

REPORT OF THE 20th BOARD MEETING

The 20th Meeting of the Governing Board (the Board) of the Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF) was held on 25–26 June 2024 in Geneva, Switzerland, and featured a high-level event titled “Emptying the camps in Northeast Syria: Reducing the Threat of Terrorism”. The approved agenda (Annex 1) and participants list (Annex 2) are attached.

1. WELCOMING REMARKS

1.1. The Chair of the Governing Board, Mr Stefano Manservigi, opened the meeting by welcoming both in-person and virtual participants.

1.2. The Chair acknowledged the current threats to multilateralism but highlighted GCERF’s success as a multilateral institution centred on shared objectives. He noted that the global environment continues to be particularly conducive to violent extremism (VE) and stressed the need to turn the discussions of the meeting into action. In addition, he emphasised the importance of fundraising for GCERF, noting the organisation’s high return on investment in comparison with others in the same field.

Preliminary Matters

1.3. The Chair introduced the list of decisions to be passed by silent agreement (without discussion), to which there were no objections, and announced that the confirmation of new Board Members (BM.20/DEC.03) would take place on the second day of the meeting after scheduled discussions among constituencies.

1.4. The Board took the following decisions:

BM.20/DEC.01: Mr Eelco Kessels of the Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency is appointed as the Rapporteur of the 20th Board meeting.

BM.20/DEC.02: The agenda for the 20th Board meeting (BM.20/DOC.01) is approved.

2. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

2.1. The Chair invited the Executive Director (ED), Dr Khalid Koser, to present his report (BM.20/DOC.02).

Opening Remarks

2.2. The ED thanked the Chair and the Board for their commitment to GCERF and their participation in the 20th Board Meeting. He extended special gratitude to the Board Member for Kosovo, who is also the country's Minister of Internal Affairs, for his attendance, to the Secretariat's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) for their assistance in preparing for the meeting, and to the rest of the Secretariat for their hard work.

Report of the Executive Director

2.3. The ED noted that GCERF would celebrate its ten-year anniversary in 2024, marking this milestone as an opportunity for modest celebration of GCERF's successes as the organisation looks to the future.

2.4. The ED stated that GCERF, focused on the controversial topic of funding civil society to prevent violent extremism (PVE) and operating in often-complicated locations, was established under a framework that is challenging to multilateralism. Yet the organisation has delivered remarkable progress towards its goals.

2.5. GCERF has unrivalled impact and expertise in preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE), operating in 22 countries and directly reaching 3.8 million beneficiaries, with 116 grants signed and 356 local partners. With the Board's approval, GCERF is planning to expand its operations in Central Asia to include Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, and in the Gulf of Guinea to include Benin and Togo.

2.6. The ED acknowledged the Board Member for Bangladesh, noting that the country has become the first to graduate from GCERF's grant support. He explained that GCERF's grant support is intended to be temporary, aiming to bridge funding gaps and foster cooperation between governments and local civil society for the sustainability of PVE efforts in the long run. Although there are no active grants in Bangladesh, the country remains a valued member of the GCERF community, and GCERF will return if requested. Additionally, an independent evaluation will be commissioned a year after the conclusion of grants to assess the scope of GCERF's impact.

2.7. Speaking on GCERF's impact, the ED stated the GCERF has provided alternatives to violent extremism to populations at risk of radicalisation and has contributed to a reduction in the number of terrorists around the globe. GCERF provides sustainability over short-term alternatives, with the average grant length being 31 months, and boasts a high return on

investment at just USD 40 per direct beneficiary. Beyond grant making, GCERF has positioned itself as a thought leader in PVE, a global advocate for PVE as a global public good, and an expert in community resilience. It has also pioneered the inclusion of civil society in high-level discussions on PVE.

2.8. Several countries around the globe, including some of GCERF's partner countries, are facing an unprecedented level of threat of VE. Meanwhile, donor countries are grappling with financial restrictions and internal political pressure that challenges multilateral efforts like those of GCERF. As a result, the international community has failed to prioritise PVE on its political agenda despite its increasing relevance, and a competing agenda is emerging.

2.9. The ED noted that between 2019–2024, GCERF doubled its number of active grants as well as tripled its number of partner countries and direct beneficiaries, but its budget increased by only 30 percent, while operating expenses remained below the Board-approved level of 15 percent. He urged the Board to allow GCERF to take greater risks and hold greater ambition while stressing the importance of burden and risk-sharing for greater returns on investment.

2.10. The ED also highlighted GCERF's focus on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) through a three-stage plan for the Secretariat, grantees, and the Board, with an emphasis on mental health.

2.11. Outlining the meeting agenda, the ED underscored the importance of support from donor and partner countries in the Replenishment Campaign (BM.20/DOC.04); reported no conflicts of interest as confirmed by the Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) (BM.20/DOC.05); commended the transparent Results Update (BM.20/DOC.06) and progress reported in developing the 2025–2028 Strategy (BM.20/DOC.07); and highlighted opportunities provided by constituency meetings. He also remarked on the limited future budget and clean audit reported in the financial papers (BM.20/DOC.08, BM.20/DOC.09, BM.20/DOC.10, and BM.20/DOC.11) and programmatic developments, including updates on the Global Action Platform (GAP), Carol Bellamy Leadership Award (CBLA), pilot initiative in Northeast Syria, as well as assessments on the opportunities to work in Afghanistan and Ukraine (BM.20/DOC.12).

2.12. Lastly, the ED encouraged Board members to focus on broader issues during the meeting, including GCERF's future strategy, current funding disparities, and the prospect of working in contentious areas.

Discussion

2.13. The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

2.14. The Board expressed its appreciation for the detail in the ED Report and congratulated GCERF on its ten-year anniversary and the Constituency Member for Mozambique for its Independence Day on 25 June.

2.15. Speaking for the Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency, the Board Member expressed excitement about the introduction of a new constituency member from the Global Action Platform (GAP) to represent civil society. He noted changes in the landscape of VE since GCERF's founding, including a shift away from the singular focus on Islamic extremism as well as growing frustrations due to the restrictions placed on civil society organisations (CSOs) and greater budget emphasis on militarisation to address VE. Given these developments, he recommended that GCERF joins CSOs, universities, and think tanks in rethinking P/CVE.

2.16. Several Board Members expressed their congratulations to Bangladesh for graduating from GCERF. Speaking for the Private Sector and Foundations constituency, the Board Member inquired if there were metrics demonstrating GCERF's long-term impact in Bangladesh to present to current and potential donors. Speaking for Bangladesh, the Board Member expressed pride in becoming the first country to graduate from GCERF and detailed GCERF's comprehensive efforts in P/CVE in the country. He noted that thanks to GCERF's assistance, Bangladesh is no longer among the top 30 countries in the Global Terrorism Index. Despite graduating, Bangladesh intends to maintain its partnership with GCERF.

2.17. Speaking for Tunisia, the Board Member requested follow-up of the role of the Africa Group of Friends, which was launched at the 19th Board Meeting.

