

PBF June 2026 Project Progress Report



PROJECT OVERVIEW

Thank you for taking the time to complete the PBF Progress report. For projects with more than one recipient, please consult among co-recipients prior to filling out the form to ensure collaboration on the responses. If you have any questions or require technical assistance in filling out the form, please send an email to gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Click Next below to start

» Report Submission

Type of report	*
☒ Semi-annual	
☐ Annual	
☐ Final	
☐ Other	
Date of submission of report	*
2026-06-15	
Name and title of person submitting the report	*
Cecilia Able-Thomas, Monitoring and Evaluations Analyst	
E-mail of person submitting the report	*
cecilia.able-thomas@undp.org	
Name and title of person who approved the report	*
Evelyn Edroma, evelyn.edroma@undp.org	

Have all fund recipients for this project contributed to the report?

*

☒ Yes

☐ No

Did PBF Secretariat or RCO focal point review the report?

*

You should normally ensure that the PBF Secretariat or the PBF focal point have an opportunity to review.

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Applicable

» Project Information and Geographical Scope

Is this a cross-border project?

*

☐ Yes ☒ No

Please select the geographical region in which the project is implemented

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| ☐ Asia and the Pacific | ☐ Central & Southern Africa | ☐ East Africa |
| ☐ Europe and Central Asia | ☐ Global | ☐ Latin America and the Caribbean |
| ☐ Middle East and North Africa | ☒ West Africa | |

Country of project implementation

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ☐ Benin | ☐ Burkina Faso | ☐ Cote D'Ivoire |
| ☒ Gambia | ☐ Ghana | ☐ Guinea |
| ☐ Guinea-Bissau | ☐ Liberia | ☐ Mali |
| ☐ Mauritania | ☐ Niger | ☐ Nigeria |
| ☐ Senegal | ☐ Sierra Leone | ☐ Togo |
| ☐ Other, Specify | | |

Other, please specify

Project Title

- ☐ 00130106: Promoting peace and social cohesion through provision of mental health services and psychosocial well-being of SGBV survivors in The Gambia
- ☐ 00120496: Strengthening Community Access to Justice, Community Policing and Effective SGBV Response
- ☐ 00119440: Strengthening community coping mechanisms against risks of climate induced conflicts and to minimize gender related vulnerabilities and tensions in The Gambia
- ☐ 00119603: Strengthening inclusive citizen engagement for more accountable governance in The Gambia
- ☐ 00129530: Support to the implementation and monitoring of the Truth, Reconciliation and Reparations Commission (TRRC) recommendations in The Gambia
- ☐ 00124863: Young women and men as stakeholders in ensuring peaceful democratic processes and advocates for the prevention of violence and hate speech
- ☐ 00134234: Support to a PBF Secretariat in The Gambia to enhance coordination and peacebuilding impact
- ☐ 00134329: Strengthening the National Infrastructure for Peace to Promote Social Cohesion in The Gambia
- ☐ 00140137: Strengthening Civil Society Organizations to promote gender equality and women's empowerment through implementation of the Action Plan on UNSCR 1325 and the TRRC White Paper Recommendations
- ☐ 00140643: Empowering Communities in The Gambia to prevent mitigate and resolve land related conflicts exacerbated by climate change
- ☐ 00140771: Empowering Marginalized Young People for Inclusion in Civic Space and Local Infrastructures for Peace
- ☒ 00141024: Sustaining The Gambia's peaceful transition by supporting implementation of the Security Sector Reform Strategy
- ☐ Other, Specify

Write the 8 digit MPTFO number and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document

EXAMPLE: 00118938: Community-based prevention of violence and social cohesion using innovation for young people in displaced and host communities

Please select the geographical region(s) in which the project is implemented *

If the project you are looking for does not appear in the following question, please make sure that you have selected the correct regions. A limited number of cross border projects span multiple geographic regions. For example, a cross border project between Niger and Chad spans both West Africa and Central & Southern Africa

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| ☐ Asia and the Pacific | ☐ Central & Southern Africa | ☐ East Africa |
| ☐ Europe and Central Asia | ☐ Global | ☐ Latin America and the Caribbean |
| ☐ Middle East and North Africa | ☐ West Africa | |

Please select the title of the project for which you are submitting the report *

Write the 8 digit MPTFO numbers and Project Title exactly as it appears in the Project Document *

EXAMPLE: 00129699/700: Supporting Cross-Border Cooperation for Increased Community Resilience and Social Cohesion in The Gambia and Senegal

Please select the countries where this project is being implemented *

Other, Please specify *

Project Start Date (Date of first transfer) *

2025-01-30

Project End Date *

2028-01-29

Has this project received an extension? *

- ☐ YES, Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, No Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- ☒ NO, No Extensions

Will this project be requesting an extension? *

- ☐ YES, Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, No Cost Extension
- ☐ YES, Both Cost and No Cost Extensions
- ☒ NO, No Extensions

Will this project be submitting a Fund Transfer Request (FTR) in the next six months? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If so, around which month do you expect to submit the request? *

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ☐ January | ☐ February | ☐ March |
| ☐ April | ☐ May | ☒ June |
| ☐ July | ☐ August | ☐ September |
| ☐ October | ☐ November | ☐ December |

Is the current project end date within 6 months? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

Is funding disbursed either into a national or regional trust fund? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select which *

- ☐ National Trust Fund
- ☐ Regional Trust Fund

Recipients

Is the convening agency a UN agency or a non UN entity? *

- ☒ UN entity
- ☐ Non-UN Entity

Please select the convening agency recipient *

- ☒ UNDP: United Nations Development Programme ☐ IOM: International Organization for Migration
- ☐ UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
- ☐ OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- ☐ UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- ☐ UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ☐ UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund
- ☐ FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization ☐ WFP: World Food Programme
- ☐ UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme
- ☐ UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- ☐ UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme ☐ ILO: International Labour Organization
- ☐ WHO: World Health Organization ☐ PAHO/WHO
- ☐ UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund ☐ UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- ☐ UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services
- ☐ UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization ☐ ITC: International Trade Centre
- ☐ UNDPO ☐ Other, Specify

Other, Please specify

*

Are there other recipients for this project?

*

- ☐ No other recipients
- ☒ Yes, other UN recipients only
- ☐ Yes, other non-UN recipients only
- ☐ Yes, both UN and non-UN recipients

Please select other UN recipients

*

Select all that apply

- ☐ UNDP: United Nations Development Programme ☐ IOM: International Organization for Migration
- ☐ UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
- ☒ OHCHR: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
- ☐ UNWOMEN: United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
- ☐ UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees ☐ UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund
- ☐ FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization ☐ WFP: World Food Programme
- ☐ UNHABITAT: United Nations Human Settlements Programme
- ☐ UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- ☐ UNEP: United Nations Environment Programme ☐ ILO: International Labour Organization
- ☐ WHO: World Health Organization ☐ PAHO/WHO
- ☐ UNCDF: United Nations Capital Development Fund ☒ UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- ☐ UNOPS: United Nations Office for Project Services
- ☐ UNIDO: United Nations Industrial Development Organization ☐ ITC: International Trade Centre
- ☐ UN Department of Peace Operations ☐ Other, Specify

Other, Please specify

*

Please select other non-UN recipients

*

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| ☐ ACTED | ☐ Action Aid UK | ☐ AAITG (ActionAid the Gambia) |
| ☐ AEDE | ☐ African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) | |
| ☐ Agence de Coopération et de Recherche pour le Développement (ACORD) | | |
| ☐ American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) | ☐ Avocats Sans Frontières | |
| ☐ Avocats Sans Frontières Belgium | ☐ Avocats sans frontières Canada | ☐ Ayuda en Accion |
| ☐ BIRN - Balkan Investigative Reporting Network | ☐ BIOM -Youth Ecological Movemen | |
| ☐ CARE International UK | ☐ Centre d'étude et de coopération internationale (CECI) - BF | |
| ☐ Christian Aid Ireland | ☐ COIPRODEN | ☐ Concern Worldwide |
| ☐ Conexion Guatemala | ☐ COOPI - Cooperazione Internazionale | ☐ CORD Burundi |
| ☐ CORDAID | ☐ Corporacion Sisma Mujer | ☐ CRS - Catholic Relief Services |
| ☐ DanChurchAid | ☐ Danish Refugee Council | ☐ EQUITAS |
| ☐ Fund for Congolese Women | ☐ Fundacion Estudios Superior (FESU) | ☐ Fundación Mi Sangre (FMS) |
| ☐ Fundación Nacional para el Desarrollo de Honduras (FUNADEH) | ☐ Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa (FLIP) | |
| ☐ Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) | ☐ HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation | |
| ☐ Humanity & Inclusion (HI) | ☐ ICTJ (International Center for Transitional Justice) | |
| ☐ Instituto Holandes para Democracia Multipartidaria (NIMD) | ☐ Integrity Watch | |
| ☐ International Alert | ☐ International Rescue Committee | ☐ Interpeace |
| ☐ Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation | ☐ Life and Peace Institute (LPI) | |
| ☐ MDG-EISA - Institut Electoral pour une Démocratie Durable en Afrique (EISA), bureau de Madagascar | | |
| ☐ Mercy Corps | ☐ MLAL - ProgettoMondo | ☐ MSIS-TATAO |
| ☐ NIMD (Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy) | ☐ Nonviolent Peaceforce | |
| ☐ Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) | ☐ Nile Sustainable Development Organization - NSDO | |
| ☐ OCNH-Organisation des Citoyens pour une Nouvelle Haïti | ☐ OIKOS | |
| ☐ ONG Adkoul - ONG Adkoul | ☐ ONG AZHAR | ☐ OXFAM |
| ☐ Peace Direct | ☐ Plan International | ☐ PNG UN Country Fund |
| ☐ Red de Instituciones por los Derechos de la Niñez | ☐ ROI - Roza Otunbayeva Initiati | |
| ☐ Saferworld | ☐ Sampan'Asa Momba ny Fampandrosoana (SAF/FJKM) | |
| ☐ Save the Children | ☐ Search for Common Ground (SFCG) | |
| ☐ SIHA (Strategic Initiative for Women in the Horn of Africa) | ☐ SismaMujer | |
| ☐ SOS Sahel Sudan | ☐ Stichting Impunity Watch | ☐ Tearfund |
| ☐ The Carter Center, Inc. | ☐ Trocaire | ☐ War Child |
| ☐ War Childhood Museum (WCM) | ☐ World Vision International | ☐ World Vision Myanmar |
| ☐ ZOA | ☐ blank_placeholder | ☐ Other, Please specify |

