



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Region of Asia Pacific (RAP)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Sri Lanka
<b>Project Title:</b>	Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP /SRL/066/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5720
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment
<b>Project Duration:</b>	01/01/2017 – 31/12/2020

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	21/06/2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01/01/2017
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31/12/2020
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	2,365,964
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	2,958,327
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	912,704
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	1,330,233

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

## Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	08/11/2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	August 2019
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>No</b>

## Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	S	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	S	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	L	

## Status

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Shanaka Gunawardena, National Project Manager, FAOLK	<a href="mailto:Shanaka.Gunawardena@fao.org">Shanaka.Gunawardena@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Chikelu Mba, Senior Officer – Team Leader, Plant Production and Protection Division (AGPMG)	<a href="mailto:Chikelu.Mba@fao.org">Chikelu.Mba@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Xuebing Sun, FAO Representative for Sri Lanka and Maldives, FAO	<a href="mailto:Xuebing.Sun@fao.org">Xuebing.Sun@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Karki Sameer, Technical Officer, CBC (TCIB)	<a href="mailto:Sameer.Karki@fao.org">Sameer.Karki@fao.org</a>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Enhanced capacity to develop, implement and coordinate biosafety legislations and regulations	<p>Number of implementation examples (evaluation, management and monitoring of LMOs) in the National Biosafety Framework that is in compliance with the CPB;</p> <p>Number of laws enforced by the enhanced high-level inter-ministerial coordination mechanism;</p>	<p>Gaps still remain in existing regulatory and institutional frameworks to implement the National Biosafety Framework (NBF);</p> <p>Capacity for sound decision-making processes and law enforcement limited;</p>		<p>At least 5 implementation examples with enhanced framework of evaluation, management and monitoring of LMOs;</p> <p>At least 3 laws enforced by the enhanced mechanism (including Act, Master plan, support regulations);</p>	<p>On Track.</p> <p>Draft of Biosafety Regulations is complete and has been submitted to the government.</p> <p>Draft Biosafety Master Plan is being developed.</p> <p>Draft Act received comments from the Attorney General's Department. The comments are being addressed by the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment.</p>	S

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>9</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)**.

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Administrative systems for making biosafety fully functional	Number of implementation examples using fully functional administrative system	Administrative and operational procedures, which are consistent with the requirements of CPB do not exist;		At least 5 implementation examples using a fully functional administrative procedure mechanism as per provisions of the draft Biosafety Act;	On Track.  Draft manual on administrative and operational procedures for handling of living modified organisms in Sri Lanka is complete. This document is submitted to the government.	S
<b>Outcome 1.3:</b> National Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) operational	Number of visitors accessing the BCH;  Satisfaction with level of information and knowledge available in the national BCH;	There is a national BCH established but not operational due to the lack of capacity to collect, process and manage the information required to run it;		At least 500 individual accesses to the BCH;  At least 70% of satisfaction rate received from multiple stakeholders;	On Track.  Compiling information to be uploaded to the BCH was initiated	S
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> National institutions strengthened for RA, RM and RC including monitoring and enforcement	Number of agencies that have institutionalized training on RA, RM and RC;  Number of focal points for RA, RM and RC in each institution identified;	The capacity of national institutions is limited to enable formulation and implementation of integrated and coherent Biosafety regulatory mechanisms;		All members, bodies and relevant agencies received institutionalized training and they are capable to work with the RA, RM and RC framework;  At least 3 focal points identified for institutional RA, RM and	On Track.  Technical working committees were formed.	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
				RC;  1 institutional mechanism in place to deal with Biosafety issues in the country;		
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Improved capacity for detection and identification of LMOs	Number of detection and identification processes of LMOs within a certain time period;  Number of designated staff;	Capacities in LMO detection and the requirements for the accreditation of laboratories not met for implementation;		At least, 70% of trained staff capable to detect and identify LMOs using upgraded instruments and guidelines developed;  At least 20 detection and identification cases processed using improved facilities at the end of the project;  At least 3 designated staff in each institution identified;	On Track.  The short-listed labs were physically assessed.  A workshop on detection and identification of living modified organisms was held with two participants from each short-listed lab.	S
<b>Outcome 3.2:</b> Laboratories fully operational with the necessary infrastructures to carry out risk assessment, and detection of LMOs, which allow Sri Lanka to meet its obligations under the	Number of identified laboratories operational with international standards;  Number of facilities for contained testing operational;  Annual budget	The accreditation of laboratories and strengthening capacities of selected public sector laboratories are required;		2 public laboratories with improved infrastructure and facilities for LMO detection as per international norms and serve as central LMO research and detection labs;  1 upgraded analytical	On Track.  Quotations for the equipment are being called to determine the total cost for upgrading each lab.	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
CPB	allocated for operation and maintenance of laboratories;			laboratory functional for compositional and nutritional analysis with state-of-the-art analytical services equipment;  These laboratories are showcased as technically viable examples;  Efficient accreditation process in place;		
<b>Outcome 4.1:</b> Enhanced awareness, education and public participation in decision-making on Biosafety	Number of awareness raising events/campaigns with positive feedback from various stakeholders across the country;  Annual budget allocated for continuous actions for Biosafety in the country;	Awareness of Biosafety needs to be further enhanced to broader stakeholders strategically;		Over 20 events/campaigns organized with At least 70% of activities received positive feedback from participants;	On Track  A survey was conducted with several key informant interviews, focus group discussions and questionnaires to collect baseline data on the level of understanding of the stakeholders on Biosafety in Sri Lanka.  Development of the strategy was initiated.	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>A working committee to develop awareness material was formed.</p> <p>A team to draft the course material for different levels of education in biosafety is being formed.</p> <p>Up to 3 issues of the Biosafety Newsletter were released on time.</p>	