2.18. Several Board members representing partner countries – including the Board Members for Kenya and Kosovo; the Alternate Board Members for Ghana and Iraq; and the Constituency Members for Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mozambique, and Niger – expressed their appreciation for GCERF's work in their countries and noted their respective progress in P/CVE. Several Board members representing partner countries also praised GCERF's efforts in Rehabilitation and Reintegration (R&R) and looked forward to further discussion at the high-level event on the topic.

2.19. The Board expressed its appreciation of GCERF's focus on DEI and mental health and requested further detail on the DEI approach with local partners, with specific statements from the Board member for New Zealand, the Alternate Board Member for the United Kingdom, and the Constituency Member for Denmark

2.20. The Board Members for Kosovo and the United States of America respectively suggested that GCERF place greater emphasis on addressing far right extremism.

2.21. The Board discussed whether GCERF should target areas with specific demand or continue its broad approach. Board Members also reiterated the necessity of advocating for GCERF and its work in their home countries.

2.22. The Chair thanked all for their interventions and emphasised the necessity of discussing PVE and its changing nature. Addressing the question posed by the Board Member for Tunisia on the Africa Group of Friends, the ED stated there would be attempts to revitalise and maintain the group for assistance with the upcoming Second Replenishment Campaign. GCERF's Head of Portfolio Management and Deputy ED, Dr Lilla Schumicky-Logan, addressed specific questions about GCERF's online and local DEI initiatives.

Annual Report

2.23. The Board passed the following decision through silent agreement, to which there were no objections:

BM.20/DEC.04: The Board approves the 2023 Annual Report of Activities contained in Annex 1 to BM.20/DOC.03 for submission to the Swiss Supervisory Authority for Foundations.

3. SECOND REPLENISHMENT CAMPAIGN

3.1. The ED introduced the discussion on the Second Replenishment Campaign (BM.20/DOC.04) by stating that most large global funds operate on replenishment cycles and that GCERF is transitioning to this model, and now launching its second campaign.

3.2. Drawing from the lessons learned during GCERF's first Replenishment Campaign, the ED proposed two replenishment cycles within a four-year strategy (BM.20/DOC.07), allowing for a midterm review. In line with this proposal, he announced that GCERF is launching its second Replenishment Campaign, which will conclude with a pledging/replenishment conference scheduled for Q1 2025 in a host state to be confirmed. Advanced discussions

are underway with Germany to host a pledging conference. The campaign aims to raise USD 80m for the two-year period covering 2025–2026.

3.3. The ED emphasised that GCERF is doing everything possible to accommodate donors, including accepting earmarked funding and single-year commitments, and permitting donors who have not funded GCERF to remain on the Board for two years following their last donation provided they commit to making a contribution at the end of the hiatus.

3.4. The ED detailed the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in facilitating the second Replenishment Campaign, including those of the host country, donors, partner countries, non-governmental Board constituencies, and the Secretariat. He stated that the Secretariat would develop a case for investment document, which stakeholders can share with policymakers to demonstrate GCERF's successes and mobilise donations. He also celebrated the pledges received from five GCERF partner countries as significant both practically and symbolically.

Discussion

3.5. The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

3.6. Speaking for Germany, the Alternate Board Member expressed regret over the inability to announce a final decision on hosting the second Replenishment Conference, explaining that the delay is due to ongoing government negotiations on the national budget. They encouraged fellow Board Members to begin mobilising resources for the replenishment campaign with urgency and suggested that GCERF seek contributions not only from regular donors but also from non-traditional sources such as the private sector.

3.7. Speaking for the Private Sector and Foundations constituency, the Board Member expressed the desire to become a greater partner with GCERF during the second Replenishment Campaign. He highlighted his representation of GCERF at the Mining Indaba Conference in February 2024 in Cape Town. He also announced plans to organise an event with the African Union in 2025 following the second Replenishment Conference that will stress the importance of investing in P/CVE to mining corporations. He noted that the energy and mining industries would be more interested in partnerships on locations that directly affect them, suggesting that the replenishment campaign should focus on these individual partnerships. Speaking for Ghana, the Alternate Board Member expressed enthusiasm for further cooperation with the private sector and the mining industry.

3.8. Board Members emphasised the importance of effectively conveying GCERF's goals and narrative. They suggested highlighting the relatively low cost and high efficiency of GCERF's work. In addition, donor countries encouraged partner countries to directly approach them and make their cases for increased investment.

3.9. Speaking for the United Kingdom, the Alternate Board Member questioned discussing the replenishment campaign before finalising a long-term organisational strategy.

3.10. Speaking for Italy, the Constituency Member asked for clarification on how GCERF managed to balance between earmarked and non-earmarked funding.

3.11. The Chair thanked all for their interventions. In response to the question from the Alternate Board Member of the United Kingdom, the ED clarified that although the meeting agenda placed the discussion on the second Replenishment Campaign before the 2025-2028 Strategy, the latter would be implemented first. Addressing the question from the Constituency Member for Italy, GCERF's Head of Finance and Compliance, Mr Nicolas Ferigoule, noted that the ratio of earmarked to unearmarked funding has increased significantly over the years. This shift has challenged GCERF's agility and flexibility. He added that GCERF is working with donor countries to loosen restrictions and facilitate work in important locations where donor enthusiasm is lower.

4. GOVERNANCE AND ETHICS COMMITTEE REPORT

4.1. The Chair of the Board introduced the Chair of the GEC, Mr Anthony Carroll, and invited him to present the Governance and Ethics Committee Report (BM.20/DOC.05).

4.2. The Chair of the GEC presented the key points of the report, updating the Board on changes in GEC membership and noting the proposed extension of his term. In terms of ethics matters, he reported that no conflicts of interest had been declared since the last Board meeting through the Declaration of Interest process. On governance matters, he reported on the establishment of an ad hoc Strategy Working Group at the Board level, and the Secretariat's launch of a Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH) Policy as part of its larger DEI Framework. He also mentioned the extension of the 'grace' period for donors represented at the Board to two years. Lastly, he welcomed the announcement that the Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency had extended its membership to include a rotating, non-voting representative from the GAP, further bringing the perspectives of community partners to the Board.

4.3. The Board passed the following decision through silent agreement, to which there were no objections:

BM.20/DEC.05: The Board:

- a. extends the term of the current Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee, **Mr Anthony Carroll**, for a one-year period until end of June 2025;
- b. approves the appointment of **Mr Fulco Van Devender**, as Chair of the Governance and Ethics Committee for a two-year period, beginning on 1 July 2025 until end of June 2027;
- c. notes the resignation of **Ms Margarita N. Gutierrez** of the Philippines as a member of the Governance and Ethics Committee, and thanks her for her service; and
- d. approves the appointment of **Ambassador Hema Kotecha** of the United Kingdom as a member of the Governance and Ethics Committee.

5. RESULTS UPDATE

5.1. The Chair of the Board invited the Head of Performance and Impact (P&I), Dr André Alves dos Reis, to present the Results Update (BM.20/DOC.06).

5.2. The Head of P&I stated that the Result Update demonstrates that GCERF has matured as an organisation, with tremendous progress in functionally achieving its programmatic mandate. He highlighted the relatively positive Third Party Monitoring (TPM) assessments conducted on programmes in Kenya and North Macedonia. He also detailed the progression of GCERF's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process, describing it as integrated, innovative, and influential.