Other, Please specify

*

Implementing Partners

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **since the project's start** ?

0

To how many implementing partners has the project transferred money **during this calendar period** ?

(for June reports: January-June;
for November reports: January-December (anticipated);
for final reports: full project duration)

0

Financial Reporting

» Delivery by Recipient

Please enter the total amounts in full US dollars allocated to each recipient organization

Please enter the original budget amount, amount transferred to date and estimated expenditure by recipient.

Please make sure you enter the correct amount. All values should be entered in **US Dollars**

For cross-border projects, group the amounts by agency, even if different country offices are involved. You will have the opportunity to share a more detailed budget in the next section.

Recipients	Total Project Budget (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total budget as is in the project document in US Dollars</i>	Transfers to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the total amount transferred to each recipient to date in US Dollars</i>	Expenditure to date (in full US \$) <i>Please enter the approximate amount spent to date in US dollars</i>	Implementati on rate as a percentage of total budget (calculated automatically)
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme	1450718	507751	454917.59	31.36%
				%

[illegible]

	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
	*	*	*	%
TOTAL	3000000	1049999	796503.09	26.55%

The approximate implementation rate as percentage of total project budget based on the values entered in the above matrix is **26.55%**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the approximate implementation rate as a % *

» Gender-responsive Budgeting

Indicate what **percentage (%)** of the budget contributes to gender equality or women's empowerment (GEWE) as per the project document? *

15

The dollar amount of the budget contributing to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) based on percentage entered above and total project budget is **US \$ 450000**. Can you confirm that this is correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *budget amount* allocated to GEWE in US Dollars *

Amount expended to date on efforts contributing to gender equality or women's empowerment is **US \$ 119475.46**. Is this correct? *

☒ Correct ☐ Incorrect

If it is incorrect, please enter the *expenditure to date* on GEWE in US dollars *

ATTACH PROJECT EXCEL BUDGET SHOWING CURRENT APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE. *

The templates for the budget are available [here](#)

PBF_SSR project_Budget_Annual_Report_2025_Final-FINAL-15_32_26.xlsx



Project Markers

Please select the Gender Marker Associated with this project *

- ☐ Score 1 for projects that contribute in some way to gender equality, but not significantly (less than 30% of the total budget for GEWE)
- ☒ Score 2 for projects that have gender equality as a significant objective and allocate between 30 and 79% of the total project budget to GEWE
- ☐ Score 3 for projects that have gender equality as a principal objective and allocate at least 80% of the total project budget to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE)

Please select the Risk Marker Associated with this project *

- ☐ Risk marker 0 = low risk to achieving outcomes
- ☐ Risk marker 1 = medium risk to achieving outcomes
- ☒ Risk marker 2 = high risk to achieving outcomes

Please select the PBF Focus Area associated with this project

*

- ☒ (1.1) Security Sector Reform
- ☐ (1.2) Rule of Law
- ☐ (1.3) Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration
- ☐ (1.4) Political Dialogue
- ☐ (2.1) National reconciliation
- ☐ (2.2) Democratic Governance
- ☐ (2.3) Conflict prevention/management
- ☐ (3.1) Employment
- ☐ (3.2) Equitable access to social services
- ☐ (4.1) Strengthening of essential national state capacity
- ☐ (4.2) Extension of state authority/Local Administration
- ☐ (4.3) Governance of peacebuilding resources (including PBF Secretariats)

Is the project part of one or more PBF priority windows?

*

Select all that apply

- ☐ Gender promotion initiative
- ☐ Youth promotion initiative
- ☐ Transition from UN or regional peacekeeping or special political missions
- ☐ Cross-border or regional project
- ☒ None

Steering Committee and Government engagement

Does the project have an active steering committee/ project board?

*

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, please indicate how many times the Project Steering Committee has met over the last 6 months?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The Project Steering Committee will be meeting in July 2026.

Please provide a brief description of any engagement that the project has had with the government over the last 6 months. Please indicate what level of government the project has been engaging with.

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Over the last six months, the project engaged the Government of The Gambia at national, institutional, parliamentary, oversight, and local levels to strengthen national ownership, coordination, accountability, and people-centered implementation of the SSR process.

At the national level, engagement with the Office of National Security, as the lead institution for SSR coordination, helped ensure that project support remained aligned with national SSR priorities, the National Security Council Act 2025, and broader peacebuilding objectives. This engagement also supported coherence among security institutions and reinforced the government's leadership of the reform process.

The project also engaged relevant ministries and security sector institutions to support policy dialogue, institutional planning, and coordination across the security governance architecture. Engagement with Parliament and independent oversight institutions contributed to strengthening democratic oversight, accountability, rights-based governance, and public trust in the reform process.

At the local level, engagement with regional authorities, community structures, traditional leaders, and local security actors helped connect national reform priorities with citizens lived security needs. This supported dialogue between communities and institutions and ensured that local perspectives on safety, trust, accountability, access to justice, and service delivery informed implementation.

Overall, government engagement during the reporting period was multi-level and strategic. It contributed to stronger national ownership, improved coordination, enhanced policy dialogue, strengthened oversight and accountability, and better alignment between government priorities and people-centered security sector reform.

PART I: OVERALL PROJECT PROGRESS

NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE REPORT:

- Avoid acronyms and UN jargon, use general /common language.
- Report on what has been achieved in the reporting period, not what the project aims to do.
- Be as concrete as possible. Avoid theoretical, vague or conceptual discourse.
- Ensure the analysis and project progress assessment is gender and age sensitive.

Please rate the implementation status of the following preliminary/preparatory activities

Contracting of partners

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
- ☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Staff Recruitment

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
- ☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Collection of baselines

*

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Identification of beneficiaries

*

- ☐ Not Started ☐ Initiated ☐ Partially Completed
☒ Completed ☐ Not Applicable

Provide any additional descriptive information relating to the status of the project, including whether preliminary/preparatory activities have been completed (i.e. contracting of partners, staff recruitment, etc.)

*

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The Security Sector Reform (SSR) Project has completed its preliminary and preparatory activities and is now in full implementation phase. Key governance, coordination, and implementation arrangements have been established, providing a strong foundation for effective project delivery and oversight.

Core project staffing across UNDP, UNODC, and OHCHR has been completed, and the project team is fully operational and supporting implementation, reporting, stakeholder engagement, monitoring, and coordination. Early lessons from implementation highlighted the importance of timely development of Terms of Reference (ToRs), concept notes, and procurement documentation to support efficient delivery of activities.

Engagement and coordination with implementing and strategic partners have been strengthened throughout the reporting period. The project continues to work closely with ONS, security institutions, oversight bodies, civil society organizations, media stakeholders, and development partners to ensure national ownership, alignment with national priorities, and coordinated implementation of activities.

Overall, the project has successfully transitioned beyond inception and preparatory stages, with institutional arrangements, staffing, planning processes, and stakeholder coordination mechanisms firmly established to support accelerated implementation and delivery of results in 2026.

Describe overall progress under each Outcome made during the reporting period (*for June reports: January-June; for November reports: January-December (anticipated); for final reports: full project duration*). Do not list individual activities. If the project is starting to make/has made a difference at the outcome level, provide specific evidence for the progress (quantitative and qualitative) and explain how it impacts the broader political and peacebuilding context.

Is the project on track for the timely completion of outputs as indicated in the workplan?