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

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

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implementation status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1.1: National Biosafety Act enacted	Q4 Y2	<i>Draft Act was revised with stakeholder input</i>	<i>Comments on the revised draft Act were received from the Attorney General's Department (AGD). These comments are being addressed by the national counterpart.</i>				25%	Revision of the draft Biosafety Act was not a planned activity under this output. However, at the request of the national counterpart, through the Secretary of the implementing ministry, this was carried out. The Act was drafted 4 years ago and so required updating in light of more recent developments.
Output 1.1.2: National Biosafety Master Plan (Strategy & Action Plan) elaborated and endorsed	Q2 Y3	<i>Draft of the National Biosafety Master Plan is being developed</i>	<i>The National Biosafety Master Plan is under development.</i>				10%	Since the Master Plan was started to prepare before achieving major project outputs, it should be revised towards the end of the project.
Output 1.1.3: Relevant regulations reviewed, drafted	Q3 Y4	<i>Draft of the Biosafety Regulations is complete</i>	<i>Draft of the Biosafety Regulations is complete</i>				70%	Since the Act is not enacted yet and may go through revisions in the subsequent steps towards enactment, regulations cannot be finalized until the Act is

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

and endorsed								enacted.
Output 1.2.1: Administrative and operational procedures for Biosafety reviewed and updated	Q1 Y3	<i>Draft documents related to the Administrative and Operational System of Biosafety is complete</i>	<i>Draft manual on administrative and operational procedures for handling of living modified organisms in Sri Lanka is complete</i>				70%	Since the Act is not enacted yet and may go through revisions in the subsequent steps towards enactment, the manual cannot be finalized.
Output 1.2.2: Guidelines developed to support the tasks of National Competent Authority (NCA) and Sectoral Competent Authorities (SCAs)	Q2 Y3	<i>Draft documents to support the tasks of NCA and SCAs are complete</i>	<i>The regulatory guidelines are included in the draft manual on administrative and operational procedures for handling of living modified organisms in Sri Lanka.</i>				70%	
Output 1.2.3 Staff of NCA, SCAs and related organizations trained	Q2 Y4	<i>To be initiated after the 1st PIR period following the work plan.</i>	<i>Forty-one (41) participants from 21 institutions including SCAs were trained.</i>				10%	Formal training cannot be conducted until the Biosafety Act is enacted.
Output 1.3.1: An enhanced website established	Q3 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Recruitment process of the IT service provider is almost complete.</i>  <i>Compiling information to be uploaded into the website was initiated.</i>				10%	
Output 1.3.2: The BCH focal point trained to collect and manage information	Q3 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this</i>	<i>Training is not initiated yet.</i>				0%	

