

**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 15  
(1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015)**

**1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>Project Title:</b>	Capacity building on biosafety for implementation of the Cartagena Protocol in India-Phase II
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change (MoEF&CC), , Government of India
<b>Project partners:</b>	UNEP/GEF
<b>Geographical Scope:</b>	National

<b>Participating Countries:</b>	India
---------------------------------	-------

<b>GEF project ID:</b>	3751	<b>IMIS number*<sup>1</sup>:</b>	GFL/5060-2716-4C42
<b>Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>GEF OP #:</b>	
<b>GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:</b>	SP 6 – Biosafety/SO3	<b>GEF approval date*:</b>	August 11, 2011
<b>UNEP approval date:</b>	May 3, 2012	<b>Date of first disbursement*:</b>	24/05/2012
<b>Actual start date<sup>2</sup>:</b>	May 29, 2012	<b>Planned duration:</b>	48 months
<b>Intended completion date*:</b>	May 28, 2016	<b>Actual or Expected completion date:</b>	May 28, 2016
<b>Project Type:</b>	Full-Sized Project (FSP)	<b>GEF Allocation*:</b>	2,727,273.00
<b>PPG GEF cost*:</b>	-	<b>PPG co-financing*:</b>	-
<b>Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:</b>	6,000,000.00	<b>Total Cost*:</b>	8,727,273.00
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):</b>	September 15, 2015	<b>Terminal Evaluation (actual date):</b>	May 02, 2016
<b>Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):</b>		<b>No. of revisions*:</b>	3
<b>Date of last Steering Committee meeting:</b>	March 16, 2015	<b>Date of last Revision*:</b>	01/07/2015
<b>Disbursement as of 30 June 2015*:</b>	1,079,297.15 USD	<b>Date of financial closure*:</b>	
<b>Date of Completion<sup>3*</sup>:</b>	May 2, 2016	<b>Actual expenditures reported as of 30 June 2015<sup>4</sup>:</b>	413,441.51 USD
<b>Total co-financing realized as of 30 June 2015<sup>5</sup>:</b>	4,429,789 USD	<b>Actual expenditures entered in IMIS as of 30 June 2015*:</b>	413,441.51 USD
<b>Leveraged financing:<sup>6</sup></b>			

<sup>1</sup> Fields with an \* sign (in yellow) should be filled by the Fund Management Officer

<sup>2</sup> Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

<sup>3</sup> If there was a “Completion Revision” please use the date of the revision.

<sup>4</sup> Information to be provided by Executing Agency/Project Manager

<sup>5</sup> Projects which completed mid-term reviews/evaluations or terminal evaluations during FY15 should attach the completed co-financing table as per GEF format. See Annex 1

<sup>6</sup> See above note on co-financing

<p><b>Project summary<sup>7</sup></b></p>	<p>India is predominantly an agriculture-based country and ranks second worldwide in farm output. Agriculture and allied sectors like <u>forestry</u>, <u>logging</u> and <u>fishing</u> accounted for 16.6% of the GDP in 2007, employed 60% of the total workforce and despite a steady decline of its share in the GDP, is still the largest economic sector and plays a significant role in the overall socio-economic development of India. India's vast majority of people depend directly on agriculture and forestry for food security and livelihood. These sectors are also considered most vulnerable to the projected climate change. India's population is growing faster than its ability to produce agricultural commodities especially food crops. Population growth coupled with rapid industrialization is increasing the demand for food, feed, fibre and fuels many folds.</p> <p>In the last decade, per unit productivity in food grains has plateaued and annual per capita availability is on the decline thereby requiring an urgent need for new technological interventions. In this context the Government of India (GOI) has recognized the potential of modern biotechnology to address poverty, food security and human health. India has made rapid progress in biotechnology research and development (R&amp;D).</p> <p>Recognizing the need for ensuring biosafety, the GOI has taken several steps to ensure safe use of LMOs. In terms of biosafety law and policies, India was one of the first in the developing world to enact a biosafety regulation in as early as 1989, 3 years before the CBD was adopted in 1992. The introduction of the biosafety rules in 1989 encompassed an implementation mechanism involving various committees at institutional, district, state and central levels. This was a pioneering step that was enabled by the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. By 2007, a constellation of legislations cognate to biosafety regulations were developed. This included the Biological Diversity Act 2002, the Plant Quarantine Order, 2003, Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006, the Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001 (PPVFR), etc.</p> <p>The GOI ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2003. Being a Party to the CPB, India is committed to meet its obligations on the transboundary movement of LMOs. Although, India is presently neither an importer nor an exporter of LMOs, there is an urgent need to strengthen the regulatory procedures and enforcement mechanisms with regard to transboundary movement of LMOs, in view of advancements in crop biotechnology at the national and global level.</p> <p>As of now Bt Cotton is the only crop approved for commercial use in the country covering an area of more than 90% of the total cotton cultivation area. In addition several other crops such as cotton, rice, castor, wheat, maize, tomato, groundnut, potato, sorghum, okra, brinjal, mustard, watermelon, papaya, sugarcane, rubber, banana, pigeon pea, <i>Artemisia annua</i> L. and chickpea are under various stages of field testing and evaluation. The impact of the release of living modified organisms (LMOs) on the sustainable use of biodiversity and human health continue to be a primary concern among many.</p> <p>While several efforts have been made by the GOI towards capacity building within the country to strengthen the biosafety regulation and to create awareness regarding biosafety issues, the urgent need to intensify capacity building on identified priority areas through a focused programme was highlighted consequent to the Phase I Capacity Building Project on Biosafety which implemented by MoEF</p>
---	--

<sup>7</sup> As in project document

	<p>with the support of World Bank/GEF in 2007.</p> <p>In the above background, the UNEP-GEF Phase-II Capacity Building Project on Biosafety was developed by MoEF and approved by GEF on 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2011. The Phase II Project is conceptualized to supplement the ongoing biosafety capacity building initiatives in India integrate international experience and promote regional cooperation.</p> <p>The main focus of this project is to strengthen institutional capacity, develop human resource and enhance public awareness on biosafety to ensure adequate protection of human health and biodiversity from potential harm arising from all LMO-related activities. The three thrust areas for capacity building are Risk Assessment and Management, Socio Economic Considerations Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of LMOs in agriculture.</p> <p>The project has 8 components. It will begin with a stocktaking assessment (Component 1), where updated information is consolidated to refine the project design and to assist in priority setting of project activities to ensure that all project outcomes are achieved. Component 2 aims to strengthen the legal and regulatory framework, whilst Component 3 will enhance institutional capabilities. Component 4 is designed to develop human resources and raising public awareness is undertaken under Component 5. Project management and Project monitoring and evaluation form Component 6 and 7. Promotion of regional cooperation, networking and sharing of experience is covered under Component 8.</p> <p>This GEF/UNEP-funded Phase II project will build on the foundations of the previous GEF/WB project. The 9 outcomes of the project are expected to contribute to the project objective of enhancing the biosafety management capacity of India, which will in turn, contribute to the overarching goal of GEF to enable CPB Parties to comply with their international obligations under this legal instrument.</p>
--	--