Discussion

5.3. Multiple Board Members commended the Head of P&I for the Results Update and asked follow-up questions. Speaking for Finland, the Alternate Board Member asked about women-led initiatives and why the term "gender norms" was used in the TPM of Kenya. The representative of Finland also asked about challenges GCERF has faced reaching specific groups. Speaking for the Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency, the Alternate Board Member inquired about the trends and developments in M&E data.

5.4. The Head of P&I addressed the Board Members' inquiries, explaining that local expectations often exclude women from participating in sports and other activities, resulting in fewer opportunities for GCERF to engage with them and causing gender disparity in results. He noted that countries often take a securitised approach to returnees, making them

less accessible in places like North Macedonia. However, progress has been made, and positive results in partner countries have led to others inviting GCERF to work with these scrutinised groups.

5.5. Discussing trends in PVE data, the Head of P&I noted an increased focus on the intersection of PVE with other fields, including intercommunal violence. He also highlighted that community resilience capacity-building programmes in countries like Nigeria and Bangladesh have helped local communities address additional issues, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and electoral violence.

5.6. Speaking for the Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks constituency, the Alternate Board Member suggested emphasising to donors the importance of GCERF's work in capacity building of local CSOs. This includes their capacity to manage funds and work with their communities on topics beyond PVE.

5.7. Speaking for Tunisia, the Board Member noted that although GCERF's work has made a strong and tangible impact on PVE overall, some programmes have limited data and seemingly immeasurable results. She inquired about how to measure the social impact of these results as well as the research and social science methods GCERF will incorporate in future programmes and policies to better capture the extent of this impact.

5.8. The Head of P&I acknowledged the limitations that GCERF faces as an organisation whose mandate is to provide and manage grants. He explained that GCERF's research is focused on operational aspects, aiming to identify and solve problems to enhance programmes. He also highlighted efforts to measure community resilience. He concluded by emphasising GCERF's adaptability in its M&E approach, adopting available quantitative and qualitative methods.

5.9. The Chair thanked all for their interventions and praised the Head of P&I for his work and his answers. He emphasised the importance of credible and tangible results and commended GCERF's ability to adapt its programmes in response to its results.

6. NEW GCERF STRATEGY (2025-2028)

Opening Remarks

6.1. The Chair passed the floor to the ED to introduce the discussion on the steps that GCERF is taking to develop its new global strategy for 2025-2028 (BM.20/DOC.07).

6.2. The ED announced that GCERF is developing its third strategy internally, building on lessons learned from previous strategies, with a focus on broad stakeholder consultation. The 2025–2028 Strategy will be presented to the Board for approval at the November 2024 meeting and launched on 1 January 2025, in time for the Q1 2025 Replenishment Conference. The strategy will serve as a crucial basis for the Replenishment Conference.

6.3. The ED passed the floor to the Head of P&I as well as the Deputy Executive Director and Head of Portfolio Management, Dr Lilla Schumicky-Logan, to outline the steps in the strategy development process.

New GCERF Strategy (2025–2028)

6.4. The Head of P&I took the floor, announcing that as part of the consultations in developing the 2025–2028 Strategy, the Secretariat launched an online survey to gather information from grantees, members of Country Support Mechanisms (CSM), National Advisors, the Independent Review Panel (IRP), the Board, and the Secretariat.

6.5. The Head of P&I reported that although the sample size of the survey was rather small, the data showed some commonalities across the various respondent groups, which increased confidence in the results. One commonality was satisfaction with GCERF’s vision (88–100 percent of respondents) and mission statements (94–100 percent of respondents). Another was on GCERF’s added value, with the organisation’s community-based approach consistently ranked among the top three contributing factors. Other facets identified as significantly contributing to GCERF’s added value included long-term investment, a bottom-up approach, capacity strengthening, collaboration, and expertise.

6.6. In terms of the topics on which GCERF should focus over the next strategy period, the most popular response across the board was R&R. Other focus topics varied depending on the stakeholders. The Board, IRP, and CSM members emphasised a focus on PVE and local governance as well as intercommunal conflict. The Secretariat, National Advisors, and grantees emphasised a focus on PVE and climate change as well as online radicalisation and artificial intelligence (AI). Other popular topics among respondents included PVE in educational settings (PVE-E), imprisonment, and national action plans (NAPs).

6.7. The Head of P&I announced that the Secretariat would follow up the survey with focus group discussions (FGDs) among various stakeholders.

Discussion

6.8. The Head of P&I passed the floor to the Deputy ED, who solicited the Board's views on the following questions to guide the strategy development process:

- I. Localisation is a key aspect of GCERF's work. Should GCERF use this approach for community resilience building in areas where VE is less visible?
- II. Are there any geographic areas that should be considered for the next four years?
- III. Should GCERF focus on branding and communication about community-based P/CVE as part of its strategy?
- IV. Should GCERF focus more on innovation? What does it mean in the P/CVE context?
- V. What role should GCERF play in advocating for PVE as a global public good?

6.9. The Deputy ED added that the final step of concluding the 2021-2024 Strategy will be launching an external evaluation of GCERF's performance against the key performance indicators (KPIs) under all previous strategies. This evaluation will help consolidate best practices and lessons learned to be used in developing the 2025-2028 Strategy.

6.10. Several Board Members commended the Secretariat and the ad hoc Strategy Working Group for the inclusive and consultative process in developing GCERF's next four-year strategy. The Board Member for Tunisia requested detailing process steps and their results in the final document. The Board Member for Japan emphasised maintaining open discussions and clear communication on the feedback window. The Alternate Board Member for the Philippines called for the process to be open to all interested stakeholders.

6.11. Several Board members also commented on the consultation survey results. Regarding GCERF's vision and mission statements, the Alternate Board Member for Germany stressed maintaining GCERF's focus on P/CVE and leveraging its unique expertise. Similar remarks were made by the France, Denmark and Italy constituency as well as the Alternate Board Member for Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks, with France encouraging further integration of action on the gender and human rights dimensions. In contrast, the Alternate Board Member for the United Kingdom proposed rearticulating GCERF's purpose within the current global context.

6.12. The Board Member for Niger emphasised prioritising community resilience, while the Alternate Board Member for Switzerland cautioned that community resilience might be too broad an entry point and PVE too narrow. In addition, he raised a question on whether the

pre-requisite of ideologically motivated violence for GCERF's interventions could be supplemented by the notion of "extreme violence" as an entry point for GCERF.

6.13. The Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks Board Member expressed concerns about GCERF being co-opted by state security arrangements, recommending a conflict transformation theory of change (TOC) and the maintenance of relative independence, with significant core and unearmarked funding as well as a broad portfolio.

6.14. In response to question (I) from the Deputy ED, the Board Member for Kenya commented that localised PVE programming should not be restricted to communities that have directly experienced VE. Other communities, especially those that might not have experienced VE but are aware of it, should also be included in such programming. This approach allows for effective prevention by supporting in-built community resilience mechanisms, including strong capacities for VE early warning. The Constituency Member for Albania shared similar views.

