FIRST REGULAR NATIONAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

Origin of report

Party:	Sri Lanka
Contact officer for report	
Name and title of contact officer:	Mr. Gamini Gamage, Director (Biodiversity)
Mailing address:	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, "Sampathpaya", 82, Rajamalwatte Road, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka
Telephone:	0094 060 2106219, 011 5741692
Fax:	0094 011 2877292, 4443943
E-mail:	gaminigamage@yahoo.co.uk
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting report:	
Date of submission:	15.07.2008
Time period covered by this report:	Year 2000 to 15.07.2008

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report:

Following information was referred.

1.National Biosafety Framework of Sri Lanka, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

2.National Biosafety Policy

3.Draft Biosafety Act

4.Food (Control of Import, Labelling and Sale of Genetically Modified Foods) Regulations 2006

Following have contributed in preparation of this report,

1.Prof. A. L. T. Perera, National Project Coordinator of the National Biosafety Framework Development Project

2.Mr. Gamini Gamage, Director (Biodiversity), Biodiversity Secretariat, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

3.Ms. S. I. Rajapakse, Environment Management Officer, Biodiversity Secretariat, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

Obligations for provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House

1. Several articles of the Protocol require that information be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (see the list below). For your Government, if there are cases where relevant information exists but has not been provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH), describe any obstacles or impediments encountered regarding provision of that information (note: To answer this question, please check the BCH to determine the current status of your country's information submissions relative to the list of required information below. If you do not have access to the BCH, contact the Secretariat for a summary):

At present Sri Lanka has updated contact details on national focal points for Biosafety Clearing House and Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, contact details of National Focal Point, National Competent Authorities, information on National Biosafety Website and Database, capacity building needs and priorities and biosafety experts.
National legislation, regulations and guidelines, is still in the development process. Food regulations has to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing House.
Problems with updating BCH are limitation of computers, internet connection and difficulties in linking the national database to the BCH. At present Sri Lanka is implementing the UNEP-GEF project on building capacity for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing House and will be able to provide information timely.

2. Please provide an overview of information that is required to be provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House:

Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
a) Existing national legislation, regulations and guidelines for implementing the Protocol, as well as information required by Parties for the advance informed agreement procedure (Article 20.3(a))			X- Information does not exist
b) National laws, regulations and guidelines applicable to the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.5);		X- Food (control of import, labelling and sale of genetically modified foods) Regulations 2006	
c) Bilateral, multilateral and regional agreements and arrangements (Articles 14.2, 20.3(b), and 24.1);			X- not applicable
d) Contact details for competent national authorities (Articles 19.2 and 19.3), national focal points (Articles 19.1 and 19.3), and emergency contacts (Article 17.2 and 17.3(e));	X		

e) In cases of multiple competent national authorities, responsibilities for each (Articles 19.2 and 19.3);	X		
f) Reports submitted by the Parties on the operation of the Protocol (Article 20.3(e));			X- Information does not exist
g) Occurrence of unintentional transboundary movements that are likely to have significant adverse effects on biological diversity (Article 17.1);			X- Information does not exist
Type of information	*Information exists and is being provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information exists but is not yet provided to the Biosafety Clearing-House*	*Information does not exist /not applicable*
h) Illegal transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 25.3);			X- Information does not exist
i) Final decisions regarding the importation or release of LMOs (i.e. approval or prohibition, any conditions, requests for further information, extensions granted, reasons for decision) (Articles 10.3 and 20.3(d));			X- Information does not exist
j) Information on the application of domestic regulations to specific imports of LMOs (Article 14.4);			X- Information does not exist
k) Final decisions regarding the domestic use of LMOs that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.1);			X- Information does not exist
l) Final decisions regarding the import of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing that are taken under domestic regulatory frameworks (Article 11.4) or in accordance with annex III (Article 11.6) (requirement of Article 20.3(d))			X- Information does not exist
m) Declarations regarding the framework to be used for LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing (Article 11.6)			X- Information does not exist
n) Review and change of decisions regarding intentional transboundary movements of LMOs (Article 12.1);			X- Information does not exist
o) LMOs granted exemption status by each Party (Article 13.1)			X- Information does not exist

p) Cases where intentional transboundary movement may take place at the same time as the movement is notified to the Party of import (Article 13.1);			X- Information does not exist
q) Summaries of risk assessments or environmental reviews of LMOs generated by regulatory processes and relevant information regarding products thereof (Article 20.3(c)).			X- Information does not exist