<p><b>Project status FY<sup>8</sup></b></p>	<p><b>Project Management and Monitoring Committee (PMMC)</b>  The Project Management and Monitoring Committee (PMMC) constituted on February 2013, to address day to day procurement and project implementation issues have met three times during the period of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015 as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ September 14, 2014 --- 5<sup>th</sup> PMMC</li> <li>➤ March 16, 2015 --- 6<sup>th</sup> PMMC</li> <li>➤ June 23, 2015 --- 7<sup>th</sup> PMMC</li> </ul> <p>Till date seven meetings of the PMMC have been convened to review project progress and to accord various approvals related to activities such as TOR, for consultants, selection of consultants, award of contracts, revision in work plan, budget etc. on a quarterly basis.</p> <p><b>Project Coordination Unit (PCU)</b>  The PCU has been established at Biotech Consortium India Limited (BCIL) on August 2013, for a period of four years. The PCU is assisting NPC on a day to day basis for activities related to the project implementation.</p> <p><b>Supervisory Mission</b>  Dr. Alex O. Biney, Portfolio Manager, UNEP for Phase II Project on Biosafety, is tentatively planning to visit India for a supervisory mission and Mid-Term Review during the second week of September 2015 to review the progress of the project.</p>
---	---

<sup>8</sup> Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

He would be participating in discussions with NPD, NPC and PCU team. He would be evaluating the progress of the project in the four thrust areas.

**National Steering Committee (NSC)**

The third meeting of the NSC, which accords the necessary approvals related to annual work plan, budget and review of project progress, was held on March 16, 2015 at New Delhi, under the Chairmanship of Shri. Hem Pande Additional Secretary, MoEF&CC and National Project Director. The Members approved the annual work plan, budget and reviewed the progress of the project made so far subsequent to the second meeting of the NSC held on June 24, 2014.

**Status of the Project Activities:**

To initiate the project activities in a planned manner, implementation plans were prepared for each of the thrust areas i.e. risk assessment and risk management (RARM), socio-economic consideration (SECs) and handling, transport, packaging and identification (HTPI) and public awareness (PA). The status of implementation under each of the thrust areas is presented below:

**THRUST AREA- I: RISK ASSESSMENT & RISK MANAGEMENT**

The contract for undertaking activities related to Risk Assessment and Risk Management (RARM) was awarded to Centre for Environmental Risk Assessment (CERA) - ILSI research foundation, Washington, USA. The progress so far is as given under

- a. **Preparation of a base paper:** An online survey on “GE Plants in product development pipeline in India” has been completed to understand the major crops and traits at various stages of product development cycle. The objective of the study was to assist in preparedness of the regulatory system to the products/traits in the pipeline.
- b. **Preparation of CFT monitoring manual:** A course manual, “Monitoring Confined Field Trials of Regulated, GE Plants,” and accompanying test questions have been drafted by CERA ILSI. This manual is designed to introduce confined field trials (CFTs) and their role in the development of new GE crop plants, the process by which CFTs are regulated in India, and the measures used to effectively manage potential environmental risks from CFTs.
- c. **Training Workshops on Management of Confined Field Trials (CFTs) of Regulated GE Plants :** Two training workshops of two days duration each were organized at New Delhi (May 25-26, 2015) and Hyderabad (June 3-4, 2015) for members of monitoring teams; scientists from ICAR research institutions; scientists from State Agricultural Universities (SAUs) and state department of agriculture etc. participated in these workshops. After completion of training workshop, a post workshop survey and quiz were also organized. To encourage maximum participation in the survey and quiz, certificates were also distributed to participants who completed both quiz and survey.

	<p><b>d. <u>Preparation of ERA guidelines:</u></b> An expert committee under the chairmanship of Prof. C.R. Babu and Prof. K. Veluthambi as the co-chair has been constituted by MOEF&amp;CC for formulation of guidelines for ERA of GE plants. Five meetings of the expert committee have been held so far. The committee has finalized the structure of the guidelines and the drafting has already been completed and reviewed during the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Guidelines are in final stages of completion. User's Guide and preparation of Risk Analysis Framework (RAF) are also near to completion.</p> <p><b>e. <u>Visit to OGTR for understanding ERA process of GE plants:</u></b> A team of eight experts consisting of representatives of concerned ministries and members of regulatory committees, visited the Office of Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) and other concerned agencies in Australia to understand the operational framework and risk analysis methodologies being followed in Australia. The five day visit was facilitated by CERA-ILSI. The officers from OGTR made detailed presentations on the Australian legislation, operations of national scheme, administrative system for handling and processing application, risk analysis and decision making, risk communication methods/approaches, monitoring and compliance etc. The visiting team had an opportunity to interact with Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ), Biosecurity Group of Department of Agriculture, Therapeutic Goods Administration, Australian Pesticide and Veterinary Medicine Authority and Commonwealth Scientific Research Organization (CSIRO).</p> <p><b>f. <u>Preparation of biology documents:</u></b></p> <p>The crop specific national institutions under ICAR have been engaged to prepare a series of biology documents for facilitating ERA process for eight crops viz. Chick Pea, Pigeon Pea, Sorghum, Papaya, Mustard, Rubber, Potato and Tomato. The following institutions were engaged:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Indian Institute of Pulses Research (IIPR), Kanpur for Chickpea and Pigeon Pea</li> <li>ii. Directorate of Sorghum Research (DSR), Hyderabad for Sorghum</li> <li>iii. Indian Institute of Horticultural Research (IIHR), Bangalore for Papaya</li> <li>iv. Directorate of Rapeseed and Mustard Research (DRMR), Bharatpur for Mustard</li> <li>v. Rubber Research Institute (RRI), Kottayam for Rubber</li> <li>vi. Central Potato Research Institute (CPRI), Shimla for Potato</li> <li>vii. Indian Institute of Vegetable Research (IIVR), Varanasi for tomato</li> </ol> <p>Dr. O.P. Govila, Former Professor of Genetics, IARI and member, GEAC is the national consultant for assisting the national institutions in preparation of biology documents by reviewing the documents. A consultative process is being followed for finalization of the biology documents as per the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Review of draft biology documents being prepared by institutions by national consultant to confirm that the documents are in line with the suggested structure and intended purpose of risk assessment.</li> <li>ii. Circulation of revised draft biology documents for comments/additional</li> </ol>
--	--

- information to State Agricultural Universities (SAUs), research institutions and private sector working on these crops.
- iii. Forwarding the comments received to respective institutions for incorporation and submission of final draft.
  - iv. Review by CERA-ILSI, UNEP and national consultant
  - v. Consultative meetings with crop specific experts for finalization, if required.
  - vi. Formatting, editing and printing.

Biology documents of seven crops are under final stages of printing and ready for circulation after a series of consultation process. The biology document on Chickpea is under circulation for comments and is expected to be ready for printing in next few weeks.