6.15. In response to question (II) from the Deputy ED, several Board Members, including members of the Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Finland-; the European Union-; Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks-; as well as the France, Denmark and Italy-constituencies spoke in support of a cautious approach to expansion, focusing on consolidating programmes and deepening GCERF's expertise. They also spoke in favour of strategic entry into countries in Central Asia, the Sahel, and the Gulf of Guinea as well as developing clear exit strategies for new partner countries. The Board Member for the United States gave similar remarks. While acknowledging these concerns, the Board Member for Private Sector and Foundations highlighted the need for expansion to develop the skills set required to engage with a wider range of stakeholders, including actors in the mining sector. The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland highlighted the importance of GCERF being visible in relation to the world's most pressing issues that are relevant to for the exercise of its mandate without overextending its capacity.

6.16. Most Board Members concurred with the need for improved branding and communication for stronger visibility and engagement with a wider range of stakeholders, including donors. The Alternate Board Member for the United Kingdom emphasised the need to adjust GCERF's narrative to allow room for work in a broad range of new and innovative topics, including AI. Recommendations included a stronger social media presence, evaluating communication strategies of similar organisations, conducting communication campaigns at the Secretariat and localised intervention levels, and increased presence in the United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU). While

acknowledging the need for stronger visibility, the Board Member for the United States stressed the need for sensitivity, especially for politically complex programmes such as the one in Northeast Syria.

6.17. Board Members encouraged work in innovation, especially that related to AI technology, online spaces, and digital knowledge-sharing platforms. The Board Member for the United States as well as the Constituency Members for Italy and Finland suggested work on online radicalisation while the Constituency Member for Albania proposed the establishment of a closed platform for engagement between partner countries.

6.18. Several Board Members suggested increasing advocacy efforts, especially through multilateral frameworks such as the UN and EU. The Alternate Board Member for Germany urged GCERF to enhance its role as a thought leader in PVE. The Alternate Board Member for Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks, emphasised the need for GCERF to advocate more for PVE investments and civil society engagement to influence politics, policymaking, and donor decisions, while cautioning against exploiting grantees and beneficiaries for fundraising and stressing that the Do No Harm principle is upheld. The Board Member for the United States remarked that stronger advocacy on PVE would be beneficial but should not be GCERF's primary focus.

6.19. In response to interventions from the floor, the Deputy ED reported that GCERF is in the process of acquiring observer status from the UN, but any additional help is welcome. GCERF is already working with several UN agencies on the ground, including the UN Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT) in Nigeria, Kenya, and Somalia; UN Development Programme (UNDP) in capacity-building for community-based integration; and UN International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) in Kyrgyzstan. She also announced that the Secretariat would launch an interactive platform under the GAP framework for all grantees to share best practices, lessons learned, and challenges with one another.

6.20. The Head of P&I expounded on the next steps of the strategy development process, noting that the upcoming evaluation of GCERF's performance against strategy KPIs will culminate in the development of a short report with synthesised information on GCERF's impact and lessons learned over the years. The report will also serve as a useful communication document. In response to the intervention made by the Philippines, he stated that consultations were not restricted to certain groups. Nevertheless, stakeholders were categorised for a cohesive narrative on survey results.

7. FINANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT

7.1. The Chair passed the floor to the Acting Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC), Mr Craig Bennett, to present the FAC Report (BM.20/DOC.08).

7.2. Joining the meeting virtually, the Acting Chair of the FAC announced that his predecessor, Ambassador Cleopa Mailu, had retired from his role and thanked him for his work in establishing the Committee.

7.3. The Acting Chair of the FAC provided an overview of the report, stating that the Committee held a formal meeting in June 2024 to review the Audited Financial Statements, which demonstrated GCERF's sound financial management. Therefore, the Committee endorsed the Audited Financial Statements (BM.20/DOC.09/ANNEX.01)

7.4. The Committee also reviewed the internal control system (BM.20/DOC.10), funding situation (BM.20/DOC.11), and Revised Budget for 2024, all of which it endorsed. He emphasised the need for additional multi-year and unrestricted funding for the organisation's flexibility.

7.5. Lastly, the Acting Chair of the FAC updated the Board on Committee membership, highlighting the need for more additional members.

7.6. With no questions or objections, the Board took the following decision:

BM.20/DEC.06: The Board:

- a. notes the resignation of **Ambassador Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu**, Kenya constituency, as chair and member of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC), and thanks him for his service;
- b. notes the resignation of **Mr Fahad Jassim Al-Dehaimi** from the Qatar constituency (Qatar Fund for Development - QFFD) as a member of the FAC, and thanks him for his service;
- c. approves the appointment of **Ms Fatima Abdulla AL-Abdulmalek** from the Qatar constituency (QFFD) as a member of the FAC in accordance with the terms of reference of the committee; and

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

8. FINANCIAL MATTERS

8.1. The Chair introduced the Head of Finance and Compliance, Mr Nicolas Ferigoule, to present the 2023 Audited Financial Statements (BM.20/DOC.09), Internal Control System (BM.20/DOC.10), and Funding Situation (BM.20/DOC.11).

8.2. The Head of Finance and Compliance highlighted GCERF's high performance of as a fund, noting a record number of grants signed in the final quarter of 2023 and efficient management of 52 active grants. GCERF spent 95 percent of its 2023 budget, demonstrating a prudent budget monitoring system. The organisation continues generating economies of scale, maintaining the proportion of operating expenses at 13 percent of the budget. While grant commitments and active grants increased by 30 and 50 percent respectively between 2022 and 2023, Secretariat expenses have increased by only 18 percent. The organisation is enhancing risk management with a new and more flexible Corporate Risk Register and a Crisis Management Plan. The Secretariat has conducted three training sessions on risk management in 2024.

8.3. The Head of Finance and Compliance also highlighted the financial challenges that GCERF is facing. He noted a significant decrease in contributions since 2022, with repercussions that will become evident in 2024 and 2025. Budget reviews have reduced operating expenses from 17 to 15 percent, and several recruitments have been postponed. There is concern that donor requirements may drive decision-making rather than the Board strategy. Projected funds available for 2025 are USD 10 million while costs are expected to amount to USD 40 million, prompting discussions about scaling back geographical coverage. He emphasised the need for multi-year and unearmarked funding for GCERF's successful functioning.

Discussion

8.4. The Chair opened the floor for questions and interventions.

8.5. The Board Member for the EU announced plans for a new grant to be signed by the end of the year, with an anticipated contribution of EUR 8 million, although the specific amount allocated to GCERF is yet to be decided.

8.6. While noting the positive results of GCERF's work in their countries, the Alternate Board Member for Burkina Faso, and the Constituency Members for Albania and Mali emphasised the continued need for GCERF's support to prevent radicalisation and the spread of VE.

8.7. In light of the above discussions, the Board adopted the following decisions:

BM.20/DEC.07: The Board approves the 2023 financial statements prepared in accordance with the IFRS for SMEs in US Dollars and in Swiss Francs (CHF).

The Board requests the Secretariat of GCERF to discuss another mandate for the period 2024–2027 only with the auditor BDO SA.