*

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

If no, please provide an explanation

*

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

Project progress summary

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

During the reporting period, the SSR Project advanced inclusive security governance, civilian oversight, accountability, public awareness, and trust-building. It helped shift SSR from a policy-level process toward a more people-centred and participatory reform agenda grounded in community engagement and institutional reform. The project advanced gender-responsive and accountable security governance by supporting the operationalization of the Generic Gender Mainstreaming Policy and the SHEA Policy. During the reporting period, simplified pocketbooks for both policies were developed and validated to make the content more accessible and practical for security personnel. Once printed and distributed, the Gender Mainstreaming Pocketbook is expected to support the integration of gender perspectives into security sector planning, leadership, accountability, and workplace culture, while the SHEA Pocketbook is expected to strengthen understanding of survivor-centred reporting, prevention, confidentiality, and institutional obligations.

Civil society engagement in Security Sector Reform (SSR) became more structured and coordinated during the reporting period. Through the establishment of the CSO Security Sector Coalition, 19 CSOs are now better positioned to coordinate their engagement, align advocacy efforts, and contribute collectively to security sector governance and accountability processes. Capacity strengthening further enhanced the ability of CSO representatives to engage in SSR oversight, monitoring, documentation, and rights-based advocacy. The establishment of the CSO-Security Sector Platform has also created a formal mechanism for regular dialogue and engagement between civil society and security institutions, strengthening trust, accountability, and collaboration. Together, these efforts have strengthened the capacity and organization of civil society actors, enabling more coordinated participation in SSR implementation, monitoring, and policy dialogue.

The completion of the national perception survey represents a strategic milestone, generating baseline data for key outcome indicators on public awareness, trust, confidence, accountability, and satisfaction with security services, while addressing critical gaps in the project results framework. The findings revealed low awareness of SSR (18.3%), with a significant gender gap (27% of men compared to 9.83% of women), alongside relatively high confidence in security institutions (77.1%). However, only 33.4% of respondents knew how to report misconduct by security officers, highlighting important accountability gaps. The survey also identified key community concerns, including theft and burglary, delayed justice, corruption, SGBV, youth unemployment, drug abuse, and limited access to services in some areas. These findings provide an important baseline for measuring future progress and informing evidence-based SSR programming.

The project strengthened public awareness, civic participation, and accountability in the SSR process by combining media capacity development, community radio engagement, nationwide outreach, and support to civilian oversight actors. Together, these interventions helped make SSR more accessible to communities, strengthened two-way dialogue between citizens and security institutions, and reinforced the role of non-security actors in promoting accountable and people-centred security governance.

The development of the SSR Media Training Manual represents an important institutional resource for strengthening ethical, human rights-based, gender-sensitive, and conflict-sensitive reporting on security governance. The manual is expected to be embedded in the journalism curricula of the University of The Gambia and MAJaC, contributing to longer-term capacity development for current and future media practitioners. Complementing this, 31 participants from 13 community radio stations, media institutions, and security sector public relations units were trained on SSR, democratic security governance, accountability, ethical reporting, gender-sensitive communication, and the National Security Council Act 2025. This strengthened the foundation for community radio to serve as a sustained channel for public information, particularly in rural and underserved communities. Building on this capacity, 16 radio programmes were conducted across all seven regions in local languages, creating space for public call-ins and interactive dialogue between communities, security institutions, oversight bodies, and civil society actors. These engagements improved public understanding of SSR, complaint mechanisms, and the roles of oversight institutions, while strengthening two-way communication between citizens and security actors.

The project also expanded grassroots participation through nationwide outreach, town halls, Bantaba dialogues, community meetings, and radio engagements, reaching at least 921 participants across all regions, including 465 women, 40% youth, and 34 persons with disabilities. These platforms enabled communities to better understand the SSR Strategy, the National Security Council Act 2025, human rights, civilian oversight, citizen responsibilities, and available complaint mechanisms. They also generated practical feedback on citizens' lived security concerns, including theft, delayed justice, weak police response, border insecurity, GBV/SGBV, drug abuse, corruption, access

to ID services, and low trust in reporting channels.

In parallel, the project strengthened civilian oversight and accountability by building the capacity of non-security actors to engage more effectively in rights-based SSR. The National Assembly training reached 52 participants, including 23 women and 29 men, and improved understanding of SSR, international and regional human rights mechanisms, Universal Periodic Review recommendations, and treaty body concluding observations. Knowledge of the UPR increased from 35% to 90%, while 86% of post-training respondents reported being very confident in using human rights standards to review draft laws.

Indicate any additional analysis on how Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and/or Youth Inclusion and Responsiveness has been ensured by the project to date

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

Gender equality, women's empowerment, and youth inclusion have been integrated across the project through inclusive participation, targeted capacity strengthening, gender-responsive tools, and evidence-based programming. The project has moved beyond simply tracking participation numbers by ensuring that women and youth are engaged as rights holders, community actors, oversight stakeholders, media practitioners, and contributors to security governance dialogue.

To date, the project has promoted women's participation across SSR consultations, community outreach, capacity-building, and oversight activities. The nationwide community outreach reached 921 participants, with women representing over 50% of participants. These engagements created safe spaces for women to raise security concerns, including SGBV, domestic violence, access to justice, reporting barriers, and women's exclusion from decision-making. Women participants also contributed recommendations on strengthening complaint mechanisms, improving police responsiveness, increasing women's leadership, and ensuring more respectful and confidential reporting processes.

The project has also strengthened gender-responsive institutional reform through support to the operationalization of the Generic Gender Mainstreaming Policy and the Sexual Harassment, Exploitation and Abuse (SHEA) Policy for security institutions. The development and validation of simplified pocketbooks for these policies is an important step toward making gender equality, professional conduct, and survivor-centred accountability more accessible to security personnel. While longer-term institutional behaviour change will need to be monitored, these tools provide a practical foundation for strengthening awareness, prevention, reporting, and accountability on gender equality and SHEA across the security sector.

Youth inclusion has also been prioritized. The national perception survey included a strong youth sample, with youth representing 44.9% of respondents. This ensured that youth perspectives on insecurity, unemployment, drug abuse, crime, trust in security institutions, and access to services informed project planning and dialogue. During the project's community outreach, 168 young people participated in dialogue on SSR, security concerns, accountability, and citizen responsibilities. In addition, the community radio training included 23 participants aged 35 and below out of 31 participants, representing 74% of total participants.

The project has also supported youth-responsive dialogue by ensuring that young people could speak directly about the links between insecurity, unemployment, migration pressures, drug abuse, and strained relations with security actors. The project's community dialogues also helped reframe youth as partners in prevention, awareness raising, community cohesion, and peacebuilding, rather than only as a risk group. Civil society and parliamentary capacity-building further reinforced the inclusion of women, youth and persons with disabilities in oversight, monitoring, advocacy and accountability.

Is the project 1+ year in implementation?

☒ Yes

☐ No

FOR PROJECTS 1+ YEAR IN IMPLEMENTATION ONLY:

Is the project demonstrating outcome-level peacebuilding results? *

Outcome-level peacebuilding results entail results achieved at the societal or structural level, including changed attitudes, behaviours or institutions.

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please provide concrete examples of such peacebuilding results *

Please limit your response to 6000 characters

The project is contributing to emerging peacebuilding results by strengthening trust, dialogue, and accountability between citizens, civil society, and security institutions. Through community engagement, civil-security dialogue, and strengthened oversight mechanisms, the project is helping to shift Security Sector Reform (SSR) from a predominantly institution-led process towards a more participatory and people-centred approach.

An important institutional change has been the establishment of mechanisms that enable more structured engagement between state and non-state actors. The CSO-Security Sector Platform and the CSO Security Sector Coalition have strengthened the ability of civil society organizations to engage collectively with security institutions on issues of accountability, oversight, and reform. These mechanisms are fostering more regular and constructive dialogue between stakeholders that have traditionally engaged on security issues in a fragmented manner, contributing to increased transparency, trust-building, and civic participation in SSR processes.

The project has also contributed to strengthened civilian oversight of the security sector. Capacity development support to civil society, oversight institutions, and the National Assembly has enhanced the ability of non-security actors to engage in policy dialogue, legislative oversight, accountability processes, and monitoring of security sector reforms. Evidence from parliamentary capacity-building activities showed significant improvements in participants' understanding of human rights mechanisms and confidence in applying human rights standards in legislative review and oversight functions, strengthening the institutional foundations for accountable security governance.

At the societal level, community dialogues, outreach activities, and media engagement have created opportunities for citizens, including women, youth, and marginalized groups, to engage directly with security institutions and raise concerns related to safety, justice, accountability, and service delivery. These interactions are helping to strengthen citizen voice, improve responsiveness to community concerns, and promote more inclusive approaches to security governance.

While many of these changes remain emergent and will require continued monitoring, the project is contributing to stronger relationships between citizens and security institutions, more inclusive participation in security governance, and enhanced institutional mechanisms for accountability and dialogue, all of which are important foundations for sustainable peace and social cohesion.

If yes, please provide sources or references (including links) as evidence of peacebuilding results, or submit them as additional attachments.

Evidence may be quantitative or qualitative but needs to demonstrate progress against outcome indicators in the project results framework. Sources may include project surveys (such as perception surveys), monitoring reports, government documents, or other knowledge products that have been developed by the project.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1f6twFVC176zRV57AJGapnWB2qKMUgmkq/view?usp=drive_link

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KhyrEUcU18VHsOo0LcDgyO8dCflkd5Ya/view?usp=drive_link

File attachment

CLEAN VERSION-NATIONAL SURVEY ON SECURITY NEEDS-15_43_35.docx



PART II: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

How many OUTCOMES does this project have *

1

2

3

4

5

more than 5.