		<i>output</i>					
Output 1.3.3: Stakeholders trained to access and share information through BCH	Q2 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Training is not initiated yet.</i>				0%
Output 2.1.1: Methodologies for RA, RM and RC reviewed, refined and updated	Q2 Y3	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Working committee is formed.</i>				10%
Output 2.1.2: Technical guidelines and manuals on RA and RM developed	Q4 Y2	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Working committee is formed.</i>				10%
Output 2.1.3: Decision-making tools prepared for RA, RM and RC	Q4 Y2	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Working committee is formed.</i>				10%
Output 2.1.4: Training strategy for RA, RM and RC developed	Q3 Y3	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Working committee is formed.</i>				10%
Output 2.1.5:	Q4 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However,</i>	<i>Working committee is</i>				10%

Staff of relevant institutions trained on RA, RM and RC		<i>PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>formed.</i>					
Output 2.1.6: National and regional institutional networks strengthened to implement National Biosafety System	Q2 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>PMU is discussing to host the South Asia Biosafety Conference of 2020 in Sri Lanka.</i>				0%	
Output 3.1.1: Testing needs and capacities for LMO detection assessed and key public laboratories identified for up-grading and accreditation	Q4 Y1	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Short-listed labs were physically assessed.</i>				90%	
Output 3.1.2: Inspection plan prepared and inspectors trained	Q2 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Not initiated yet.</i>				0%	
Output 3.1.3: Personnel trained on LMO detection and identification	Q3 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this</i>	<i>A workshop on detection and identification of living modified organisms was held by AgBC and BCIL with 2 participants from each short-listed lab.</i>				5%	

		<i>output</i>					
Output 3.2.1: Key government laboratories identified, established, strengthened and appropriately equipped for risk management and detection of LMOs	Q2 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Quotations for the equipment are being called to determine the cost to upgrade each lab.</i>			10%	
Output 3.2.2: Laboratories accredited by SLAB for risk assessment, LMO detection and identification based on ISO and ISTA standards	Q4 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>Not initiated yet..</i>			0%	
Output 4.1.1: Public awareness and participation strategy developed	Q4 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. ToR of the consultant to conduct the activities under this output was technically cleared.</i>	<i>Development of the strategy was initiated. .</i>			10%	
Output 4.1.2: Targeted awareness-raising activities implemented	Q4 Y4	<i>Press conference was held to make the media and public aware about the project and Biosafety in general. Several awareness material were produced.</i>	<i>A survey was conducted to collect baseline data on the level of understanding of the stakeholders on Biosafety in Sri Lanka in order to inform the development of public awareness campaigns.</i>			10%	

			<i>A working committee to develop awareness material was formed.</i>					
Output 4.1.3: Curriculum, syllabus and course materials prepared for post-graduate course for Biosafety, and the gaps in primary (Ordinary Level), secondary and university level education for Biosafety filled through improvement of curricula.	Q4 Y4	<i>Not initiated yet. However, PMU is progressing with the procedure towards partnering with technically capable entities to conduct the activities related to this output</i>	<i>A team to draft the course material for different levels of education in biosafety is being formulated.</i>				5%	
Output 4.1.4: Information materials developed and disseminated through various media	Q4 Y4	<i>First issue of the Biosafety newsletter was released</i>	<i>Two issues of the Biosafety newsletter were released in addition to two special publications in lieu of the two issues missed in 2017. The third issue of the Biosafety newsletter is close to be released.</i>				62%	

**Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.**

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

Max 200 words:

Under component 1, legal documents required to enhance the capacity for implementing and coordinating biosafety legislations and regulations were drafted and submitted to the government. Under component 2, technical working groups to formulate the documents were formed. Under component 3, LMO detection labs were assessed. Under component 4, technical working groups were formed to develop awareness material and course material for different levels of education. Further, several awareness material were developed and newsletters were published. Recruiting individual consultants with technical competency nationally and internationally was a challenge posed in this project.