BM.20/DEC.08: The Board approves the internal control measure currently in place. It requests the Secretariat to continue developing and operating the internal control system based on the principles and approach described in the document BM.20/DOC.10.

BM.20/DEC.09: The Board:

- a. appreciates the work of the Finance & Audit Committee (FAC) for its thorough review of the revised 2024 budget and notes its endorsement;
- b. approves the revised 2024 budget as follows:
 - Expenses: USD 30.5m.

9. PROGRAMMATIC MATTERS

9.1. The Chair invited the Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management to present on programmatic matters, including the Country Investment Strategy for Indonesia (BM.20/DOC.13), IRP Update (BM.20/DOC.14), and Portfolio Update (BM.20/DOC.12).

Country Investment Strategy for Indonesia

9.2. Upon invitation by the Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management, a representative of the National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (BNPT) presented the Country Investment Strategy for Indonesia (BM.20/DOC.13).

9.3. The BNPT representative expressed interest in GCERF's support throughout Indonesia and highlighted a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach in the Strategy. He also welcomed donor commitments to support PVE efforts in the country.

Discussion

9.4. The Chair opened the floor for questions and interventions.

9.5. Board Members congratulated Indonesia on its Investment Strategy, with the Alternate Board Member for Somalia looking forward to its own Investment Strategy to be approved at the November 2024 Board Meeting. The Alternate Board Member for Civil Society and Policy, Think and Do Tanks stressed the importance of engagement with local CSOs and understanding their contexts of operation, including the limitations they face, while the Private Sector and Foundations Board Member emphasised engagement with private sector actors. The Board Member for New Zealand reported efforts to seek funding in support of the Investment Strategy.

9.6. The Board took the following decision:

BM.20/DEC.10: The Board:

- a. approves the GCERF Country Strategy for Investment in Indonesia as detailed in BM.20/DOC.13/ANNEX 1; and
- b. requests the Secretariat to proceed with grant-making at a value of up to USD 7 m.

IRP Update

9.7. Noting the need for additional expertise on Indonesia and Africa at the IRP, the Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management proposed the addition of two new members with expertise and experience on these matters.

9.8. The Board took the following decision:

BM.20/DEC.11: The Board:

- a. approves the appointment of the following additional experts to the IRP until 31.12.2027:
 1. ANWAR, Mr Deka;
 2. LYANMOURI, Mr Ryda;
- b. confirms that the following members are serving on the IRP panel:

Second and final term:

 3. CHRISTIAN LEKE, Mr Achaleke until 31. 12. 2026;

4. ROURE, Ms Maud until 31. 12. 2026;

First term:

1. DANZIGER, Mr Richard, until 31. 12. 2026;
2. GLAZZARD, Dr Andrew, until 31. 12. 2024;
3. MALEFAKIS, Dr Medinat until 31. 12. 2024;
4. MALET, Dr David until 31. 12. 2024;
5. JRAD, Ms Eya until 31. 12. 2025;
6. LAMALAN, Ms Fatima Star Usman until 31. 12. 2025;
7. SANS, Ms Gazbiah until 31. 12. 2026;
8. RAVNKILDE, Mr Adam until 31. 12. 2025;
9. SAMPSON, Mr John until 31. 12. 2025.

Portfolio Update

9.9. The Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management passed the floor to her Deputy to present a number of updates on GCERF's portfolio.

9.10. The Deputy Head of Portfolio Management reported on several key initiatives. The pre-departure project in Northeast Syria has engaged various stakeholders and completed a baseline survey and risk matrix update, identifying 71 women and 149 children in al-Roj Camp in need of support. The project, initially scheduled for one year, seeks additional funding to extend support in al-Roj and increase beneficiary numbers. There is also interest in expanding operations to al-Hawl camp, potentially facilitating transfers from al-Hawl to al-Roj for safe repatriation.

9.11. Accountability surveys over three years have revealed that over 30 percent of GCERF's grantees received additional PVE funding with GCERF's support. Grantees reported high levels of satisfaction with gender principles, PVE expertise, and assistance in M&E. In response to 88 percent of grantees requesting a knowledge-sharing platform, GCERF will launch an online GAP platform in July 2024, involving 350 grantees across six PVE thematic working groups. The success of the R&R working group is the basis of the high-level event on "Emptying the Camps in Northeast Syria: Reducing the Threat of Terrorism."

9.12. Additionally, the Carol Bellamy Leadership Award (CBLA), which supports women's leadership in PVE, providing USD 2,000 per awardee, plans to expand support to local initiatives in all partner countries.

9.13. The Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management outlined measures to ensure the sustainable transition of PVE programmes in Bangladesh previously supported by GCERF, promoting continued engagement post-graduation.

9.14. The Deputy ED / Head of Portfolio Management revisited discussions on PVE programming in Afghanistan. Recent developments in Afghanistan prompted the Secretariat to seek a review about opportunities and challenges to engage in PVE programming. The assessment was led by the IRP Chair, who made two key recommendations on the matter: Firstly, it is crucial for GCERF to operate in the environs of Afghanistan. Secondly, it is possible for GCERF to work in Afghanistan through a pilot project on PVE.

9.15. The IRP Chair highlighted the evolving international engagement with Afghanistan's *de facto* authorities over the past two years, despite the absence of formal recognition. He noted that the increased attacks by IS-K abroad, the risk of radicalised migrants from Afghanistan, and worsening climate risks support the timing for GCERF's reassessment on engagement.

9.16. The IRP Chair advised proceeding with P/CVE engagement, noting precedents and the *de facto* authorities' interest in reducing IS-K recruitment.

9.17. Following a request from the Government of Ukraine for GCERF's support during the 19th Board Meeting, the Institute of Economics and Peace (IEP) assessed GCERF's potential added value in the country. The assessment reviewed Ukraine's standing on eight pillars of positive peace and its links to resilience against violent extremism. The assessment found that prior to the full-scale Russian invasion in 2022, Ukraine showed positive progress across most of the pillars of positive peace, but standing on some indicators had already begun deteriorating between 2020 and 2022. The invasion significantly worsened Ukraine's standing on positive peace pillars, including distribution of resources, high level of human capital, free flow of information, sound business environment, and good relations with neighbours.

9.18. The assessment also identified 36 ongoing programmes by various international and local organisations in Ukraine, focusing on positive peace pillars and areas relevant to GCERF's mandate. It highlighted gaps in programmes addressing free flow of information, relations with neighbours, and trade facilitation. While social cohesion and community agency initiatives are prominent, programmes focusing on socioeconomic opportunities, sense of purpose, and veteran integration are limited. Furthermore, there is need for localisation of programmes to address contextual differences across the country.

9.19. From its assessment, the IEP suggests that the most value GCERF could add to Ukraine would come from programming that focuses on localisation and resilience building, human capital development, as well as addressing disinformation for social cohesion.