Please write out the project outcomes as they are in the project results framework found in the project document

Outcome 1:

Strengthened security institutions to promote implementation of gender responsive Security Sector Reform, ensuring adherence to the rule of law and human rights in The Gambia.

Outcome 2:

Strengthened oversight mechanisms to ensure accountability and transparency in the implementation of security sector.

Outcome 3:

Outcome 4:

Outcome 5:

Outcome 6:

Outcome 7:

Outcome 8:

Additional Outcomes *

If the project has more than 8 outcomes, please enumerate the remaining outcomes here

INDICATOR BASED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Using the Project Results Framework as per the approved project document or any amendments, provide an update on the achievement of all **outcome** and **output** indicators in the table below.

- Where it has not been possible to collect data on indicators, state this and provide any explanation.
- Provide gender and age disaggregated data. (500 characters max per entry)

» Outcome 1: Strengthened security institutions to promote implementation of gender responsive Security Sector Reform, ensuring adherence to the rule of law and human rights in The Gambia.

O C 1	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
1. 1	Indicator 1.1.1a: Percentage increase of security institutions implementing gender- responsive service delivery according to the newly adopted legislation, gender policy, and strategies.	25% (2-GPF and GAF- out of 8 security institutions)	50%			
1. 2	Indicator 1.1.1b: Level of public awareness and satisfaction with the security sector reform process.	18.3%	35%	25%		
1. 3	Indicator 1.1.1c: Increase in the proportion of women in the decision- making and leadership roles in the security sector.	4	8			
1. 4						
1. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 1 have?

1 2 3 **4** 5 more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 1

Output 1.1

Strengthened legal frameworks, policies, and strategies to effectively support the implementation of Security Sector Strategy in The Gambia

Output 1.2

Enhanced capacity of the Office of National Security and relevant state institutions to effectively coordinate the implementation of the SSR strategy.

Output 1.3

Strengthened accountability, data and knowledge management for real-time and evidence-based decision making within the security sector.

Output 1.4

Enhanced gender responsive security sector through increased women's participation and representation in decision making roles.

Output 1.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 1 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» **Output 1.1: Strengthened legal frameworks, policies, and strategies to effectively support the implementation of Security Sector Strategy in The Gambia**

1. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 1.1	Indicator 1.1.1: Number of legislations, policies, strategies related to security sector reform developed/reviewed adopted and integrated into the operational practices and guidelines.	3	6	1	1	
1. 1.2	Indicator 1.1.2: Number of institutions with increased knowledge to advocate for the passage of security legislations.	4	6		35 (15 women including 1 PwD), 20 men including 1 PwD)	

1. 1. 3	Indicator 1.1.3b: Number of people with access and increased knowledge through simplified and translated SSR strategy and gender policy desegregated by gender and age.	0	1000	500	500	
1. 1. 4	Output Indicator 1.1.4: Proportion of population with knowledge of SSR disaggregated by region, gender and age	18.3%	35%	392 (220 Male, 172 Female, 161 youth, 25 PWD)	392 (220 Male, 172 Female, 161 youth, 25 PWD)	
1. 1. 5						

» **Output 1.2: Enhanced capacity of the Office of National Security and relevant state institutions to effectively coordinate the implementation of the SSR strategy.**

1. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 2. 1						
1. 2. 2						
1. 2. 3						
1. 2. 4						
1. 2. 5						

» **Output 1.3: Strengthened accountability, data and knowledge management for real-time and evidence-based decision making within the security sector.**

1. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 3. 1	Indicator 1.3.1: National survey on security needs and concerns of the population, including perceptions of the youth, conducted and validated.	0	1	1		
1. 3. 2	Indicator 1.3.3: Existence of a functional MEL system (frameworks, guidelines, etc.) in place within the security sector.	0	1	1	1	
1. 3. 3						
1. 3. 4						
1. 3. 5						

» **Output 1.4: Enhanced gender responsive security sector through increased women's participation and representation in decision making roles.**

1. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
1. 4. 1	Indicator 1.4.4: Number of male gender champions with technical expertise advocating for women participation in leadership positions and the elimination of all forms of GBV within the security sector. Disaggregated by gender and regions.	0	20		45 (15 females, 30 males and 2 PWD)	
1. 4. 2						
1. 4. 3						
1. 4. 4						

1. 4. 5						
.....						

» Output 1.5:

1. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
.....						
1. 5. 1						
.....						
1. 5. 2						
.....						
1. 5. 3						
.....						
1. 5. 4						
.....						
1. 5. 5						
.....						

» Outcome 2: Strengthened oversight mechanisms to ensure accountability and transparency in the implementation of security sector.

O C 2	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
2. 1	Indicator 2ai: Percentage of reported complaints of malpractices against security sector actors through formal processes disaggregated by institutions and regions.	16 complaints formally reported to NHRC. By institution: GPF: 11/16 = 68.8%; DLEAG: 2/16 = 12.5%; GAF: 1/16 = 6.3%; GID: 1/16 = 6.3%; GRA: 1/16 = 6.3%. By region: KMC: 6/16 = 37.5%; Banjul: 4/16 = 25%; WCR: 4/16 = 25%; URR: 2/16 = 12.5%; LRR, CRR and NBR: 0%.	16		30 complaints were formally reported to NHRC in 2025. By institution: GPF: 19/30 = 63.3%; GID: 4/30 = 13.3%; GAF: 3/30 = 10.0%; DLEAG: 2/30 = 6.7%; GPS: 2/30 = 6.7%. By region: WCR: 9/30 = 30.0%; KMC: 7/30 = 23.3%; Banjul: 5/30 = 16.7%; CRR: 4/30 = 13.3%; URR: 3/30 = 10.0%; LRR: 1/30 = 3.3%; NBR: 1/30 = 3.3%	
2. 2	Indicator 2aii: Percentage of complaints malpractices against security sector actors investigated through formal processes desegregated by institutions and regions.	100%	100%		25 complaints were investigated and processed. 83.3% investigated and processed	

2. 3	Indicator 2aiii: Percentage of complaints of malpractices against security sector actors satisfactorily addressed through formal processes disaggregated by institutions and regions.	81.3%	85%		20 complaints were satisfactorily addressed. Based on 30 complaints reported, this equals 20/30 = 66.7% satisfactorily addressed.	
2. 4	Indicator 2b: Percentage of population who express confidence in the security sector (disaggregated by gender.	52%	62%	74%		
2. 5	Indicator 2c: Proportion of the public expressing confident in the oversight institutions and their effectiveness in ensuring accountability within the security sector. Disaggregated by gender.	33.4%	40%			

How many outputs does outcome 2 have?

1 2 3 **4** 5 more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 2

Output 2.1

Capacity of the National Assembly to engage and support the SSR processes is enhanced.

Output 2.2

Capacity of the National Human Rights Commission to carry out its oversight functions, coordinate stakeholders and contribute to SSR is enhanced.

Output 2.3

Civil society and Office of the Ombudsman Office of Ombudsman is better able to participate effectively and engage in meaningful oversight and accountability of the SSR process.

Output 2.4

Strengthened Civil-Security relation to improve trust and confidence in the Security sector.

Output 2.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 2 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» **Output 2.1: Capacity of the National Assembly to engage and support the SSR processes is enhanced.**

2. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 1. 1	Indicator 2.1.1: Needs assessment on National Assembly role in the SSR processes conducted and validated.	0	1			
2. 1. 2	Indicator 2.1.2: Number of handbooks developed and in use by the national assembly members and clerks to effectively implement the SSR.	0	100			

2. 1. 3	Indicator 2.1.3: Number of National Assembly members with acquired knowledge to effectively contribute and perform oversight function to the SSR process. Disaggregated by gender.	0	58			
2. 1. 4	Indicator 2.1.4: Number of National Assembly members with technical knowledge from peer-to- peer dialogue on SSR process.	0	58			
2. 1. 5						

» **Output 2.2: Capacity of the National Human Rights Commission to carry out its oversight functions, coordinate stakeholders and contribute to SSR is enhanced.**

2. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 2. 1	Indicator 2.2.1: Number of NHRC commissioners and staff with acquired knowledge on SSR to perform oversight function. Disaggregated by gender and age.	0	45	52 23 Females 29 Male	52 23 Females 29 Male	
2. 2. 2	Indicator: 2.2.2b: Number of CSO actors harassed and arrested by security actors for playing an oversight role in SSR.	9	5		19 From NHRC 2025 Annual Report	

2. 2. 3	Indicator 2.2.6: Number of National Assembly members and security institutions capacitated on the recommendations from human right council, AU, treaty bodies and special mechanism to effectively perform oversight roles. Disaggregated by region.	0	58	52 National Assembly Members and Staff (23 female and 29 male)	67 National Assembly Members and Staff (27 female and 40 male)	
2. 2. 4						
2. 2. 5						