#### **THRUST AREA II: SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS**

The activities related to socio-economic considerations for Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), have been assigned to Research and Information System for Developing countries (RIS). RIS has associated with following six national institutions for undertaking various project activities i.e. developing and validating questionnaires, conducting baseline surveys, organizing workshops and meetings for development of guidelines and methodologies etc.:

- Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), New Delhi
- Gujarat Institute of Developmental Research (GIDR), Ahmedabad
- Institute of Social and Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore
- National Academy of Agricultural Research and Management (NAARM), Hyderabad
- Tamil Nadu Agricultural University (TNAU), Coimbatore
- University of Agricultural Sciences (UAS), Raichur

Subsequent to signing of contracts with all partnering institutions, the first meeting was held on November 6, 2014 at New Delhi. The initial guidance document had been made by the RIS team within first four months from the commencement of the project. It captured the existing studies on socio-economic assessment of certain crops based on extensive literature review and analysis of available ex-ante and ex-post studies undertaken by various institutions and researchers across the crops and regions in India. It also encompassed analysis of available studies on cost-benefit analysis

RIS in collaboration with Institute of Social and Economic Change (ISEC) organized a two-day “Workshop on developing guidelines and methodologies for socio-economic assessment of LMOs” from December 11-12, 2014 at ISEC, Bangalore to discuss in detail the initial draft guidance document, selection of methodologies and questionnaire design. Principal Investigators (PIs) from all the partner institutions participated in this. In addition RIS invited couple of external experts. Based on the Workshop deliberations, the project partners are working on finalizing the design of the questionnaires for various stakeholders in respective sample survey locations based on selected crops and traits. The partner institutions have also started identifying two crops and two traits for use in the surveys and field work from the list provided by MoEF&CC.

Each partner institution selected two crops and traits for the field survey. The crops and regions selected by the respective project partners is as shown in the following table

Institution	Crops	Traits	Location
GIDR	Castor and Groundnut	Fungus/Bacterial and Nitrogen Use	Gujarat
IARI	Mustard and Tomato	Insect Resistance and Delayed Ripening	Haryana and Punjab
TNAU	Brinjal and Maize	Insecticide Resistance and Herbicide Tolerance	Tamil Nadu
ISEC	Bt Cotton and Aerobic Paddy	Insect Resistance and Drought/salinity Tolerant	Karnataka
NAARM	Maize and Brinjal	Herbicide Tolerance and Insect Resistance	Telangana
UAS	Pigeon Pea and Black Gram	Insect Resistance and Fungal Resistance	Karnataka

A common questionnaire has been prepared for collection of information through surveys. This questionnaire will be used by all partner institutions for ensuring uniformity in data collection. As data is collected for different crops and different traits having a common questionnaire ensures that essential information that is relevant for understanding SE impacts is collected for the identified crops and traits. On the basis of the draft questionnaires, a common set of variables and parameters mentioned by each of the institutions will be prepared.

### **THRUST AREA III: HANDLING, TRANSPORT, PACKAGING AND IDENTIFICATION**

The activities under HTPI have been divided into three sub-components namely strengthening of institutions for LMO detection, Identity preservation and strengthening capacity of enforcement agencies.

#### **Strengthening of institutional capacity for LMO Detection:**

Subsequent to the completion of the stocktaking assessment of six labs during Phase-I of the stocktaking exercise by ScanBi Diagnostics in association with Dr. Lalitha Gowda, Chief Scientist, CFTRI, Mysore as the national and Dr. Murali Krishna from PCU, the final report submitted by ScanBi has been reviewed in the inter-ministerial meeting and recommended inviting proposals from all the six institutions and also suggested to audit three additional labs namely

- Export Inspection Council (EIC) Lab, Kochi
- Geo-Chem Laboratories Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai
- Punjab Biotechnology Incubator, Mohali

Subsequently, Dr. Lalitha Gowda and Dr. Murali Krishna visited the above three labs for stocktaking assessment and the final report submitted by Dr. Gowda was reviewed in the 7th PMMC held in June 23, 2014. PMMC recommended the following:

- A. To provide financial support of Rs. 100 lakhs to NBPGR and Rs. 75 Lakhs to PBTI, EIA-Kochi and DFTCML each for strengthening their existing capacities as well as for procurement of equipments required for LMO detection.
- B. Constitution of a Sub-Committee with Dr. Gowda as the Chair and the representatives of four institutions as Members of the Committee. The first meeting of the Sub-Committee for finalization of the equipments list is scheduled to be held in the first week of the July, 2015.
- C. The Sub-Committee would finalize the list of common equipments required by all the four labs and procure the same through a common tendering process.

The Members of the PMMC also recommended the proposal submitted by Ms. Intertek-ScanBi Diagnostics for providing training to scientists and staff in aspects related to LMO detection in India and Sweden. A formal contracts needs to be signed between Intertek ScanBi Diagnostics and Biosafety Project, MoEF&CC

#### **Identity Preservation**

This component includes understanding of strategies and methodologies that are being followed to maintain Identity Preservation (IP) of various commodities such as basmati rice, soybean etc. followed by an estimation of the cost implications in terms of additional infrastructure, testing, maintenance, human resources, etc. to assess whether the existing IP systems for non GMO commodities can be applied for handling LMOs in India

The contract for documenting the identity preservation steps being followed for basmati rice has been assigned to All India Rice Exporters Association (AIREA). AIREA has already completed the farmer's survey covering approx. 20,000 farmers from 400 villages in four rice growing states of Punjab, Haryana, Delhi and Western Uttar Pradesh during Kharif 2014. Draft report on completion of farm survey has been submitted by AIREA and is under finalization.

The Members of the 7<sup>th</sup> PMMC also recommended the proposal submitted by Dr. P.K.Ghosh from Ms. Sompradip Publishers and Consultants for preparation of a feasibility study for implementing IP systems for LMOs in India. A formal contracts needs to be signed between Sompradip Publishers and Consultants and Biosafety Project, MoEF&CC

#### **Strengthening of Enforcement Capacity**

Being an emerging and scientifically advanced area, capacity building of enforcement personnel such as customs and plant quarantine officers are critical in implementing the requirements under Article 17 and 18 of the Protocol

Article 18 of the CPB requires parties to take measures to take measures for the safe handling, packaging and transportation including appropriate documentation of LMOs that are subject to transboundary movement. Whereas Article 17 calls for measures to prevent unintentional or illegal entry of LMOs.

This component has been divided into two parts namely (i) activities for strengthening the Plant Quarantine and (ii) activities for strengthening the



Customs.

### **Update on activities for strengthening the Plant Quarantine**

In order to understand the existing procedures followed by Customs and Quarantine and the linkages between the two which is essential for assessing the training needs at various levels and for preparation of outreach material; Dr. Ranjini Warriar, Director along with officials from NBPGR has visited the Plant Quarantine Research Station at Rangpuri and the Air Cargo facilities at T3 of the IGI Airport wherein a detailed presentation was made by the Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) officials.