9.20. The Board Chair noted, that in addition to the request for support from the Government of Ukraine during the 19th Board Meeting, GCERF received a letter of request from the Deputy Foreign Minister of Ukraine the previous day

Discussion

9.21. The Chair opened the floor for questions and interventions.

9.22. Board Members commended the progress made in the Northeast Syria project and gave suggestions on its next steps. The Alternate Board Member for Germany suggested conducting a feasibility study before expanding to al-Hawl camp while the Board Member for Tunisia sought further information on the beneficiary selection criteria, requesting that all children in al-Roj camp be supported. The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland requested clarification on whether the project's expansion would involve only geographical broadening or also include the broadening of activities, emphasising the need for close supervision from the Project Advisory Steering Group (PASG). The Board Member for the United States commended the project as a valuable learning experience but cautioned against expanding into al-Hawl camp due to increased risks, suggesting a focus on improving returnee transfers to al-Roj camp instead.

9.23. Most Board Members were not in a position to comment on the prospect of GCERF programming in Afghanistan. The Alternate Board Member Germany cited concerns about collaborating with *de facto* authorities, which could imply recognition of the Taliban regime. The Board Members for France, Germany, and Tunisia opposed engagement due to the Taliban's violations on human, women's, and children's rights. The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland echoed these concerns, stating that it is not feasible for GCERF to work in Afghanistan without collaborating with the Taliban regime.

9.24. In contrast, the Board Member for Qatar supported programming in Afghanistan to address the challenges faced by the people, emphasising the possibility and importance of engagement without political recognition. The Board Member for Civil Society and Policy, Think, and Do Tanks stated that the policy of isolation towards Afghanistan is unsustainable and stressed the need for engagement to provide practical support to communities without recognising the Taliban. The Board Member for the European Union agreed that

programming in Afghanistan could be symbolically valuable but added that GCERF should clarify that its objective is not to demonstrate the Taliban's commitment to P/CVE and echoed the concerns stated by Germany and Switzerland.

9.25. Board Members had mixed views on GCERF programming in Ukraine. The Alternate Board Members for Germany and Qatar suggested focusing GCERF's limited resources elsewhere, as violent extremism is not a primary issue in Ukraine. The Board Members for France and the European Union echoed these sentiments, noting that the current focus in Ukraine is on the reintegration of displaced persons rather than the reintegration of demobilised veterans. Furthermore, the Board Member for the United States noted the existence of other organisations better suited for programming in Ukraine. The Alternate Board Member for Switzerland emphasised the need to demonstrate a clear "case" for GCERF's engagement in Ukraine, based on its funding mechanisms and suggested aligning efforts with GCERF's PVE mandate, for example in relation to disinformation that can lead to violent extremism.

9.26. Board Members expressed general support for GCERF's ongoing projects. The Board Member for Chad expressed gratitude for recent PVE grants and supported the establishment of a CSM in 2024 for improved national follow-up. The Board Member for Yemen thanked GCERF for its impactful projects, highlighting strong engagement and consultations with the Minister of Planning and International Cooperation.

10. CONFIRMATION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS

10.1. The Chair requested approval of the following decision, confirming changes to the membership of the Board (postponed from the first day of the meeting).

BM.20/DEC.03: The Board notes the following change in its membership (each without signatory authority) since the 19th Board meeting:

- **Australia, Japan, and New Zealand**: Ambassador Paula Wilson replaces Mr Koichi Warisawa as the Board member;
- **Australia, Japan, and New Zealand**: Mr Koichi Warisawa replaces Ambassador Jeffrey Roach as the Alternate Board member;
- **Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Philippines**: Ambassador Tareq Md Ariful Islam replaces Ambassador Mohammad Sufiur Rahman as the Board member;
- **Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Philippines**: Mr Oscar Valenzuela replaces Ms Margarita Gutierrez as the Alternate Board member;

- **Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger:** Ambassador Laouali Labo replaces Minister Madeleine Alingué as the Board member;
- **Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger:** Ms Sanogo Mariam Tounkara replaces Mr Saleck Ould Mohamed Ainatt as the Alternate Board member;
- **Germany, Netherlands, Norway, and Finland:** Ms Anka Feldhusen replaces Ms Naomi Yorks as the Board member;
- **Germany, Netherlands, Norway, and Finland:** Ambassador Päivi Kairamo replaces Ms Anka Feldhusen as the Alternate Board member;
- **Qatar:** Ambassador Faisal Al-Henzab replaces Ambassador Mutlaq Al-Qahtani as the Board member.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

11.1. The Chair opened the floor for remarks on any other business.

11.2. The Alternate Board Member for Denmark announced that this would be his last meeting with GCERF as he will move on to another role. He expressed gratitude to the Secretariat and bid farewell to the Board and the Chair.

11.3. Speaking in favour of programming in Afghanistan, the Constituency member of Kyrgyzstan highlighted a joint roadmap between the EU and Central Asia, launched in December 2023, facilitating joint action regarding Afghanistan. He mentioned that the UN Special Rapporteur on Women and Girls encourages GCERF's assistance to Afghan non-governmental organisations (NGOs). He echoed remarks by Qatar and Civil Society and Policy, Think, and Do Tanks, stating that engagement with Afghan NGOs will not necessarily legitimise the Taliban regime.

11.4. The Chair emphasised GCERF's commitment to staying informed and engaged with global developments, as demonstrated by the assessments of Afghanistan and Ukraine. He stressed maintaining this engagement within GCERF's mandate, acknowledging diverse viewpoints but noting a lack of consensus. He highlighted requests for timely distribution of papers and better organisation of agenda items to allow sufficient discussion time for critical issues. In addition, he called to attention the financial constraints faced by GCERF, which have impacted the Secretariat's work, resulting in the postponement of several activities.

11.5. The Chair offered to hold an online mid-term meeting before Autumn 2024 if needed and noted upcoming UN events as opportunities to showcase GCERF's added value and boost the organisation's branding on a global stage.

11.6. The Chair adjourned the meeting.

**ANNEX 1
BM.20/DOC.01: AGENDA**

TUESDAY 25 JUNE 2024

Meeting Room C1, Petal 5, Maison de la Paix, Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2E, CH-1202 Geneva.

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Morning Coffee | | |
| 09:15 – 09:30 | Preliminary Matters | | Board Chair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of Rapporteur • Approval of Agenda • Confirmation of New Board Members | DOC.01 (for decision) * ¹ | |
| 09:30 – 10:30 | Report of the Executive Director | DOC.02 (for discussion) | Executive Director |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Plan • 2023 Annual Report | DOC.03 (for decision) * | |
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | Second Replenishment Campaign | DOC.04 (for discussion) | Executive Director / Head of Resource Mobilisation |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Buffet Lunch | | |
| 13:00 – 13:15 | Governance and Ethics Committee (GEC) Report | DOC.05 (for decision) * | Chair of the GEC |
| 13:15 – 13:45 | Results Update | DOC.06 (for discussion) | Head of Performance and Impact |
| 13:45 – 15:15 | New GCERF Strategy (2025–2028) | DOC.07 (for discussion) | Executive Director |
| 15:15 – 15:30 | Coffee Break | | |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | Presentation by DALIL, AI Project | | Selected by the Paris Peace Forum |
| 16:00 – 17:00 | Constituencies' Meeting | | Board members |
| 17:00 – 18:30 | Reception | | |

¹ Decisions with an asterisk (*) will be adopted without discussion if there are no objections before the commencement of the Board meeting.