» **Output 2.3: Civil society and Office of the Ombudsman Office of Ombudsman is better able to participate effectively and engage in meaningful oversight and accountability of the SSR process.**

2. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 3. 1	Indicator 2.3.1a: Number of CSOs within the SSR coalition SSR that are utilising acquired knowledge to actively participate in the oversight and implementation of SSR processes.	0	23	27 participants (9 females and 18 males)		
2. 3. 2	Indicator 2.3.5: Number of IPC members with knowledge on SSR to support outreach programs. Disaggregated by gender, age and regions	0	150		50	National training completed. Regional trainings will be completed in Q3 2026.
2. 3. 3	Indicator 2.3.7: Existence of an operationalized CSOs-Security sector platform.	0	1	1	1	
2. 3. 4						

2. 3. 5						
---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

» **Output 2.4: Strengthened Civil-Security relation to improve trust and confidence in the Security sector.**

2. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 4. 1	Indicator 2.4.1: Existence of functional civil security committees disaggregated by gender, age and regions.	0	3			
2. 4. 2	Indicator 2.4.2: Number of community radio personnel with the relevant knowledge on the SSR strategy to engage the community through radio programs. Disaggregated by gender.	0	20	31 Male 18 Female 13 PWD 2	31 Male 18 Female 13 PWD 2	
2. 4. 3	Indicator 2.4.3: Number of people reached through community radio stations on SSR. Disaggregated by gender.	0	10000	Soma - 3,000 Kerewan - 3,500 Taxi FM - 3,500 GRTS Basse - 3,500 Paradise Farafenni - 2,500	Soma - 3,000 Kerewan - 3,500 Taxi FM - 3,500 GRTS Basse - 3,500 Paradise Farafenni - 2,500	

2. 4. 4	Indicator 2.4.4: Number of community personnel within the community- based structures with knowledge on SSR.	48	62	392 (Male 220, Female 172, 25 PWD)	392 (Male 220, Female 172, 25 PWD)	
2. 4. 5	Indicator 2.4.5: Number of people with knowledge of reporting mechanisms for reporting complaints.	0	3500	379 participants (228 females, 151 males and 6 PWD)	379 participants (228 females, 151 males and 6 PWD)	

» Output 2.5:

2. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
2. 5. 1						
2. 5. 2						
2. 5. 3						
2. 5. 4						
2. 5. 5						

» Outcome 3:

O C 3	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
3. 1						
3. 2						
3. 3						
3. 4						
3. 5						

How many outputs does outcome 3 have?

12345more than 5.

Please list all outputs for outcome 3

Output 3.1

Output 3.2

Output 3.3

Output 3.4

Output 3.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 3 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» **Output 3.1:**

3. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 1. 1						
3. 1. 2						
3. 1. 3						
3. 1. 4						
3. 1. 5						

» Output 3.2:

3. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 2. 1						
3. 2. 2						
3. 2. 3						
3. 2. 4						
3. 2. 5						

» Output 3.3:

3. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 3. 1						
3. 3. 2						
3. 3. 3						
3. 3. 4						
3. 3. 5						

» Output 3.4:

3. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 4. 1						
3. 4. 2						
3. 4. 3						
3. 4. 4						
3. 4. 5						

» Output 3.5:

3. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
3. 5. 1						
3. 5. 2						
3. 5. 3						
3. 5. 4						
3. 5. 5						

» Outcome 4:

O C 4	Outcome Indicator s	Indicator Baseline	End of Project Indicator Target	Indicator progress for reporting period	Indicator progress since project's start	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any)
4. 1						
4. 2						
4. 3						
4. 4						
4. 5						
How many outputs does outcome 4 have? 12345more than 5.						
Please list all outputs for outcome 4						
Output 4.1						
Output 4.2						
Output 4.3						

Output 4.4

Output 4.5

Other Outputs

If Outcome 4 has more than 5 outputs, please enumerate the remaining outputs here

For each output, and using the, project results framework, provide an update on the progress made against all output indicators

» **Output 4.1:**

4. 1	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 1. 1						
4. 1. 2						
4. 1. 3						
4. 1. 4						
4. 1. 5						

» Output 4.2:

4. 2	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 2. 1						
4. 2. 2						
4. 2. 3						
4. 2. 4						
4. 2. 5						

» Output 4.3:

4. 3	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 3. 1						
4. 3. 2						
4. 3. 3						
4. 3. 4						
4. 3. 5						

» Output 4.4:

4. 4	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cummulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 4. 1						
4. 4. 2						
4. 4. 3						
4. 4. 4						
4. 4. 5						

» Output 4.5:

4. 5	Output Indicators <i>Describe the indicator</i>	Indicator Baseline <i>State the baseline value of the indicator</i>	End of Project Indicator Target <i>State the target value of the indicator at the end of the project</i>	Indicator progress for reporting period <i>State the current value of the indicator for the reporting period</i>	Indicator progress since project's start <i>State the current cumulative value of the indicator since the start of the project</i>	Reasons for Variance/ Delay (if any) <i>Explain why the indicator is off track or has changed, where relevant</i>
4. 5. 1						
4. 5. 2						
4. 5. 3						
4. 5. 4						
4. 5. 5						
If the project has more than 4 outcomes, use this space to describe progress on progress on indicators for the remaining outcomes						

*

PART III: Cross-Cutting Issues

Is the project planning any significant events in the next six months? (eg. national dialogues, youth congresses, film screenings, etc.)

If yes, please state how many, and for each, provide the approximate date of the event and a brief description, including its key objectives, target audience and location (if known)

Events	Event Description	Tentative Date	Location	Target Audience	Event Objectives (900 characters)
Event 1	Organize a policy forum on barriers to women's recruitment, retention, and career advancement in security institutions, and present national security survey findings on public security needs, including youth perceptions of security forces. Develop a policy brief with key findings and recommendations	September 2026	Banjul	Policy makers	To promote data-driven programmatic and policy interventions for sustainability, strengthen community-security engagements and trust, and enhance public ownership of security initiatives
Event 2	Organize a stakeholder workshop to disseminate the findings of the Human Rights Due Diligence Review of the security sector to lay the basis for risk-informed policy and decision-making, and programmatic commitments based on HRDDP risk assessment criteria.	September 2026	Banjul	Security institutions; NHRC; CSOs; development partners; policy makers	To disseminate the findings of the Human Rights Due Diligence Review of the security sector and provide a platform for stakeholders to understand the identified risks and challenges, promoting informed dialogue, risk-informed decision-making and programmatic commitments.
Event 3	The official launch of the CSO-Security platform	July 2026	Banjul	CSOs Security Sector actors	The meeting will provide an opportunity to endorse the draft Terms of Reference, officially launch the platform, and host a panel discussion between CSOs and security institutions.

Event 4	In collaboration with the ONS and GPU, train media outlets across the country on professional coverage of SSR issues, and embed the training manual at curriculum of UTG school of journalism	September 2026	Banjul	Media	Enhance media capacity for professional SSR reporting; institutionalize the training in UTG's journalism curriculum; strengthen partnerships between media and SSR stakeholders for accurate public information dissemination.
----------------	---	----------------	--------	-------	--

Human Impact

This section is about the human impact of the project. Please state key stakeholders (including but not limited to: Civil Society Organizations, Beneficiaries, etc.) of the project, and for each, please briefly describe:

- i. The challenges/problem they faced prior to the project implemantation
- ii. The impact of the project in their lives
- iii. Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from a representative of each stakeholder group

This is an optional question. You may leave it unanswered if not relevant

Human Impact	Type of stakeholder	What has been the impact of the project on their lives?	Provide, where possible, a quote or testimonial from the stakeholder

1	Communities and grassroots beneficiaries especially women	Through nationwide outreach, Bantaba dialogues, town halls, and community radio programmes, communities were able to directly engage with ONS, NHRC, the Ombudsman, CSOs, and security actors in local languages. The project helped improve public understanding of SSR as a people-centred reform process focused on accountability, professionalism, rights, and service delivery. It also created safe spaces for citizens to raise concerns on theft, delayed justice, border insecurity, GBV/SGBV, corruption, drug abuse, and weak reporting channels. The project created platforms for women to raise their specific security concerns and influence discussions on accountability and service delivery. Women participated actively in the outreach community engagements, where they raised issues around domestic violence, rape, early marriage, access to justice, women's leadership, and the need for more gender-sensitive complaint mechanisms.	Bakary Kitabu Fatty - Alkalo Kerewan "This gathering is important because we have been looking forward to something like this. we have also seen the efforts made towards the reform, as this is not my first time attending a community outreach However, efforts towards the reform should be prioritised. Even though we are seeing changes take place, they can be quicker." Imam Ceesay - Kerewan Central Mosque "We are thanking you for this initiative, and we as Imam's will make it a priority to spread this information in various gatherings, including our sermons as our safety is our responsibility." Nyaha B Ndong - Lady Councillor Jokadou "What we learned here today is really important because it's a great experience and of benefit to us that will also help us improve. This is something we are really happy about given that we are leaders at our communities and whatever is being said here today, will be shared within the community aswell."
---	---	---	--