Pursuant to the above field visit, a proposal has been received from NBPGR for training of PPQ officials. The proposal submitted by NBPGR has been reviewed by the Members of the PMMC and approved the same for organizing three training workshops for Plant Quarantine Officers and 4 workshops would be organized for Customs officials in four regional stations.

Technical support for organizing workshops for Customs officials would be provided by NBPGR whereas logistics support would be provided by NACEN. A proposed study tour to University of Murdoch, Australia to be undertaken by Plant Quarantine officials have been approved by PMMC.

The tentative dates for this study tour would be Sep 28, 2015 to Oct 03, 2015. A formal contract needs to be executed between NBPGR and Biosafety Project, MoEF&CC for organizing these training workshops.

### **THRUST AREA IV: PUBLIC AWARENESS**

The activities related to the component on "Information dissemination to promote public awareness" involve undertaking development of various outreach material and their dissemination around the country with an objective to improve systems for public education, awareness, participation and access to biosafety information.

The following agencies have been engaged under Phase-II Biosafety Project for undertaking activities related to Public Awareness and the progress is as indicated below:

1. **Asia BioBusiness (ABB) Pte Ltd, Singapore** has been engaged for implementing activities related to risk communication on biosafety i.e., development of a risk communication strategy; preparing syllabus for training, modules for workshops on risk communication for policy makers and experts and providing assistance for organizing a regional workshop.

A team of experts from ABB Pte Ltd visited India from January 5-9, 2015 for interactions with a range of stakeholder's viz. regulators, policymakers, scientists, communication specialists, legal experts, industry, etc. These meetings were aimed towards:

- Seeking further clarifications of project objectives
- Identifying key issues to be considered in developing risk communication strategies
- Identifying key targets for the risk communication trainings

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying targets for the communication process</li> </ul> <p>In order to meet the above objectives, meetings were organised with various focus groups as well as one to one interactions with individual experts.</p> <p>Draft Risk Communication Strategy prepared by ABB Pte. Ltd has been communicated to various stakeholders for inputs and suggestions. Comments received from experts have been communicated to ABB Pte. Ltd for incorporation of the same and final Risk Communication strategy and training modules are awaited. It is proposed to organize two workshops at New Delhi and Hyderabad during the month of October 2015.</p> <p><b>2. CAB International (CABI), South Asia, New Delhi</b> has been engaged to develop primers/brochures./booklets/FAQs and other outreach material in 8 regional languages viz., English, Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Gujarati, Tamil, Telugu and Oriya. The key deliverables assigned to them are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 brochures and their translation into 8 regional languages</li> <li>• 1 primer and its translation into 8 regional languages</li> <li>• 1 booklet on Frequently asked questions (FAQs) and its translation into 8 regional languages</li> <li>• 1 glossary of terms and its translation into 8 regional languages</li> <li>• Short animation (pictorial representation explaining the concepts of biosafety to non-experts) and its translation into 8 regional languages</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC), New Delhi</b> has been engaged to organize four national and five regional level media workshops on biosafety, producing programmes for IIMC community radio 'Apna Radio' and broadcasting the same in regional community radios with the focus being on biosafety in agriculture sector an developing a quiz program on biosafety for the journalists.</p> <p>IIMC has completed the conduct of 5 training workshops and remaining 4 workshops would be completed by August 2015. IIMC has also completed the formulation of quiz questions and this quiz would be aired in APNA Radio program. Interview for telecast in APNA Radio program with Prof. Ashiwini Pareek, JNU and Dr. Vinay Kumar, Digital Green has been completed and would be aired shortly.</p> <p><b>4. Biotech Consortium India Limited (BCIL), New Delhi</b> has been engaged to prepare a biosafety resource toolkit containing five brochures as indicated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Regulatory framework for Genetically Engineered plants in India</li> <li>b. Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: An overview</li> <li>c. Confined field trials of Genetically Engineered plants</li> <li>d. Frequently asked questions about Genetically Engineered plants</li> <li>e. Accessing Information/Databases: Useful resources for safety</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p style="text-align: center;">assessment of genetically modified organisms</p> <p>Draft brochures of all the above documents have been completed by BCIL and are under finalization. In addition, booklets for students on basics of biotechnology and biosafety are also under preparation.</p> <p>As a parallel exercise, BCIL is also implementing the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Hindi translation of the text of CPB and Nagoya Kuala Lumpur Supplementary Protocol on Liability and Redress has been completed for wider circulation.</li> <li>II. A quarterly Biosafety Newsletter is being prepared and circulated to about 10,000 stakeholders on a quarterly basis. Till now 14 issues were published and circulated from July 2011, which provides information on the project activities, developments under the CPB, new publications related to emerging issues and upcoming events related to biosafety and CPB.</li> </ol> <p>On another note, a Communication Workshop on Agricultural Biotechnology and Invitational Media Workshop on Communicating Food Science and Agricultural Biotechnology was organized by MoEF&amp;CC in collaboration with International Food Information Council (IFIC) Foundation, USA, IIMC and BCIL organized on November 19 and 20, 2014 respectively.</p> <p>The objective of the workshops was to improve public understanding of science based communications in agricultural biotechnology for the policy makers, members of the regulatory committees, scientists and media practitioners. The workshop on agricultural biotechnology was attended by 67 participants mainly comprising policy makers, members of regulatory committee's viz., Review Committee on Genetic Manipulation (RCGM), Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) and scientists. The workshop for media personnel was attended by 35 participants mainly comprising of journalists, communication specialists from Department of Biotechnology, Department of Science and Technology and the Department of Communication Research of IIMC.</p> <p>Guidance documents prepared by IFIC Foundation i.e. "Food Biotechnology: A Communicator's Guide to Improving Understanding" and "Improving Public Understanding Guidelines: for Communicating Emerging Science on Nutrition, Food Safety and Health", for journalists, scientists and other communicators were circulated to the participants of the workshop.</p>
--	--

<b>Project status FY<sup>9</sup></b>	<p>The Project activities under various thrust areas have been initiated by identification of appropriate consultants/ agencies after setting up of PCU which was made operational in August 2013. The contract for activities related to RARM has been assigned to CERA-ILSI, Washington, USA through involvement of various national agencies and experts at various stages.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

<sup>9</sup> Progress made during current reporting period (one paragraph stating key changes since previous reporting period)