WEDNESDAY 26 JUNE 2024

Meeting Room C1, Petal 5, Maison de la Paix, Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2E, CH-1202 Geneva.

| Time | Topic | Document | Presenter |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) Report | DOC.08 (for decision) | Acting Chair of the FAC |
| 09:15 – 09:45 | Financial Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2023 Audited Financial Statements Internal Control System Funding Situation | DOC.09 (for decision) * DOC.10 (for decision) * DOC.11 (for decision) * | Head of Finance and Compliance |
| 09:45 – 10:45 | Programmatic Matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portfolio Update Indonesia Country Investment Strategy IRP Update | DOC.12 (for discussion) DOC.13 (for decision) DOC.14 (for decision) * | Deputy Executive Director |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Any Other Business | | Board Chair |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | Coffee Break | | |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | High-Level Event – “Emptying the Camps in Northeast Syria: Reducing the Threat of Terrorism”² | | Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP) |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | Lunch & Networking | | |

² See attached concept note.

ANNEX 2
PARTICIPANTS LIST (*attending virtually)

GOVERNING BOARD CHAIR

Mr Stefano Manservigi

BOARD MEMBERS

Australia, Japan, and New Zealand

Board Member: H.E. Ms Paula Wilson, Ambassador for Counter-Terrorism, Head, International Security and Disarmament Division, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade, Wellington

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

Constituency Members:

Australia: H.E. Ms Emily Roper, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Ms Ayano Hashimoto, Deputy Director, International Safety and Security Cooperation Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Tokyo

Mr Craig Bennett,* Head of Audit and Risk Division, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and Acting FAC Chair, Wellington

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and North Macedonia

Board Member: H.E. Mr Xhelal Sveçla, Minister of Internal Affairs of Kosovo, Pristina

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

Constituency Members:

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

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

Mr Mensur Hoti, Director of Department for Public Safety, Ministry Internal Affairs of Kosovo,
Pristina

Ms Jeta Tela, Chief of Staff, Cabinet of the Minister, Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kosovo,
Pristina

Ms Aulona Bytyqi, Executive Assistant, Cabinet of the Minister, Ministry of Internal Affairs of
Kosovo, Pristina

Mr Willier Hugo, Permanent Mission of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations Office
in Geneva

Bangladesh, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, and the Philippines

Board Member: Ms Shanchita Haque, Minister, Deputy Permanent Representative and
Chargée d'affaires a.i. on behalf of H.E. Mr Mohammad Sufiur Rahman, Ambassador and
Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the
United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: Mr Romeo Benitez, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior
and Local Government of the Philippines (DILG) on behalf of Mr Oscar Valenzuela,
Undersecretary, Department of the Interior and Local Government of the Philippines (DILG),
Manila

Constituency Members:

Kyrgyzstan: H.E. Mr Omar Sultanov, Ambassador and Permanent Representative,
Permanent Mission of the Kyrgyz Republic to the United Nations in Geneva, Embassy of the
Kyrgyz Republic to Switzerland

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

Md. Abdullah Al Forhad, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Bangladesh to the United
Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Aidyn Seidakhamatov, Attaché, Permanent Mission of the Kyrgyz Republic to the United
Nations Office in Geneva, Embassy of the Kyrgyz Republic to Switzerland

Ms Anita Sofiana, Policy Analyst, National Counter Terrorism Agency of the Republic of
Indonesia (BNPT), Jakarta

Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger

Board Member: H.E. Mr Laouali Labo, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Niger to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: Ms Sanogo Mariam Tounkara, Director General of Religious, Customary and Traditional Affairs, Ministry of Territorial Administration, Decentralization and Security of Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou

Constituency Members:

Chad: Mr Soumaine Moussa, Ministry for Economy, Development Planning and International Cooperation of the Republic of Chad, N'Djamena

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

Civil Society, Policy, Think and Do Tanks

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

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

Constituency Member: Ms Eijnxh Peppa, Co-Chair of the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Returnees from Northeast Syria to the Western Balkans Working Group, Global Action Platform (GAP)

European Union

Board Member: Ms Maria Rosa Sabbatelli, Head of Unit, FPI.1 –Peace and Stability – Global Threats, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), European Commission, Brussels

France, Denmark, Italy, and Sweden

Board Member: Ms Amélie Delaroche, Deputy Head, Counter Terrorism and Organized Crime Department, Strategic, Security and Disarmament Directorate, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs of France, Paris

Alternate Board Member: Mr Christian Bunk Fassov, Counterterrorism Coordinator, Department of Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Copenhagen

Constituency Members:

Italy: Mr Alberto Dal Degan, First Counsellor – Head of Office, Office for Transnational Threats and Integrated Strategies, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Rome

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

Germany, Netherlands, Norway, and Finland

Board Member: Janna Lisa Chalmovsky, Desk Officer, Cluster Transnational Organized Crime & Instability, P/CVE and Terrorism, Division S03 Crisis Prevention, Stabilization, Peacebuilding, Federal Foreign Office on behalf of Ms Anka Feldhusen, Director for Civilian Crisis Prevention and Stabilisation, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Ms Päivi Kairamo, Ambassador for Counterterrorism Cooperation, Legal Service, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki

Constituency Members:

The Netherlands: Mr Hein-Peter Knegt, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Norway: H.E. Mr Knut Langeland, Ambassador and Special Envoy for the Sahel, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo

Kenya, Mozambique, and Somalia

Board Member: Dr Rosalind Nyawira, Director, National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC) on behalf of H.E. Dr Cleopa Kilonzo Mailu, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Kenya to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Alternate Board Member: Mr Abdullahi Mohamed Nor, Director General, Tubsan National Centre for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism; Senior Advisor to the President of the Federal Government of Somalia, Mogadishu

Constituency Members:

Mozambique: H.E. Mr Geraldo Gonçalves Miguel Saranga, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Mozambique to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Jacinto Lapido Loureiro, President of the Executive Committee, Integrated Development Agency for the North of Mozambique (ADIN), Pemba

Mr Haggai Mario Quissimuço Maunze, Coordinator of the Management Unit of Economical Programmes, ADIN, Pemba

Ms Rukia Ahmed, Head of Programmes and Partnerships, Tubsan National Centre for Preventing and Countering Violent Extremism, Mogadishu

Nigeria and Ghana

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

Alternate Board Member: Mr Edward Asomani, National Security Coordinator, Ministry of National Security of the Republic of Ghana, Accra

Constituency Members:

Ms Oghoritsewarami Mattu, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to the United Nations Office in Geneva

Mr Prince Osei-Tutu, Director, Human Security, Ministry of National Security of the Republic of Ghana, Accra

Private Sector and Foundations

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

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

Qatar

Board Member: H.E. Mr Faisal Abdullah Al-Henzab, Ambassador and Special Envoy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar for Counterterrorism and Mediation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

Constituency Member: Mr Ghanem Al-Marri, Counsellor, Office of the Special Envoy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar, Doha

Switzerland

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

Tunisia and Iraq

Board Member: Ms Neila Feki, Vice-President, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