2	Youth	Prior to implementation, youth were often discussed mainly in relation to unemployment, drug abuse, migration pressures, and crime. Many young people also felt excluded from decision-making and reported strained relations with security actors. The project created opportunities for youth to participate in community dialogues, perception surveys, and media engagement. Youth perspectives were captured in the national perception survey, where young people represented 44.9% of respondents. Through outreach and radio programming, youth were able to discuss the links between insecurity, unemployment, drug abuse, lack of opportunity, and trust in security institutions. This helped reposition youth as partners in prevention, awareness raising, and peacebuilding rather than only as a risk group.	Jabou Sisawo - Speaker National Youth Parliament “Many young people are aware about security sector reform but there are still gaps so it is the responsibility of every young person to try and engage in security sector reform.” Abdou Bah - Tahawal Serrekunda “I believe the trust between the security and the citizens of the country is very, very important because this will go a long way in making sure that crimes at local level is reduced because these trust that we will get to have will make sure that the young people or citizens in the communities will be able to report crimes and they will also be able to fight against crime through the community policing that we have in our communities.” Abdou Hydara - Youth Committee Representative “It is very important for youths to take part in this kind of programs because it promotes inclusivity and it promotes people centered security reform.”
---	-------	--	--

3	Media Practitioners	Prior to the project, community radio personnel and media practitioners had limited technical knowledge of SSR and how to report on security governance in an ethical, accurate, and conflict-sensitive manner. The project trained 31 participants from community radio stations, media institutions, and security sector public relations units. The training strengthened their understanding of SSR, democratic security governance, ethical reporting, gender-sensitive communication, accountability, and the NSC Act 2025. This served as a foundation for the use of community radio in outreach activities. Nine radio programmes were later conducted across the regions in local languages, enabling public call-ins and wider community dialogue.	“Public Relations Officers play an important role in engaging transparently with citizens, media, and stakeholders in a manner that builds trust, accountability, and legitimacy.” “Community radio is one of the closest platforms to the people. Through this project, we are now better equipped to use local languages to explain SSR, accountability mechanisms, and citizens’ rights.”
-----------------	----------------------------	---	--

4	National Assembly Members	Before the intervention, many parliamentary actors had limited engagement with SSR and limited technical knowledge on how to use international human rights recommendations for oversight, legislative review, and budget advocacy. The project supported a capacity-building training for 52 participants, including 23 women and 29 men, from the National Assembly, NHRC, and media. Knowledge of the UPR increased from 35% to 90%, and 86% of post-training respondents reported being very confident in using human rights standards to review draft laws. This strengthened Parliament's capacity to support implementation of human rights recommendations through public hearings, committee reviews, law-making, and budget oversight.	Hon. Muhammed Kanteh described the National Assembly training as "timely and necessary" and reaffirmed Parliament's commitment to supporting implementation of UPR recommendations. Commissioner Halimatou Dibba emphasized that the impact of the training "goes beyond the two-day training" and encouraged continued engagement with the NHRC for guidance and follow-up on UPR and treaty body recommendations.
---	---------------------------	--	---

In addition to the stakeholder specific impact described above, please use this space to describe any additional human impact that the project has had.

Please limit your response to 4000 characters.

The project has contributed to broader human impact by making Security Sector Reform (SSR) more accessible, inclusive, and responsive to the everyday security needs of citizens. For many communities, particularly those in rural and underserved areas, SSR was previously seen as a distant institutional process. Through community outreach, Bantaba dialogues, town hall meetings, and radio programmes in local languages, the project brought SSR closer to communities and created spaces where citizens could ask questions, raise concerns, and receive direct responses from security actors, oversight institutions, and civil society organizations.

These engagements improved public understanding of rights, citizen responsibilities, complaint mechanisms, and the roles of institutions such as the Office of National Security, National Human Rights Commission, Office of the Ombudsman, CSOs, and security institutions. This is important because informed citizens are better able to claim their rights, report misconduct, engage constructively with authorities, and hold institutions accountable.

The project also created opportunities for communities to raise concerns that directly affect their safety and wellbeing, including theft, burglary, weak police response, delayed justice, border insecurity, drug abuse, GBV/SGBV, corruption, access to identification services, and low trust in reporting channels. By documenting these concerns and feeding them into project planning and national-level discussions, the project helped ensure that SSR is shaped not only by institutional priorities, but also by the lived experiences and security needs of citizens.

The project has also contributed to rebuilding trust between communities and security institutions. In a post-authoritarian context where security actors were historically associated with fear, intimidation, and limited accountability, the opportunity for communities and security institutions to interact in non-enforcement settings is an important step toward changing perceptions and relationships. These engagements helped humanize institutions, reduce information gaps, encourage dialogue, and reinforce the idea that security is a shared responsibility between citizens and the state.

The project further amplified the voices of women, youth, persons with disabilities, traditional leaders, and grassroots actors in security governance. Women were able to raise concerns related to SGBV, domestic violence, confidentiality, access to justice, and exclusion from decision-making. Youth highlighted issues such as unemployment, drug abuse, irregular migration, crime, and strained relations with security actors. Persons with disabilities and marginalized communities were also included in outreach and survey processes, helping ensure that reform discussions reflect diverse security needs.

The use of community radio expanded the project's human impact by reaching people beyond physical meeting spaces, particularly in communities where radio remains one of the most trusted and accessible sources of information. Radio programmes in local languages enabled wider participation through call-ins and helped sustain public dialogue on SSR, accountability, rights, and complaint mechanisms.

Overall, the project's human impact lies in strengthening citizens' voice, confidence, and participation in security governance. It is helping shift SSR from a technical institutional process into a more people-centred reform effort grounded in trust, inclusion, accountability, and the everyday security priorities of Gambians.

You can also upload upto 3 files in various formats (picture files, powerpoint, pdf, video, etc.) to illustrate the human impact of the project

OPTIONAL

File 1

OPTIONAL

[Click here to upload file. \(< 10MB\)](#)

File 2

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

File 3

OPTIONAL

Click here to upload file. (< 10MB)

You can also add upto 3 links to online resources which illustrate the human impact of the project

OPTIONAL

Link 1

OPTIONAL

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vSA6alftGRZqwB5mlCYKyEbnWnTougTa/view?usp=drive_link

Link 2

OPTIONAL

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vSA6alftGRZqwB5mlCYKyEbnWnTougTa/view?usp=drive_link

Link 3

OPTIONAL

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oDNWjThctnZ5Jgks_KLX7DNSBRROzuuQ/view?usp=drive_link

Please tick the applicable change based on above narrative.

How we worked:

*

Please select up to 3.

- ☐ Enhanced digitization
- ☐ Innovative ways of working
- ☐ Mobilized additional resources
- ☐ Improved or initiated policy frameworks
- ☒ Strengthened capacities
- ☒ Partnered with with local/grassroots Civil Society Organizations
- ☐ Expanding coalitions & galvanizing political will
- ☐ Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- ☒ Strengthened partnerships with UN Agencies

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Strengthen capacities: The project strengthened the capacities of key actors, including Parliament, CSOs, media practitioners, community radio personnel, oversight institutions, and community-based actors, to engage more effectively in people-centred SSR. Capacity-building improved knowledge of SSR frameworks, human rights standards, oversight mechanisms, monitoring and documentation, conflict sensitivity, Do No Harm, and accountability approaches.

As a result, Parliament is better equipped to support rights-based legislative review and oversight; CSOs are better positioned to monitor reforms and engage directly with security institutions; media actors can support accurate public information and dialogue; and communities have improved understanding of SSR, citizen responsibilities, and complaint mechanisms. Overall, these efforts strengthened national and local capacities for inclusive, accountable, and trust-based security governance.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Partnered with local/grassroots civil society organizations: The project partnered closely with local and grassroots civil society organizations to ensure that Security Sector Reform was not implemented as a top-down institutional process, but as a people-centred reform agenda informed by community voices. Key partners included the CSO Coalition on SSR through TANGO, community-based structures, women and youth groups, traditional leaders, and local civic actors.

Please explain one of the selected options

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Strengthened partnerships within UN Agencies: The project strengthened partnerships among UNDP, UNODC, and OHCHR through joint planning, coordinated implementation, shared reporting, and complementary technical support to national stakeholders. Joint implementation was reflected in activities such as community outreach, media engagement, National Assembly capacity-building, CSO capacity strengthening, and support to oversight and accountability mechanisms. The agencies jointly engaged national counterparts including ONS, NHRC, the Office of the Ombudsman, the National Assembly, security institutions, and civil society actors. This helped ensure that SSR interventions were not fragmented, but mutually reinforcing across governance, human rights, justice, accountability, and public engagement.

Who are we working with

*

- ☐ Strengthened partnerships with IFIs
- ☒ Strengthened partnerships between UN Agencies
- ☒ Partnered with local civil society organizations
- ☐ Partnered with local academia
- ☐ Partnered with sub-national entities
- ☒ Partnered with national entities
- ☐ Partnered with local volunteers

Please explain

Please limit your response to 3000 characters

The project has strengthened strategic partnerships and coordination among key stakeholders involved in Security Sector Reform. Collaboration among the three implementing UN agencies has been enhanced through active participation in the Project Steering Committee, regular technical coordination meetings, joint planning sessions, and continuous communication, fostering a unified approach to implementation and delivery of project results.

