the addition of 3 new beneficiary countries for the CFM</li> <li>• Update on the Accelerated Funding Mechanism</li> </ul>	DOC.07 (for decision) DOC.08 (for information)	Executive Director
17:30	<b>Reception</b>		

**WEDNESDAY 2 DECEMBER 2015**

**Location – Hotel N’vY, Sausalito Salles A+B, Rue de Richemont 18, Geneva, Switzerland**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
09:00 - 10:00	<b>Financial Matters</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Objectives of Financial Management</li><li>• Proposed Budget for 2016</li><li>• External Audit Arrangements</li></ul>	DOC.09 (for input) DOC.10 (for decision) DOC.11 (for decision and input)	Chief Financial Officer
10:00 - 10:15	<b>Coffee break</b>		
10:15 – 12:00	<b>Resource Mobilisation Strategy 2016-2018</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Presentation of Strategy</li></ul>	DOC.12 (for information)	Executive Director
12:00 - 13:30	<b>Lunch</b>		
13:30 - 13:45	<b>Report of the Ethics Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approval of Chair</li><li>• Status update</li></ul>	DOC.13 (for decision and information)	Chair of Ethics Committee
13:45 - 14:30	<b>TBD/Any other business</b>		



**3<sup>rd</sup> Board Meeting  
1-2 December 2015  
Geneva, Switzerland**

**ATTENDANCE LIST**

**CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

Ms Carol Bellamy

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**Australia and New Zealand**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Miles Armitage, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism and Assistant Secretary, Counter-Terrorism Branch, Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Canberra

**Constituency Member:** Ms Alexandra Reuhman, Policy Adviser, Permanent Mission of New Zealand to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Mr Ian McConville, Counsellor (Disarmament Affairs), Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

**Bangladesh**

**Alternate Board Member:** H.E. Mr M. Shameem Ahsan, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

**Canada and United Kingdom**

**Board Member:** Ms Sue Breeze, Head of Equalities & Non Discrimination Team, Human Rights and Democracy Department, Foreign & Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

**Alternate Board Member:** Ms Nell Stewart, Director, Capacity Building Program Division, Non-Proliferation and Security Threat Reduction Bureau, Global Affairs Canada, Ottawa

**Constituency Members:** Mr Alastair King-Smith, Head of International Counter Extremism, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, London

H.E. Mr Mark Matthews, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Mr Ian Duddy, Political Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

### **Civil Society**

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

---

### **European Union**

**Board Member:** Mr Adriaan van der Meer, Head of Unit, Instrument Contributing to Stability and Peace – Global and Transregional Threats, European Commission, Brussels

**Constituency Member:** Ms Maria Sanchez, Programme Manager, DEVCO Fragility Unit, European Commission, Brussels

---

### **Foundations**

**Board Member:** Ms Angela Salt, Executive Director, Tony Blair Faith Foundation, London

**Constituency Member:** Ms Naureen Fink, Head of Research and Analysis, Global Center on Cooperative Security, New York

---

### **Mali**

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Amadou Opa Thiam, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Mali to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

### **The Netherlands (Constituency to be determined)**

H.E. Mr Piet de Klerk, Ambassador and Special Counterterrorism Envoy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the Hague

Mr Maurice Paulussen, First Secretary, Political Affairs, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

### **Nigeria**

**Board Member:** H.E. Ms Nonye Udo, Ambassador and Director, Second United Nations Division, International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Abuja

---

### **Policy. Think and Do Tanks**

**Board Member:** Mr Maqsoud Kruse, Executive Director, Hedayah, Abu Dhabi

---

**Alternate Board Member:** Mr Mark Singleton, Director, International Centre for Counter-Terrorism  
– The Hague

---

**Private Sector**

**Board Member:** Dr Tim Docking, Leader, Global Post and Emerging Markets Funding Group, IBM,  
Washington, D.C.

---

**Qatar**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Mutlaq Al-Qahtani, Ambassador and Director of International Organizations  
Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

**Constituency Member:** Ms Noor Al-Sada, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the State of Qatar  
to the United Nations Office, Geneva

---

**Switzerland**

**Board Member:** H.E. Mr Stephan Husy, Ambassador and Coordinator for International Counter-  
Terrorism, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Bern

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

---

**United States of America**

**Alternate Board Member:** Dr Raffi Gregorian, Director, Office for Multilateral Affairs, Bureau of  
Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

**Constituency Member:** Mr Irfan Saeed, Director, CVE, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

---

**PRESENTER**

Ms Humera Khan, Executive Director, Muflehun, and Chair of Independent Review Panel,  
Washington, D.C.

## **OBSERVERS**

### **Czech Republic**

Mr Daniel Míč, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Ms Denisa Machačková, Associate, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Egypt**

Mr Mohamed Elmolla, Counselor, Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Mr Mohamed Elshahed, Counselor (Human Rights), Permanent Mission of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **France**

Mr Jean-Noel Ladois, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Mr Achille Despres, Associate, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Germany**

Mr Axel Kuechle, Counsellor (Humanitarian Affairs, IHL), Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations Office, Geneva

Ms Lena Zagst, Legal Trainee, Migration and Humanitarian Affairs, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Indonesia**

Dr Petrus R. Golose, Deputy Head for International Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

Mr Yanuar Lutfi, Director for International Convention and Resolution, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

Mr Herry Sudradjat, Director for Regional and International Cooperation, National Counter Terrorism Agency (NCTA), Jakarta

### **Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)**

H.E. Mr Mokhtar Omar, Ambassador and Senior Adviser, Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), Geneva  
Ms Flavia Ganarin, Executive Office, Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), Geneva

### **International Organization of la Francophonie (OIF)**

Mr Bakary Junior Bamba, Advisor on Human Rights, Peace and Security issues, Permanent Delegation of the International Organization of la Francophonie to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Italy**

Mr Daniele Borrelli, Counsellor, Directorate General for Political Affairs and Security, Office III, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of Italy, Rome

### **Japan**

Ms Natsuko Wada, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

### **Kenya**

H.E. Mr Andrew Kihurani, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Kosovo**

Ms Garentina Kraja, Adviser to President, Office of the President of Kosovo, Prishtina

### **Morocco**

Mr Amine Chabi, Minister Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Morocco to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Norway**

Ms Beate Gabrielsen, Senior Adviser, Legal and Financial Section, Department for Security Policy and the High North, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo

### **Russia**

Mr Daniil Mokin, Head of Division, Department for New challenges and Threats (DNCT), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Moscow

Mr Andrey Vlasov, Third Secretary (Humanitarians and Human Rights), Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Spain**

Mr Diego Ruiz Alonso, Deputy Head of International Terrorism Unit, Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain, Madrid

### **Tunisia**

Mr Slim Ghariani, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Tunisia to United Nations Office, Geneva

### **Turkey**

Ms Müge Ant, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Turkey to United Nations Office, Geneva

### **United Arab Emirates**

Mr Abdulrahman Alneyadi, Head of Section, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi

### **Staff members of GCERF's Secretariat**