Alternate Board Member: Mr Ali Abdullah Abbas Al-Bdair, Head of the National Committee to Combat Extremism, Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) of the Republic of Iraq, Baghdad

Constituency Member: Ms Sonia Abbassi, Permanent Secretary, National Counter Terrorism Commission of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis

United Kingdom and United States of America

Board Member: Dr Sharri R. Clark, Deputy Director for CVE, Bureau of Counterterrorism (CT), U.S. Department of State on behalf of D.C. Mr Ian Moss, Deputy Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Alternate Board Member: H.E. Ms Hema Kotecha, Ambassador and Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva

Constituency Member: Mr Will Robey, Drivers of Terrorism Hub Team Leader, Counter Terrorism Department, National Security Directorate, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, London

Yemen: Dr Nazar Abdullah Nasser Basuhaib, Vice Minister of Planning and International Cooperation of the Republic of Yemen, Aden

OBSERVERS

Benin

Mr Eric Kossi Agossounon, Secretary General of the Ministry of the Interior and Public Security of the Republic of Benin, Cotonou

Belgium

Mr Koen Van Acoleyen, Minister Counsellor – Head of Cluster Development, Humanitarian Aid and Migration, Health and Environment, Permanent Representation of Belgium to the United Nations in Geneva

Poland

Mr Łukasz Różycki, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the UN Office at Geneva

Sri Lanka

Mr Sanjeewa Wimalagunawardhana,* Director General, National Secretariat for NGOs of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Mr Chatura Perera,* Director, International Security Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Ms Kokila Gunasoma,* Staff Officer, National Intelligence Division, Ministry of Defence of Sri Lanka, Colombo

Tajikistan

Mr Parviz Emomov, Personal Assistant to the Ambassador/Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Tajikistan to the United Nations Office in Geneva

European Union Advisory Mission In Iraq

Mr Adam Ravnkilde, Senior Strategic Adviser, Preventing & Countering Violent Extremism; Member of the Independent Review Panel, Baghdad

Ms Marwa Dallyousif, National Language Officer, Baghdad

The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IIJ)

Mr Steven Hill, Executive Secretary,* The International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IIJ), Malta

Mr Reinhard Uhrig,* Director, Administration and Outreach, IIJ, Malta

Institute for Economics & Peace (IEP)

Mr Steve Killelea, Founder and Executive Chairman, IEP, Sydney

Ms Katya Demushkina, Deputy Director Europe & MENA region, IEP, Brussels

Independent Review Panel (IRP)

Mr Richard Danziger, IRP Chair

Qatar Fund for Development (QFD)

Ms Shamsa Abdulla Al Falasi,* Strategic Partnerships Development Officer, QFD, Doha

UNDP

Dr Glaucia Boyer, Global Advisor and Focal Point on Reintegration-DDR-PRR, Recovery Solutions and Human Mobility Team, Crisis Bureau, United Nations Development Programme

GCERF Secretariat

ANNEX 3

GCERF High-Level Event on

“Emptying the Camps in Northeast Syria: Reducing the Threat of Terrorism”

26 June 2024 at 11:30 – 13:00

Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2D, Geneva

AGENDA

11:30 – 11:35

Opening Remarks

Mr Stefano Manservigi, Chair of the GCERF Governing Board

11:35 – 11:40

Introduction

Mr Ian Moss, Deputy Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Bureau of Counterterrorism, U.S. Department of State (video statement)

Mr Ali Abdullah Abbas Al-Bdair, Head of the National Committee to Combat Extremism, Office of the National Security Adviser (ONSA) of the Republic of Iraq

11:40 – 12:30

Emptying the Camps in Northeast Syria: Reducing the Threat of Terrorism

Panel discussion on the obstacles to maintaining momentum on returns from Northeast Syria, and how to resolve them. The discussion aims to bring together different perspectives – states that have returned nationals and those that are unwilling to; learns lessons on what does and does not work in rehabilitation and reintegration; and chart concrete steps towards emptying the camps.

Moderator: Dr Khalid Koser, Executive Director, GCERF

H.E. Mr Xhelal Sveçla, Minister of Internal Affairs of Kosovo

Mr Peter Wagner, Director and Head of the European Commission Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI)

Colonel Adylbek Kadyraliev, Deputy Head, Anti-Terrorism Centre of the State Committee for National Security of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan (joining online)

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

12:30 – 12:45

Civil Society Discussion

Introduction of two guidance documents by local civil society organisations supported by GCERF:

- Case-management-based approaches for people returning from Northeast Syria and Iraq to the Western Balkans
- Community-based integration, which can support mass returns through community engagement, for example in Mali, Burkina Faso, Yemen, and Somalia.

Moderator: Mr Eelco Kessels, Executive Director, Global Center on Cooperative Security

Ms Eijnxh Peppa, Co-Chair of the Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Returnees from Northeast Syria to the Western Balkans Working Group of the Global Action Platform

Dr Lilla Schumicky-Logan, Deputy Executive Director and Head of Portfolio Management (Programme) Unit, GCERF

12:45 – 12:55

Interventions from the floor

12:55 – 13:00

Closing Remarks

H.E. Ambassador Thomas Greminger, Director, Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP)

13:00 – 14:00

Lunch & Networking

Context

The global environment is more conducive to violent extremism today than at any point since the Arab Spring. ISIS-K is demonstrating its global ambition, the ongoing crisis in Gaza risks radicalizing a generation of youth, the Sahel is at a tipping point, while around 45,000 former terrorist fighters and their families remain in camps in Northeast Syria. In different ways these present intractable challenges: confronting ISIS-K requires engaging with the Taliban authorities, a lasting ceasefire in Gaza is distant, the Sahel is in a political vacuum.

Of all the global pressure points on violent extremism, evacuating the camps in NE Syria may be the most achievable. There is rare consensus between security, development and human rights perspectives, and across bi-partisan lines, that a lasting solution is required for the former terrorist fighters and their families still residing in the camps in Northeast Syria.

There has been progress (17.2. percent reduction in the population): an increasing number of countries are returning at least family members, and the international community is mobilising to support return, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

But this progress risks stalling, as some countries continue to resist calls to return their nationals, and others that have returned family members are far more reluctant to return men who are often held in prisons serving their long sentences with no prospect of return. The unintended consequence of returns to date may be to leave in the camps the very people most likely to be at risk of radicalisation and recruitment by terrorist groups, without the mitigating effect of family and community and with dwindling prospects.

This panel is intended to provide a clear-eyed, empirically-driven, and non-adversarial analysis of the obstacles to maintaining momentum on returns from Northeast Syria, and how to resolve them. It aims to bring together different perspectives - states that have returned nationals and those that are unwilling to; learn lessons on what does and does not work in rehabilitation and reintegration; and chart concrete steps towards emptying the camps.

Within this framework, two major guidance documents will be launched by prominent members of local civil society organisations supported by GCERF: One on case-management-based approaches for people returning from Northeast Syria and Iraq to the Western Balkans, and the second on community-based integration, which can support mass returns through community engagement, for example in Mali, Burkina Faso, Yemen, and Somalia.