The project has also leveraged strong partnerships with government institutions, including the Office of National Security (ONS), National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), Ministry of Interior, National Assembly, and various security institutions, ensuring national ownership and alignment with government priorities. These partnerships have facilitated the implementation of capacity-building initiatives, policy development processes, and oversight activities that support accountable and inclusive security governance.

Civil society has remained a key partner in advancing transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. CSOs actively participate in project governance through the Project Steering Committee and have been engaged in consultations, planning processes, and implementation activities. The project further supported the establishment and operationalization of the CSO Coalition on Security Sector Reform, providing a coordinated platform for advocacy, dialogue, monitoring, and engagement with security institutions. Together, these partnerships have strengthened collaboration, enhanced inclusiveness, and ensured that reform efforts reflect the priorities and concerns of both institutions and communities.

Leave No one Behind

Select all beneficiaries targeted with the PBF resources as evidenced by the narrative

*

Mandatory

- ☐ Unemployed persons
- ☐ Minorities (e.g. race, ethnicity, linguistic, religion, etc.)
- ☐ Indigenous communities
- ☒ Persons with Disabilities
- ☐ Persons affected by violence (including GBV)
- ☒ Women
- ☒ Youth
- ☐ Children
- ☐ Minorities related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity and expression
- ☐ People living in and around border areas
- ☐ Persons affected by natural disasters
- ☐ Persons affected by armed conflicts
- ☐ Internally displaced persons, refugees or migrants

PART IV: Monitoring, Evaluation and Compliance

» Monitoring

Please list key monitoring activities undertaken in the reporting period *

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

During the reporting period, the project monitored implementation through a combination of technical coordination mechanisms, activity-level monitoring, partner reporting, community feedback, and evidence generation. Key monitoring activities included Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee meetings, which reviewed implementation progress, identified risks and bottlenecks, and provided strategic and technical oversight to ensure alignment with national Security Sector Reform (SSR) priorities.

Regular coordination meetings were held among UNDP, UNODC, OHCHR, the Office of National Security (ONS), and implementing partners to track progress against the work plan, coordinate joint activities, update the results framework, and address implementation challenges. The project also used activity reports, attendance records, disaggregated participant data, pre- and post-training assessments, and partner reports to monitor implementation progress and assess immediate results, strengthening evidence-based reporting and results tracking.

A key monitoring and evidence-generation activity was the National Public Perception Survey, which collected data on public security concerns, perceptions of safety, trust in security institutions, accountability, and inclusion. The findings are informing programming and providing important baseline data for measuring future changes in public confidence and security service delivery.

Community-based monitoring was undertaken through nationwide outreach missions, Bantaba dialogues, town hall meetings, and community radio programmes. These platforms enabled citizens to provide feedback on security concerns, police responsiveness, GBV/SGBV, access to justice, complaint mechanisms, border security, and trust in security institutions. This feedback has been used to inform adaptive programming and ensure interventions remain responsive to community needs.

The project also monitored capacity-building activities through pre- and post-training assessments for participants from the National Assembly, civil society, media, and security institutions. These assessments measured improvements in knowledge and understanding of SSR, human rights, oversight, accountability, and conflict sensitivity. In addition, the project initiated the development of an ONS Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Framework and reporting dashboard, which will strengthen long-term monitoring of SSR implementation and support evidence-based decision-making beyond the project period.

Do outcome indicators have baselines? *

If only some of the outcome indicators have baselines, select 'yes'

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief description. If not, explain why not and when they will be available.

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

While several outcome indicators were originally marked as TBD in the project results framework, the project has made significant progress in establishing baseline data during the reporting period. Baseline information has been generated through the National Survey on Security Needs and Public Perceptions, institutional assessments, human rights and governance analyses, and administrative data from partner institutions. The National Survey conducted in 2026 provides baseline data on public awareness and satisfaction with the Security Sector Reform (SSR) process, public confidence in security institutions, and perceptions of accountability and oversight mechanisms. The survey also generated disaggregated data by gender, age, disability status, and region, providing a foundation for measuring changes in public trust and confidence over the life of the project. In addition, baseline information on women's participation in decision-making and leadership roles within the security sector has been collected through institutional assessments and consultations with security institutions. Data on accountability and oversight mechanisms, including complaints reporting and handling processes, are being consolidated through collaboration with the Office of the Ombudsman, National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), Office of National Security (ONS), and relevant security institutions.

Elaborate on what sources of evidence have been used to report on indicators (and are available upon request)

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Evidence used to report on indicators includes activity reports, attendance sheets, pre- and post-training assessments, partner reports, meeting minutes, community outreach reports, and the national perception survey report. Activity reports provide details on implementation progress, outputs delivered, key results, challenges, participant feedback, and recommendations. Attendance sheets are used to verify participation numbers and support sex-, age-, disability-, institution- and region-disaggregated reporting where available. Pre- and post-training assessments have been used to measure immediate knowledge gains, changes in confidence, and improved understanding of SSR, human rights, accountability, oversight mechanisms, and reporting responsibilities. Partner reports and technical inputs from implementing partners, including national institutions and civil society actors, have also informed progress reporting and indicator updates. The national perception survey provides outcome-level evidence on public awareness of SSR, trust and confidence in security institutions, perceptions of safety, security concerns, accountability, and inclusion of women, youth and persons with disabilities. Meeting minutes from governance structures, including the Project Steering Committee and technical coordination meetings, provide evidence of oversight, decision-making, coordination, and follow-up actions.

Has the project launched outcome level data collection initiatives? e.g. perception surveys

Perception survey is a formal collection of information from a randomly selected sample of respondents through their responses to standardized questions. See PBF Guidance Note for more information [link](#)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

*

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The project launched an outcome-level data collection initiative through the National Survey on Security Needs, Public Perceptions, and Security Sector Reform in The Gambia. The survey was designed to generate nationally representative and disaggregated evidence on citizens' security needs, public awareness of SSR, perceptions of safety, trust and confidence in security institutions, satisfaction with security service delivery, and confidence in oversight and accountability mechanisms. The survey used a mixed-methods approach, combining a nationally representative household survey with focus group discussions and key informant interviews. It captured the perspectives of women, men, youth, persons with disabilities, rural and urban communities, security and justice actors, oversight bodies, civil society, and community leaders. The findings provide important baseline and outcome-level data for the project results framework. For example, the survey found that awareness of SSR remains limited at 18.3%, while 65.5% of respondents believe SSR has improved security institutions since 2017. It also identified key public security concerns, including theft and burglary, delayed justice, weak investigations, corruption, drug abuse, border insecurity, and limited police responsiveness. The survey results are being used to inform adaptive programming, community outreach, policy dialogue, oversight interventions, and future monitoring of changes in public trust, perceptions of safety, satisfaction with security services, and confidence in accountability mechanisms.

Has the project used or established community feedback mechanisms?

*

Community feedback mechanism, or community-based monitoring, is an organized system for communities of participants to monitor the local effects and impact of an intervention. Ideally, this system empowers the community to express whether their expectations are being met and to provide suggestions to decision-makers for possible (re)focusing. See PBF Guidance Note for more information. [link](#)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please provide a brief description

*

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

The project used community feedback mechanisms through structured community outreach, Bantaba dialogues, town hall meetings, community radio call-in programmes, and consultations linked to the national perception survey. These mechanisms created spaces for communities to share their views on the local effects of SSR, raise security concerns, assess whether reforms are responding to their needs, and provide recommendations to decision-makers and reform actors. Through outreach activities across all regions, communities engaged directly with the Office of National Security, National Human Rights Commission, Office of the Ombudsman, CSOs, security actors, traditional leaders, and local authorities. These engagements enabled citizens to provide feedback on issues such as theft and burglary, weak police response, delayed justice, border insecurity, GBV/SGBV, drug abuse, corruption, access to identification services, and low trust in reporting mechanisms. Community radio programmes also functioned as a feedback mechanism by allowing wider audiences, especially in rural and underserved communities, to participate through local-language discussions and call-ins. This enabled citizens who could not attend physical meetings to ask questions, share concerns, and receive direct responses from institutions involved in SSR. The national perception survey further strengthened community-based monitoring by systematically capturing citizens' views on security needs, public trust, satisfaction with security services, accountability mechanisms, and perceptions of SSR. The findings provide baseline and outcome-level evidence that will be used to track changes over time and inform adaptive programming. Feedback gathered through these mechanisms is being used to refine project interventions, inform community engagement strategies, strengthen awareness of complaint mechanisms, and ensure that SSR implementation remains responsive to citizens' lived security needs and expectations.