Therefore, the main progress achieving the outcomes and outputs is partnering with international and national technically competent entities toward implementation through a contract (with Biotech Consortium India Limited for Components 1, 2 and 3) and letters of agreement (with National Science Foundation and Agriculture Biotech Center for Components 2 and 3 respectively). Further, this facilitates the ownership of the project by the widest possible stakeholder base, and hence the eventual applicability of its outputs that goes beyond the project.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

Max 200 words:

A major challenge was that the Biosafety Act had issues to be resolved and revised. Although this activity was not identified during project development, it was decided during the first steering committee meeting. This new task had to be completed before enacting the Act (Output 1.1.1). Revision of the Act was challenging since certain revisions were controversial. This unforeseen scenario made other activities in the Component 1 challenging as well (e.g. regulations cannot be finalized until the Act is finalized and endorsed).

Additionally, preparation of awareness material was challenging since they had to be produced in two local languages (Sinhalese and Tamil) in addition to the English version. This was challenging since Biosafety is a highly technical subject and the translations were too technical to be understood by the general public.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	S	S	<i>The project implementation was expedited after partnering with two national institutions (National Science Foundation and Agriculture Biotechnology Centre) and an international entity (Biotech Consortium India Limited). Most of the major objectives were achieved successfully with minor shortcomings during the reporting period.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	S	S	The project delivery is on track. More efforts and resources should be allocated for policy and institutional strengthening for ensuring long term sustainability of the project results.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	S	S	<i>Mandatory Ratings/comments</i>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	MS	S	<i>The project's initial delays have continued to impact its overall performance. The project team and the government's commitment to speed up the implementation has meant that the year's progress has been satisfactory and the project should be aiming to overcome remaining barriers to slow initial implementation and achieve satisfactory ratings by next PIR.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

<b>Overall Project Risk classification</b> (at project submission)	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>18</sup>.</b> If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	No change in risk

*Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.*

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i>

Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
<b>1</b>	Delay in approval of the Draft Biosafety Act due to the lack of decision-making and coordination capacity but also the lack of active involvement of concerned ministries/ departments/ agencies;	S	Enactment of the draft Biosafety Act was delayed since it had to go through revisions as requested by the Secretary of the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment (implementing partner). Further, Attorney General's Department had identified an issue in the Act, which is being addressed by the implementing partner. FAO cannot get directly involved in this regard to perform a mitigation action.	Progress on mitigation cannot be assessed since mitigation action is beyond the control of the PMU.	
<b>2</b>	Lack of effective linkages between Sectoral Competent Authorities to effectively implement the project due to the different level of capacities and involvement;	L	Component 2 activities were not completed and Biosafety Act is not enacted yet to assess this risk.		
<b>3</b>	Low level of awareness on biosafety may make it difficult to gain support, especially from senior government officials and policy makers for the project;	L	Involvement of senior governmental officials and policy makers in project related meetings and workshops helped them understand the need for Biosafety in Sri Lanka keeping this risk at a lower level. Further, a survey was conducted to assess the understanding of biosafety among different stakeholders.	Successful. Data from the survey will be utilized when preparing the public awareness strategy.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
	The capacity of stakeholders to conduct risk analysis and detection of LMOs is weak and therefore cannot support the full operationalization of the NBF;	L	Component 3 activities were not completed to assess this risk. Therefore, no mitigation action is needed.		
	Climate change threatens biodiversity and impacts ecosystem functions of Sri Lanka. Potential harm arising from LMOs may worsen those vulnerabilities.	L	Currently, there are no known LMOs in Sri Lanka to have an impact on the biodiversity. Therefore, no mitigation action is needed.		

**Project overall risk rating** (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	This project builds capacity of Sri Lanka for the eventual safe release of GMOs into the environment. The involvement of the widest possible stakeholder base is required for every stage of the project development and implementation. Though an extremely sensitive undertaking, the project designs enables the continued stakeholder engagement.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	No	
<b>Project Outputs</b>	No	

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;">Original NTE:</div> <div style="width: 45%;">Revised NTE:</div> </div> Justification:

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?**

This project does not apply a gender sensitive approach.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

Indigenous people are not involved in this project.

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

Over 150 participants from 56 institutions were actively involved in several meetings/workshops of the project. The table below, indicate those events (with the date held) and the stakeholders who participated.