	<p>The contract for undertaking activities related to Socio-economic considerations have been assigned to RIS and six other National Institutions have further collaborated with RIS for effective implementation of activities related to SEC.</p> <p>The Stocktaking assessment activities related to LMO detection under HTPI component has been completed by ScanBi Diagnostics, Sweden. The proposal submitted by Intertek-ScanBi for providing training to Scientists and staff have been approved by PMMC and a formal contract would be signed shortly.</p> <p>Activity related to documenting Identity Preservation (IP) steps being followed for basmati rice in India has been completed by AIREA through a farm survey involving 20000 farmers and the draft report has been received and is under review.</p> <p>The contract for preparing a feasibility study for implementing IP systems in LMOs in India would be awarded to Ms. Sompradip Publishers and Consultants, New Delhi. The proposal submitted by them has been approved by PMMC in its 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p> <p>Activities related to strengthening enforcement capacities (Plant quarantine and Customs) would be assigned to NBPGR and a total of 7 training workshops for Plant Quarantine and Customs officials would be organized jointly by NBPGR and NACEN.</p> <p>Activities related to Public awareness is being implemented through various agencies namely ABB Pte. Ltd, IIMC, CABI and BCIL.</p> <p>The National Steering Committee (NSC) and Project Management and Monitoring Committee (PMMC) have been constituted and are meeting at regular intervals to accord the necessary approvals from time to time.</p>
<p><b>Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets<sup>10</sup></b></p>	<p>GEF strategic long-term objective: BD3 - Strategic programme for GEF IV: SP 6: Building Capacity for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.</p> <p>The Indian Biosafety Project aims to strengthen the biosafety management system in India with special emphasis on Risk Assessment and Management, Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of LMOs, Socio Economic Considerations and Public awareness, to ensure adequate protection of human health and biodiversity from potential harm arising from all LMO related activities. The project has 8 components.</p> <p>The Project will build on the foundations of the previous GEF/WB project. The 9 outcomes of the project are expected to contribute to the project objective of enhancing the biosafety management capacity of India, which will in turn, contribute to the overarching goal of GEF to enable CPB Parties to comply with their international obligations under</p>

<sup>10</sup> For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

	this legal instrument.
--	------------------------

**2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE**

*State the global environmental objective(s) of the project<sup>11</sup>*

<p>The overarching goal of this project is to assist the GOI, as Party to the CPB, to build capacity to implement the CPB through activities at the national, sub regional and regional levels. It is also consistent with the “Programme Document for GEF Support to Biosafety in GEF 4” approved in April, 2008.</p> <p>The project objective is to strengthen the biosafety management system in India with special emphasis on Risk Assessment and Management, Handling, Transport, Packaging and Identification of LMOs, Socio Economic Considerations and Public awareness, to ensure that adequate protection of human health and biodiversity from potential harm arising from all LMO-related activities.</p>
--

*Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). **Describe any significant environmental or other changes (results) attributable to project implementation.** Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific **project outcomes** (not more than 300 words)*

<p>As there were some delays in the initiation of the activities due to administrative procedures, several activities have been started in parallel with the involvement of multiple institutions/ agencies. Even though activities related to RARM, SEC and PA were progressing well, there was delay in initiation of activities related to Strengthening Enforcement Capacities. However, the activities related to strengthening enforcement capacities have been initiated after repeated follow ups with various international and national agencies. The activities related to training of plant quarantine officials would be undertaken by NBPGR and trainings for customs officials would be undertaken by NACEN with technical support from NBPGR. It is expected that due to initiation of enforcement activities, the project would be completed in time as per agreed time lines.</p>
---

*Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document <sup>12</sup>(not more than 200 words)*

--

---

<sup>11</sup> Or immediate project objective

<sup>12</sup> Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

### 3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **UNEP Task Manager**<sup>13</sup> will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

#### 3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
Objective <sup>18</sup> :	<b>Objectives have outcomes which have indicators and its mentioned below</b>					

<sup>13</sup> For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

<sup>14</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

<sup>15</sup> Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1).

<sup>16</sup> Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

<sup>17</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions.

<sup>18</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Updated information is consolidated to guide the planning of specific activities under this project</p>	<p>The project design will be fine-tuned based on the updated information and needs assessment by the Project Coordinating Team under the supervision of the National Execution Agency (NEA).</p>	<p>Information available but scattered</p>	<p>Information will be consolidated and used</p>	<p>Needs assessment report would be used for sustainability of activities</p>	<p>Stocktaking assessment has been completed through ScanBi Diagnostics.</p> <p>Nine National Institutions were audited for assessing their LMO detection capacities</p> <p>Crops and traits which are under various stages of product development pipeline completed through CERA-ILSI</p>	<p>S</p>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b>  <b>Outcome 2A.1</b> A legal and regulatory framework that is consistent with the CPB, is strengthened to permit effective evaluation, management and monitoring of LMO(s) risk</p>	<p>The legal framework consistent with CPB will be in place</p>	<p>Laws , policies and guidelines are in place</p>	<p>Gaps in the regulatory regime and inconsistencies with the CPB will be identified</p>	<p>Strengthened legal regime consistent with CPB</p>	<p>Baseline survey on compliance with Article 15, 16 and Annex III of the CPB has been prepared and is under review.</p> <p>Identifying the gaps between existing system and country obligations under Article 8, 10 and 18 (2) of CPB would be assigned to NBPGR. Proposal accepted and contract needs to be signed.</p> <p>Draft ERA guidelines have been prepared through Expert Committee</p> <p>Preparation of biology documents for 6 crops have been completed and 2 are in various stages of consultative process</p>	<p>S</p>



Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 2B.1</b> Socio-economic assessment are considered</p>	<p>Parameters and methodologies for socio-economic assessments are in place</p>	<p>Limited experience with Bt Cotton</p>	<p>Model questionnaires on SE will be available</p>	<p>Parameters and methodologies for SE assessment, including guidelines for cost benefit analysis are in place</p>	<p>RIS with support of 6 other institutions have initiated the activities. Model Questionnaires on SE are ready and surveys initiated.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2C.1</b> A national system is established for handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs, consistent with the requirements under Article 7 and Article 18 of the CPB</p>	<p>An operational administrative system for handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs is in place</p>	<p>A basic administrative system exists but it is inadequate for handling, transport, packaging and identification of LMOs</p>	<p>A feasibility report for identity preservation (IP) system will be available for commodities such as basmati rice and soybean</p>	<p>An operational administrative system is in place including a certification and testing mechanism</p>	<p>AIREA has completed the survey with 20000 farmers documenting IP steps followed for basmati rice. Feasibility report would be assigned to Sompradip Publishers &amp; Consultants.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Institutions and staff capacity is enhanced for LMO detection</p>	<p>An institution with a network of 2-3 laboratories is strengthened for LMO detection</p>	<p>Laboratories for LMO detection exist however these institutions need further strengthening in terms of infrastructure and human resources</p>	<p>Short listing of potential partners in the network  Plans for Infrastructure improvement are in place</p>	<p>Institution with a network of 2-3 laboratories is strengthened with improved infrastructure and at least 20 trained technicians</p>	<p>4 labs identified for strengthening LMO detection facilities. Training of 20 staff in India and 8 in Sweden on LMO detection with support of Intertek-ScanBi Diagnostics</p>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator <sup>14</sup>	Baseline level <sup>15</sup>	Mid-term target <sup>16</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2015	Progress rating <sup>17</sup>
<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> <b>Outcome 4.1</b> Human resource is developed for strategic areas such risk evaluation.</p>	<p>At least 20 scientists will be trained in risk evaluation</p>	<p>Limited number of experts available. More focused training needed</p>	<p>Training manuals for environment risk evaluation and management in place</p>	<p>20 scientists will be trained</p>	<p>8 scientists/ regulators went for training in OGTR, Australia.  50 scientists were trained on management of field trails in two workshops held at New Delhi and Hyderabad</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 4.2</b> Enforcement mechanism at the ports of entry is strengthened with trained staff</p>	<p>At least 2 officials at every point of entry will be trained in enforcement of trans boundary movement procedure</p>	<p>Under phase I of GEF project, about 500 plant quarantine and custom officials sensitized</p>	<p>Training manual and working knowledge document for custom and plant quarantine officials available</p>	<p>At least 2 officials at every point of entry will be trained in enforcement of transboundary movement procedure</p>	<p>Training programs initiated through NBPGR and NACEN. 45 Plant Quarantine &amp; 120 Customs officials will be trained through 7 training workshops by end of 2016</p>	<p>S</p>