» Evaluation

Is the project on track to conduct its evaluation? *

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evaluation budget (in USD) included in the project budget: *

Response required

60000

If project will end in next six months, is your upcoming evaluation on track?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Not Applicable

Please describe the preparations

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Contact
information

Name

Organization

Job title

Email

Please mention
the focal
person
responsible for
sharing the
final evaluation
report with the
PBF:

Sainey Ceesay

UNDP

Head of Governance

sainey.ceesay@undp.org

» Catalytic Effect

Catalytic Effect (financial): Has the project mobilized additional non-PBF financial resources since the project's start? *

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

How many funders or grants has the project received additional non-PBF funding from **since the project started?** *

Catalytic Effect (non-financial): Has the project enabled or created a larger or longer-term peacebuilding change to occur, in addition to the direct project changes? Please refer to PBF Catalytic Effect Guidelines for more information.

*

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, please select the relevant option below:

*

☒ Some catalytic effect

☐ Significant catalytic effect

If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-financial) catalytic effect, i.e. removed barriers to unblock stalled political, institutional or other peacebuilding processes at different levels in a country, and/or created the conditions to establish new processes to do so

*

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

A key catalytic change is the increased ownership and participation of civil society and communities in the SSR process. Through the CSO-Security Sector Platform, civil society organizations now have a structured space to engage directly with security If relevant, please describe how the project has had a (non-financial) catalytic effect, i.e. removed barriers to unblock stalled political, institutional or other peacebuilding processes at different levels in a country, and/or created the conditions to establish new processes to do so (3000 characters):

A key catalytic change is the increased ownership and participation of civil society and communities in the SSR process. Through the CSO-Security Sector Platform, civil society organizations now have a structured space to engage directly with security institutions, share community concerns, and contribute to accountability and reform priorities. This has helped shift CSOs from being external observers to active participants in SSR implementation, monitoring and dialogue. This type of catalytic effect aligns with PBF guidance, which recognizes catalytic effects where a PBF investment removes barriers to engagement of additional stakeholders in peacebuilding efforts.

The project has also helped institutionalize community engagement as part of security governance. The nationwide outreach, Bantaba dialogues, town halls and community radio programmes created channels for citizens, traditional leaders, women, youth, persons with disabilities, oversight institutions and security actors to discuss security needs, accountability, complaint mechanisms and trust. These engagements are helping to change the way SSR is understood from a technical, institution-led process to a people-centred reform agenda shaped by community voices.

In addition, the project has strengthened capacities of Parliament, CSOs, media actors and oversight institutions to continue supporting SSR beyond individual activities. National Assembly members are now better equipped to use human rights standards in legislative review and oversight, while CSOs have improved capacity to monitor reforms, document concerns and advocate for accountability. Community radio actors are also better positioned to sustain public awareness and dialogue in local languages.

Overall, the project has created momentum for broader peacebuilding change by strengthening national ownership, widening participation, improving civil-security dialogue, and embedding accountability and inclusion within SSR processes. These changes are expected to support longer-term transformation in trust, institutional behaviour and democratic security governance in The Gambia.

Sustainability

Please describe any steps that have been taken to ensure the sustainability of peacebuilding gains, including any mechanisms, platforms, networks and socio-economic initiatives supported, beyond the duration of the project

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Sustainability has been built into the project through national ownership, institutional capacity strengthening, and the creation of platforms, tools, and evidence systems that can continue beyond the project period. The project works through national institutions, particularly the Office of National Security (ONS), which leads SSR coordination, and engages government, oversight bodies, security institutions, civil society, Parliament, media, and communities through existing national structures.

The Project Steering Committee and Technical Committee provide formal mechanisms for strategic oversight, joint planning, coordination, and follow-up. These structures help ensure that SSR priorities remain nationally led and aligned with government reform processes beyond individual project activities.

The project has also supported platforms that can sustain dialogue and accountability. The CSO-Security Sector Platform creates a structured space for civil society and security institutions to engage directly, discuss community concerns, build trust, and strengthen accountability. This helps institutionalize civil-security dialogue and ensures that CSOs remain active participants in the SSR process.

Sustainability is further supported through capacity strengthening of key oversight and accountability actors. National Assembly Members and staff were trained on SSR, human rights mechanisms, UPR recommendations, and treaty body concluding observations, strengthening their ability to support legislative review, public hearings, committee oversight, and budget advocacy. CSO representatives were also trained on SSR frameworks, monitoring, documentation, conflict sensitivity, Do No Harm, and human rights-based approaches, enabling them to continue public awareness, advocacy, and oversight.

The project has invested in practical knowledge products and institutional tools. The Gender Mainstreaming and SHEA pocketbooks provide simplified guidance for security institutions, supporting continued awareness and application of gender-responsive and survivor-centred standards. The SSR Media Training Manual and training of community radio personnel strengthen the capacity of media actors to continue accurate, ethical, and locally accessible reporting on SSR. Community radio has also been used as a sustainability mechanism. By training radio personnel and supporting radio programmes in local languages, the project has created a foundation for continued public awareness and dialogue, particularly in rural and underserved communities where radio remains a key source of information.

The project is also laying the groundwork for longer-term institutional sustainability through support to the development of the ONS MEL Framework and reporting dashboard, which will strengthen evidence-based monitoring of SSR implementation. The national perception survey also provides an evidence base and baseline for future programming, enabling stakeholders to track changes in trust, safety, accountability, and public perceptions over time.

Are there any other issues concerning project implementation that you want to share, including any capacity needs of the recipient organizations?

Please limit your response to 3000 characters.

Monitoring and Oversight Activities

Please describe any key event related to monitoring and oversight. Please click next if no activities have yet taken place.

Events include Steering Committee meetings, Monitoring visits, Third party monitoring, Community based monitoring, any data collection, Perception or other survey findings, evaluation reports, audit or investigations.

Monitoring and oversight activities	Name of the Event	Summary	Key Findings
Event 1	Project Steering Committee Meeting	Provided strategic oversight of project implementation, reviewed 2025 progress, discussed risks and implementation challenges, and approved the 2026 Annual Work Plan.	The PSC reaffirmed national ownership of the SSR process, strengthened coordination among UN agencies and government partners, and supported strategic direction for implementation.
Event 2	Technical Committee Meetings	Brought together UNDP, UNODC, OHCHR, ONS and partners to coordinate implementation, review progress, update workplans, and follow up on reporting and risk management.	The Technical Committee meetings strengthened coordination between UN agencies and national partners by providing a regular platform to review implementation progress, update workplans, identify bottlenecks, and agree on follow-up actions. The meetings also supported stronger results tracking, reporting, and risk management, while reinforcing national ownership and ensuring that project activities remained aligned with the SSR Strategy and national reform priorities.

Event 3	National Perception Survey on SSR and Security Needs	Generated evidence on public perceptions of security, trust in institutions, accountability, and citizen security priorities.	Theft and burglary were the leading community-level security concern at 44.11%, while petty theft and pickpocketing were the main national-level concern at 19.15%. Women represented 51% of respondents, youth 44.9%, and persons with disabilities 6.18%.
Event 4	Community Outreach	Created platforms for communities to engage directly with ONS, NHRC, Ombudsman, CSOs and security actors on SSR, accountability, complaint mechanisms and security concerns.	Communities raised concerns on theft, delayed justice, weak police response, border insecurity, GBV/SGBV, corruption, drug abuse, access to ID services, and low trust in reporting mechanisms. The engagements improved awareness and strengthened civil-security dialogue.
Event 5	Community Radio Engagements	Used local-language radio programmes to expand SSR awareness and enable public call-ins, particularly in rural and underserved communities.	Radio programmes increased access to SSR information, improved public understanding of the SSR Strategy and NSC Act 2025, and created wider platforms for citizens to ask questions and engage with reform actors.
Event 6	National Assembly Capacity-Building Training	Strengthened the capacity of National Assembly Members and staff on SSR, UPR recommendations, treaty body concluding observations, and Parliament's oversight role.	The training reached 52 participants, including 23 women and 29 men. Knowledge of the UPR increased from 35% to 90%, and 86% of post-training respondents reported being very confident in using human rights standards to review draft laws.

Event 7	CSO Coalition Capacity-Building Workshop	Built the capacity of 25 CSO representatives on SSR frameworks, oversight mechanisms, monitoring and documentation, conflict sensitivity, Do No Harm, and HRBA.	CSOs improved their ability to monitor reform, document concerns, advocate for accountability, and engage with security institutions through the CSO-Security Sector Platform.
Event 8			

Final Steps

- Please save a PDF copy of the form by clicking on the *Printer* icon on the top right corner of the page.
- A dialogue box will appear: Please select the A4 size and portrait orientation.
- Click "prepare" and save the document as a PDF.
- (If on first attempt, the generated page is not readable, close the pop up page and go back to the first page of the online form using the "Return to Beginning" option and try to print the PDF version from there)
- After printing the PDF version, please submit the report in the last page of the form. You can use the "Go to End" button in the bottom right corner.
- In compliance with our reporting requirements, **please upload the PDF version of the report as well as your *financial report in excel format* to the MPTF-O Gateway.**

If you encounter any difficulty in filling the form or generating the print-out for MPTFO Gateway, please contact Gabriel Velastegui gabriel.velasteguimoya@un.org

Thank You. You have finished the report. Please Click on the SUBMIT button below. When the report is submitted, a confirmation note will appear on a yellow banner on top of the page. This can take a few seconds.