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Type of involvement identified</b>	<b>Stakeholder's engagement</b>
Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment through Biodiversity Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretary of the ministry to chair the PSC that will coordinate and supervise the project as nodal ministry of CPB;</li> <li>• The Biodiversity Secretariat as the NEA for implementation of the project;</li> <li>• Ensure administrative processing for the Biosafety Act, rules and regulations;</li> <li>• Implement the administrative procedures and technical guidelines developed as part of the project;</li> <li>• Ensure enhanced public awareness through regular information</li> </ul>	<p>Involved actively in the identified activities (left column) contributing towards project implementation. Key meetings that were held with the involvement of the NCA are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (31 October 2018)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting for the draft Biosafety Act (13 November 2018)</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Type of involvement identified	Stakeholder's engagement
	<p>dissemination about the project activities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure setting up of information portal and managing nBCH;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (23 February 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group meeting (21 March 2018)</li> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with Sectoral Competent Authorities (25 July 2018)</li> <li>• FGD with decision-makers and enforcement authorities (20 August 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (26 October 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (08 November 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for Component 3 (28 March 2019)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
Parliamentarians and Legal experts from Legal Draftsmen Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate the process of examination, adopting and enactment of the proposed Biosafety Act;</li> <li>• Ensure consultative process for finalizing guidelines, administrative procedures, SOPs etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Although parliamentarians didn't get involved in any of the activities yet, Legal Draftsmen Department contributed towards the revision of the Biosafety act and was taking part in the following meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Type of involvement identified	Stakeholder's engagement
		meeting (21 March 2018) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• FGD with decision-makers and enforcement authorities (20 August 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (26 October 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
Department of Agriculture, Department of Animal Production and Health, Department of Health, Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Department of Wildlife Conservation and Ministry of Industry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide inputs on the development of regulatory and other relevant documents as SCAs;</li> <li>• Participate in training programmes on RA, RM and RC;</li> <li>• Participate in national and international events during the project;</li> <li>• Provide technical inputs to awareness raising workshops;</li> <li>• Ensure institutional mechanism for Biosafety;</li> <li>• Provide inputs as food safety inspectorate for the enforcement of Biosafety regulations;</li> </ul>	Participated and provided input during the following events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (31 October 2018)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting for the draft Biosafety Act (13 November 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (23 February 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group meeting (21 March 2018)</li> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with Sectoral Competent Authorities (25 July 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (26 October 2018)</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Type of involvement identified	Stakeholder's engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (08 November 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for Component 3 (28 March 2019)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
<p>Enforcement officials including Customs, National Plant Quarantine Services, Seed Inspectors, scientists/technical experts from research laboratories involved in detection and monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support strengthening of infrastructure and capacities for detection of LMOs;</li> <li>• Provide inputs on the transboundary movement of GMOs/ LMOs and procedures/ guidelines for sampling, field trials inspection and monitoring etc.;</li> <li>• Participate in training programs on procedures for sampling, detection, inspection and monitoring, and BCH;</li> <li>• Provide inputs on training modules for BCH access;</li> <li>• Participate in consultations on documents and training modules related to sampling, detection, inspection and monitoring;</li> <li>• Assist in strengthening enforcement systems for effective Biosafety regulations related to transgenic animals and animal feed;</li> </ul>	<p>Participated and provided input during the following events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (31 October 2018)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting for the draft Biosafety Act (13 November 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group meeting (21 March 2018)</li> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with Sectoral Competent Authorities (25 July 2018)</li> <li>• FGD with decision-makers and enforcement authorities (20 August 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (08 November 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Type of involvement identified	Stakeholder's engagement
		Component 3 (28 March 2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
Sri Lanka Accreditation Board for Conformity Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assist in the process for accreditation of identified laboratories</li> <li>• Participate in training programs/information exchange with other accreditation bodies at international level</li> </ul>	Participated and provided input during the following events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• FGD with decision-makers and enforcement authorities (20 August 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for Component 3 (28 March 2019)</li> </ul>
Scientific Agencies including NSF, CARP, National Research Council, COSTI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and draft guidelines for RA, RM and RC on Biosafety;</li> <li>• Develop outreach materials for different target groups;</li> </ul>	Participated and provided input during the following events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (31 October 2018)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting for the draft Biosafety Act (13 November 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group meeting (21 March 2018)</li> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Project Steering Committee meeting (08 November 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for Component 3 (28 March 2019)</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Type of involvement identified	Stakeholder's engagement
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
<p>University and research institutions such as University of Peradeniya and University of Colombo, Tea Research Institute, Rubber Research Institute, Coconut Research Institute and Rice Research and Development Institute and Horticultural Crop Research and Development Institute</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide technical support in enhancing capacity for RA and LMO detection;</li> <li>• Provide technical inputs for the development of safety assessment guidelines and manuals for RA and RM of GMOs/LMOs, formats for RA summaries and conduct trainings;</li> <li>• Provide technical inputs on the national Biosafety master plan, website, E-learning tools on Biosafety regulations etc.;</li> <li>• Support consultative meetings for finalizing various Biosafety regulations and guidelines;</li> <li>• Provide technical inputs to training workshops;</li> <li>• Coordinate post graduate diploma and integrate Biosafety with other courses;</li> <li>• Ensure upgrade and accreditation of laboratory for LMOs/GMOs detection;</li> <li>• Provide technical support to regulatory authorities for risk assessment and management, and enforcement officials for detection of LMOs/GMOs;</li> <li>• Develop capacities, curriculum and a post graduate course on Biosafety;</li> <li>• Ensure the establishment of a post graduate course in consultation with Ministry of Education;</li> </ul>	<p>Participated and provided input during the following events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception workshop (29-30 August 2018)</li> <li>• Consultative meeting for the draft Biosafety Act (13 November 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (26 January 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Technical Expert Group meeting (23 February 2018)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group meeting (21 March 2018)</li> <li>• Media Conference (29 March 2018)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> Working Group meeting (25 June 2018)</li> <li>• Component 1 workshop (26-27 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Training for component 1 (28 February 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting for Component 3 (28 March 2019)</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> National Coordinating Committee on Biosafety meeting (5 April 2019)</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop for LMO detection (27 May 2019)</li> </ul>
<p>Private sector, NGOs, CSOs, mass media and local communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support awareness activities to incorporate views and perspectives into the planning and implementation of the project;</li> <li>• Support knowledge management on Biosafety;</li> <li>• Support and participate in workshops, particularly those related to communication and dissemination;</li> <li>• Consensus building for the national Biosafety issues;</li> </ul>	<p>Thirty three (33) journalists from 24 news agencies participated in the press conference held on 29 March 2018. Further, they contributed to the project by writing several newspaper articles that enhanced the awareness of the project and Biosafety among public</p>