<p><b>Outcome 5:</b><sup>19</sup> Public awareness on biosafety issues, biosafety regulation and regional cooperation is enhanced.</p>	<p>Extent of feedback from target groups on biosafety issues, regulations and procedures is increased upto 50%</p>	<p>Approximately 5,000 participants representing stakeholder groups viz. agricultural scientists, government officials, legal personnel, media, industry, school children and teachers, were sensitized under Phase I</p>	<p>Development of a risk communication strategy for various stakeholders</p>	<p>Outreach material for both in print and electronic form available for use by various stakeholders.</p> <p>About 10,000 Stakeholders representing key segments sensitized</p>	<p>*Draft Risk communication strategy prepared and circulated for comments and suggestions. *IIMC has organized 5 awareness (150 people) workshops for Media persons. *Two workshops for Media and Agriculture scientists organized for Communicating Science by MoEFCC, IFIC, IIMC &amp; BCIL. *Two training workshops for Scientists &amp; regulators on Management &amp; Monitoring of CFTs organized *Outreach materials such as brochures on CFTs and information sources, regulatory requirements, FAQs, Cartagena Protocol etc. prepared by BCIL is under review. *Quarterly Biosafety Newsletter is being circulated to more than 10000 stakeholders regularly</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	--

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please add columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY2014 rating	FY2015 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods
S	S	Several activities have been initiated in parallel to bridge the time gap lost due to delays in approval. The progress of the project is very satisfactory in all the four thrust areas and also in full compliance with reporting requirements in ANUBIS also as per UNEP requirements.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

---

<sup>19</sup> Add rows if your project has more than 5 Outcomes.

## 3.2 Project implementation progress

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> Baseline information to evaluate potential changes in the environment due to introduction of LMOs is compiled and updated					
<b>Activity 1:</b> Preparation of a base paper covering review of crops and traits under development, need for biology documents, information on non-target and beneficiary organisms in different agro ecological zones and status of available guidelines	30/04/2014	80%	100%	Activity assigned to NBPGR and will be completed by March 2015	S
<b>Output 1.1.2:</b> Existing documentation is reviewed for compliance between the information needed under the prevailing regulatory system and the CPB.					
<b>Activity2:</b> Review of existing documents and identification of gaps with respect to country obligations under Articles 8, 10 and 18 (2) of CPB.	31/4/2015	Yet to be initiated	20%		
<b>Output 1.1.3:</b> A survey is conducted to identify the public institutions, facilities and laboratories to be up-graded to be national referral laboratory					
<b>Activity 3:</b> Preparation of a base paper on status of facilities, infrastructure, human resource, level	31/5/2014	100%	100%		

<sup>20</sup> Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

<sup>21</sup> As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

<sup>22</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

<sup>23</sup> To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
of expertise in selected institutions					
<b>Activity 4:</b> Identification of requirements for operationalizing a state of the art referral lab for the detection of LMOs	30/6/2014	100%	100%		
<b>Output 1.1.4:</b> An assessment is carried out on the long term funding needed from Gol					S
<b>Activity 5:</b> Assessment of long term funding requirements to sustain the national referral laboratory and its associated network of laboratories	31/7/2014	80%	90%		
<b>Output 1.1.5:</b> National consultation with all stakeholders and partners is carried to discuss results from needs assessment studies					
<b>Activity 6:</b> Consultative meetings on final project design based on results of stocktaking assessment	01/6/2014	70%	100%		S
<b>Output: 2A.1.1:</b> Existing RA and RM procedure and guidelines are reviewed to confirm whether India is compliant with CPB obligations					
<b>Activity 7:</b> Preparation of a base paper on the status of conformity of existing procedures and guidelines with Article 15, 16 and Annex III of CPB	30/4/2014	80%	90%	Base paper to be finalized after consultative meeting	
<b>Output: 2A.1.2:</b> Crop-specific biology and ecology document is developed to assist dossier preparation					
<b>Activity 8:</b> Preparation and review of biology documents for eight crops such as mustard,	30/10/2015	60%	80%	7 biology documents ready for printing	

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
pigeonpea, chickpea, tomato, papaya, potato, rubber and sorghum.					
<b>Output: 2A.1.3:</b> Baseline data on presence of wild relatives is gathered for better risk management of LMOs.					
<b>Activity 9:</b> Collection of baseline data on the presence of wild relatives of eight crops such as mustard, pigeonpea, chickpea, tomato, papaya, potato, rubber and sorghum.	31/07/2015	60%	90%	Information covered under biology documents	
<b>Output: 2A.1.4:</b> Guidelines and procedures are developed for specific types of risk associated with specific traits.					
<b>Activity 10:</b> Preparation of a risk analysis framework and its validation using an example	30/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	60%	RAF under preparation	S
<b>Activity 11:</b> Review of international practices in ERA through a study tour and development of ERA guidelines	31/10/2015	20%	100%		
<b>Activity 12:</b> Development of procedures for assessing risks associated with stacking of genes expressing multiple traits	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 2A.1.5:</b> LMOs are monitored by regulatory agencies after environmental release					
<b>Activity 13:</b> Review of international practices for post release monitoring, development of guidance document and identification of roles and responsibilities of various agencies for post release monitoring	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 2A.1.6:</b> Indicators to measure gene flow and impact on non-targets are developed to assist					

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
in RA and RM					
<b>Activity 14:</b> Workshop for identification and development of indicators for impact on non target organisms	31/7/15	Yet to be Initiated	30%	Questionnaires ready	S
<b>Activity 15:</b> Listing of non target organisms with reference to specific traits/crops in different agro-ecological zones	31/7/15	Yet to be Initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 2B.1.1</b> Questionnaire is developed for conducting a socio-economic survey					
<b>Activity 16:</b> Design model questionnaires for socio economic assessment and their validation of the questionnaire through sample survey	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	80%		
<b>Output: 2B.1.2</b> Guidelines and methodologies are developed for socio-economic assessment of GM crops apart from Bt cotton					
<b>Activity 17:</b> Drafting guidelines, tools and methodologies for SE assessment through a network of experts from various institutes and consultation with experts and relevant stakeholders for finalizing the guidance document with respect to both ex-ante and ex-post studies	31/10/2015	Yet to be initiated	20%		S
<b>Output: 2B.1.3</b> Guidelines are developed for risk benefit analysis					
<b>Activity 18:</b> Drafting guidelines and methodologies for cost benefit analysis through a network of experts from various institutes and consultation with experts and relevant stakeholders for finalizing the document	31/10/2015	Yet to be initiated	20%		S



Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
<b>Output: 2C.1.1</b> A feasibility study is carried out on measures to be taken for putting in place an 'identity preservation system' for handling of LMOs in agriculture					
<b>Activity 19:</b> Document the steps involved in the identity preservation system for export commodities such as basmati rice	31/7/15	30%	90%		HS
<b>Activity 20:</b> Preparation of a feasibility study of implementing such an IP system for handling LMOs in India.	31/01/16	30%	40%		
<b>Output: 2C.1.2</b> To identify best practices suitable for India, a review is undertaken for strategies to sample, detect, quantify and certify LMOs from selected GM importing/exporting countries					
<b>Activity 21:</b> Review strategies for sampling, detection, quantification and certification of LMOs from selected importing/exporting countries.	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	20%		S
<b>Activity 22:</b> Preparation of report on suitable options for India and designation of institutions responsible for certification and testing	30/4/15	Yet to be initiated	20%		
<b>Output: 3.1.1</b> A feasibility study is carried out on public private partnership (PPP) for LMO detection					
<b>Activity 23:</b> Carry out a feasibility study on LMO detection for developing a network of laboratories.	31/10/14	80%	100%		
<b>Output: 3.1.2</b> Institutions are strengthened with improved infrastructure and equipment for detection and verification of LMO in agriculture					

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
<b>Activity 24:</b> Establishing a referral laboratory with a network of LMO detection laboratories	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	80%		S
<b>Activity 25:</b> Improving infrastructure and facilities for LMO detection in the identified laboratories	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	60%		
<b>Activity 26:</b> Accreditation of laboratories as per the international norms	30/4/16	Yet to be initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 3.1.3</b> Methodology and procedures are developed for LMO detection					
<b>Activity 27:</b> Development of sampling procedures and methodologies for LMO detection	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	30%		S
<b>Activity 28:</b> Development of SOPs and protocols for participating laboratories and relevant agencies such as customs and plant quarantine	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 3.1.4:</b> Staff, irrespective of gender, is trained for LMO detection and maintenance of laboratory					
<b>Activity 29:</b> Training of laboratory technicians in LMO detection	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	30%		S
<b>Activity 30:</b> Training of laboratory staff for maintenance of laboratory equipment	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	30%		
<b>Output: 4.1.1</b> Training modules/manuals are prepared for conducting/ evaluating risk assessment and management					
<b>Activity 31:</b> Prepare training modules/manuals for conducting environmental risk assessment and risk management	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	70%		S
<b>Activity 32:</b> Training of experts in RA & RM involved in technical and scientific advisory	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	20%		

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
committees and biotech R&D developers					
<b>Activity 33:</b> Training in preparation of guidance documents for dossier development	31/1/16	Yet to be initiated	20%		
<b>Output: 4.1.2</b> Training modules / manuals are prepared for monitoring field trials of GM crops and compliance evaluation					
<b>Activity 34:</b> Preparation of training modules for monitoring field trials and compliance evaluation	31/7/15	Yet to be Initiated	100%		HS
<b>Activity 35:</b> Training of members of monitoring teams responsible for compliance evaluation, technical persons conducting field trials and extension functionaries	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	100%		
<b>Output: 4.2.1:</b> Training modules/manuals are prepared for training of custom and plant quarantine officials for enhanced enforcement at the ports of entry					
<b>Activity 36:</b> Preparation of training modules and working knowledge documents for enhanced enforcement at points of entry	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	10%		S
<b>Activity 37:</b> Training of customs officials on verification of documentation requirements for transboundary movement and use of BCH	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	10%		S
<b>Activity 38:</b> Training of quarantine officers for on-site verification of LMOs and use of BCH	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	10%		
<b>Activity 39:</b> Development of an online technical backstopping mechanism or system for enforcement officers at points of entry	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	10%		

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
<b>Activity 40:</b> Hands on workshops for enforcement officers at regional and sub-regional levels (also as part of regional cooperation under component VI.3)	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	10%		
<b>SOutput: 5.1.1:</b> Innovative outreach programs are developed for risk communication both through print and electronic media					
<b>Activity 41:</b> Development of a risk communication strategy for various stakeholders	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	50%		S
<b>Activity 42:</b> Development of a training module and training workshops in risk communication for key policy makers and experts	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	20%		
<b>Activity 43:</b> Development and dissemination of outreach programmes to implement the risk communication strategy through print and electronic media	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	20%		
<b>Output: 5.1.2:</b> Educational programs on biosafety issues for TV and radio are developed in collaboration with the local and national level agencies					
<b>Activity 44:</b> Preparation of audio visual educational material on awareness of biotechnology and biosafety issues for teachers and students	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	50%		
<b>Activity 45:</b> Organize awareness workshops on biosafety for the media	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	60%		
<b>Activity 46:</b> Organization of a quiz programme for school children	31/1/16	Yet to be Initiated	50%		
<b>Output 5.1.3:</b> Primers/ brochures/ booklets /FAQs					

Outputs <sup>20</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>21</sup>	Implementation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)	Comments if variance <sup>22</sup> . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating <sup>23</sup>
and Glossary of terms in different local languages are widely distributed to policy makers, researchers, students, farmers, civil society etc.					
<b>Activity 47:</b> Development of primers/brochures/booklets/FAQs, glossary of terms and other outreach material in regional languages	31/12/15	Yet to be Initiated	60%		
<b>Output 5.1.4:</b> A mechanism is established to communicate regulatory decisions on LMOs to the public.					
<b>Activity 48:</b> Upgrading the National Biosafety websites	30/4/16	80%	85%		S
<b>Activity 49:</b> Timely deposition of regulatory decisions on LMOs in the BCH	30/4/16	90%	90%		
<b>Output 5.1.5:</b> Biosafety newsletters are published regularly and distributed					
<b>Activity 50:</b> Appointment of the newsletter editorial board	31/12/12	100%	100%		HS
<b>Activity 51:</b> Publication and distribution of biosafety newsletter on a quarterly basis	30/4/16	100%	100%		
<b>Output 5.1.6:</b> National, regional and international workshops are organized for targeted audience					
<b>Activity 52:</b> Organization of national workshops for key stakeholders for implementation of public awareness strategy	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	30%		S
<b>Activity 53:</b> Organizing an international workshop on sharing experience in risk communication and awareness raising	31/10/15	Yet to be Initiated	Yet to be Initiated		
<b>Output 6.1.1:</b> Project Management					