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

### **Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

The baseline data collection on the level of understanding of the stakeholders on Biosafety in Sri Lanka, which was held through focus group discussions, key informant interviews and questionnaires, was a key knowledge activity. This activity and the media conference helped to spread the knowledge of biosafety and relevant information among many stakeholder groups.

The following are links to some of the awareness material produced through the project,

1. What do the experts say? GM food and GM plants: <http://www.fao.org/3/CA2088T/ca2088t.pdf>
2. Biosafety newsletter Vol 1 issue 2: <http://www.fao.org/3/CA1326T/ca1326t.pdf>
3. Findings and Perceptions on biosafety: <http://www.fao.org/3/I8857EN/i8857en.pdf>
4. Biosafety newsletter Vol 1 Issue 1: <http://www.fao.org/3/I8715T/i8715t.pdf>

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment	In-kind	85,714	17,772		
National Government	Ministry of Health Nutrition and Indigenous	In-kind	8,571	37,570		
National Government	Department of Animal Production and Health	In-kind	357,143	1,456		
National Government	Department of Agriculture	In-kind	405,714	128,481		
National Government	National Plant Quarantine Services	In-kind	291,143	196,203		
National Government	Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources	In-kind	36,143	8,006		
National Government	Department of Wildlife	In-kind	285,714	6,573		

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other.

<sup>23</sup> Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other.

	Conservation					
National Government	Sri Lanka Customs	In-kind	382,471	366,165		
National Government	University of Colombo	In-kind	300,000	203,296		
National Government	University of Peradeniya	In-kind	300,000	204,015		
National Government	National Science Foundation	In-kind	105,714	10,696		
	FAO	In-kind	400,000	150,000		
	<b>Total</b>		<b>2,958,327</b>	<b>1,330,233*</b>		

**\*USD 1 = LKR 158**

**Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement**

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

**Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.