<b>Outputs</b> <sup>20</sup>	<b>Expected completion date</b> <sup>21</sup>	<b>Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2014 (%)</b>	<b>Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2015 (%)</b>	<b>Comments if variance<sup>22</sup>. Describe any problems in delivering outputs</b>	<b>Progress rating<sup>23</sup></b>
<b>Activity 54:</b> Establishment of a Project Coordinating and Monitoring Unit	31/10/13	100%	100%		S
<b>Output 7.1.1:</b> Project Monitoring And Evaluation					
<b>Activity 55:</b> Project Monitoring and Evaluation at Mid-term and project termination	31/12/16	20%	50%		S
<b>Output 8.1.1:</b> Regional Networking And Cooperation					
<b>Activity 56:</b> Participation in the Annual Meetings of National Project Coordinators under the implementation projects and other regional activities to facilitate sharing of information	31/1/16	100%	100%		S

Overall project implementation progress<sup>24</sup> (*To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager. Please add columns to reflect prior years' ratings*):

<b>FY14 rating</b>	<b>FY15 rating</b>	<b>Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
S	HS	The project executing has seen a good delivery of results which can be replicated across the region. In addition as per the guidance of UNEP to execute components in parallel has led to increase in delivery of results

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. (*To be completed by UNEP Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager<sup>25</sup>*)

<b>Action(s) to be taken</b>	<b>By whom?</b>	<b>By when?</b>
------------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

<sup>24</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

<sup>25</sup> UNEP Fund Management Officer should also be consulted as appropriate.

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When

3.3. Risk

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

**RISK FACTOR TABLE**

**Project Managers** will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (**PM**) and one for the UNEP Task Manager (**TM**). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The **UNEP Task Manager** should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems	√						PM :	X						
										TM:							
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other	Body(ies) meets periodically	Members lack commitment Committee/bo	√						PM :	X						



Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
	project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	dy does not fulfil its TOR							TM:						
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment	√						PM:	X					
										TM:						
Work flow	Project progressing	Some changes in	Major delays or changes in	√						PM:	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
	according to work plan	project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	work plan or method of implementation							PM:						
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize	√						PM:	X					
										TM: The project has leveraged substantial cofinance						
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	√						PM:	X					
										TM:						
Financial manageme	Funds are correctly	Financial reporting slow	Serious financial	√						PM:	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating							Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	Low		Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project management</b>																	
nt	managed and transparently accounted for	or deficient	reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds								TM:						
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting	√							PM:	X					
											TM:						
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive	Consultation and participation	Symptoms of conflict with critical	√							PM:	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																
<b>Project management</b>																
	feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders							TM: Project through the planned interventions has seen several stakeholders join and assist in execution from government agencies, para stats, private sector, universities/research institutions in country and international						
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident	√						PM:	X					
										TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating							Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	Low		Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																		
<b>Project management</b>																		
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	√							PM:	X						
											TM:							
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties	√							PM:	X						
											TM: Project is developing useful scientific tools and guidelines which will impact positively on biosafety practice not only in India but across the region							

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating								
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined			
<b>INTERNAL RISK</b>																			
<b>Project management</b>																			
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives	√						PM:	X								
										TM:									
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary										PM:									
										TM:									

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project context</b>																	
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile	√						PM:	X						
										TM:							
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	√						PM:	X						
										TM:							
Social, cultural and economic	There are no evident social,	Social or economic issues or	Project is highly sensitive to	√						PM:	X						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	
<b>EXTERNAL RISK</b>																	
<b>Project context</b>																	
factors	cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers								TM:						
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance	√							PM:						
											TM:						
Others, please specify																	



If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the **Task Manager** should be provided below

--

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN
Rank – importance of risk Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence) Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk Who – person(s) responsible for the action Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	Risk Statement <sup>26</sup>		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY14 rating	FY15 rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	The project delivery is on course with a mechanism in place to identify and manage any potential project delivery risk. The focus on expertise for diverse source has also helped in a balanced delivery of results

<sup>26</sup> Only for Substantial to High risk.

**If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation**

**4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **UNEP Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes  No
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes  No
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes  No

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes  No
- Terminal evaluation Yes  No
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes  No

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes  No
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes  No
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes  No  MTR planned
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes  No
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes  No

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU): S

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period<sup>27</sup>

A Project Management and Monitoring Committee (PMMC) has been constituted to oversee the progress of the project on a regular interval and this PMMC has meet 3 times and National Steering Committee has met once during the period from July 2014 to June 2015. Minutes of the PMMC and NSC meetings are uploaded in ANUBIS.

- A. Fifth PMMC meeting was held on September 14, 2014
- B. Sixth PMMC meeting was held on March 16, 2015
- C. Seventh PMMC meeting was held on June 23, 2015
- D. Third meeting of the National Steering Committee was held on March 16, 2015
- E. The team from Phase-II biosafety project had also participated in the Cartagena Protocol COP-MOP 7 and made a poster presentation titled” Publications as tools for strengthening biosafety capacities in India” held from September 29, 2014 to October 3, 2014 at Pyeongchang, Korea.

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

The baseline information in most of the project activities is as expected and accordingly so far no effect has been observed on selected indicators and design of activities.

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

So far, the selected indicators have been useful and relevant.

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

Identification of international agencies/ experts for activities related to HTPI component particularly strengthening enforcement capacities was a major challenge. As of now due to rigorous and continuous follow up with several international and national agencies was able to streamline the activities. NBPGR, NACEN and University of Murdoch have been identified as potential partners for undertaking this activity.

<sup>27</sup> Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions<sup>28</sup> are still valid

No changes in the indicators or project intervention logic; key assumptions are still valid.

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

So far no major negative effects have been observed, PMMC is responsible for overall monitoring

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

As the project design was prepared in a consultative manner with involvement of stakeholders, the implementation is also taking place in line with project design. So it is important to engage stakeholder right from the beginning of project formulation.

## 5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

- Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.
- Institutional arrangements, including project governance;
- Engagement of the private sector;
- Capacity building;
- Scientific and technological issues;  
The broad involvement of area specific expertise in LMO Detection, development of biology documents and Socio economics among others has lead to high quality focus in highlighting and developing science based technological tools
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;

---

<sup>28</sup> Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (i.e, the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

A strong focus on risk communication coupled with the development of communication strategies will provide a useful platform for replication

- Financial management and co-financing.

5.2. *Please highlight a few major achievements resulting so far from the project implementation, including but not limited to:*

- Concrete results, both on-the-ground and normative  
Several concrete results on ERA, Biology Documents, LMO Detection, Communication tools have been developed supported by audio visuals and this will go a long way in entrenching the biosafety system to support biotechnology development and decision making in India
- Gender and indigenous peoples issues
- Private Sector
- Sustainability
- Innovation
- Upscaling