Article 2 – General provisions

3. Has your country introduced the necessary legal, administrative and other measures for implementation of the Protocol? (Article 2.1)	
a) full domestic regulatory framework in place (please give details below)	
b) some measures introduced (please give details below)	X
c) no measures yet taken	
4. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 2, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Sri Lanka has not yet passed any laws to specifically deal with GMOs. However National Biosafety Framework for Sri Lanka includes a regulatory regime. It has identified some provisions in existing laws that could be used to control, check and even ban introduction of certain GMOs. These recommendations which cover all LMOs, GMOs and their products should be implemented by drafting an enacting Acts, Regulations, etc. At present Sri Lanka is drafting its Biosafety Act. Regulations were made by the Ministry of Healthcare and Nutrition, Food (Control of Import, Labelling and Sale of Genetically Modified Foods) Regulations 2006 has come into effect from January 2007.	

Articles 7 to 10 and 12: The advance informed agreement procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

5. Were you a Party of import during this reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
6. Were you a Party of export during this reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
7. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by exporters 1/ under the jurisdiction of your country? (Article 8.2)	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	X
c) no	

1/ The use of terms in the questions follows the meanings accorded to them under Article 3 of the Protocol.

d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
8. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, did you request any Party of import to review a decision it had made under Article 10 on the grounds specified in Article 12.2?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X
d) not applicable – not a Party of export	
9. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 9.2(c).	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X
10. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
11. If your country has taken decisions on import of LMOs intended for release into the environment during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Articles 7 to 10 and 12, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

Article 11 – Procedure for living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

12. Is there a legal requirement for the accuracy of information provided by the applicant with respect to the domestic use of a living modified organism that may be subject to transboundary movement for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.2)	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
d) not applicable (please give details below)	
13. Has your country indicated its needs for financial and technical assistance and capacity-building in respect of living modified organisms intended for direct use as food or feed, or for processing? (Article 11.9)	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	X
c) not relevant	

14. Did your country take decisions regarding import under domestic regulatory frameworks as allowed by Article 11.4?	
a) yes	
b) no	
c) not applicable – no decisions taken during the reporting period	X
15. If your country has been a Party of export of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	
16. If your country has been a Party of import of LMOs intended for direct use for food or feed, or for processing, during the reporting period, please describe your experiences and progress in implementing Article 11, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

Article 13 – Simplified procedure

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

17. Have you applied the simplified procedure during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
18. If your country has used the simplified procedure during the reporting period, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, please describe your experiences in implementing Article 13, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

Article 14 – Bilateral, regional and multilateral agreements and arrangements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

19. Has your country entered into any bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
20. If your country has entered into bilateral, regional or multilateral agreements or arrangements, or if you have been unable to do so for some reason, describe your experiences in implementing Article 14 during the reporting period, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Not applicable	

Articles 15 and 16 – Risk assessment and risk management

21. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, were risk assessments carried out for all decisions taken under Article 10? (Article 15.2)	
a) yes	
b) no (please clarify below)	
c) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X

22. If yes to question 21, did you require the exporter to carry out the risk assessment?	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
23. If you took a decision under Article 10 during the reporting period, did you require the notifier to bear the cost of the risk assessment? (Article 15.3)	
a) yes – in all cases	
b) yes – in some cases (please specify the number and give further details below)	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import / no decisions taken under Article 10	X
24. Has your country established and maintained appropriate mechanisms, measures and strategies to regulate, manage and control risks identified in the risk assessment provisions of the Protocol? (Article 16.1)	
a) yes – fully established	
b) not yet, but under development or partially established (please give further details below)	X
c) no	
25. Has your country adopted appropriate measures to prevent unintentional transboundary movements of living modified organisms? (Article 16.3)	
a) yes – fully adopted	
b) not yet, but under development or partially adopted (please give further details below)	
c) no	X
26. Does your country endeavour to ensure that any living modified organism, whether imported or locally developed, undergoes an appropriate period of observation commensurate with its life-cycle or generation time before it is put to its intended use? (Article 16.4)	
a) yes – in all cases	X
b) yes – in some cases (please give further details below)	
c) no (please give further details below)	
d) not applicable (please give further details below)	
27. Has your country cooperated with others for the purposes specified in Article 16.5?	
a) yes (please give further details below)	
b) no (please give further details below)	X

28. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Articles 15 and 16, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
In view of the Cabinet decision on approving the National policy on Biosafety, for importation of Genetically Modified Organism (GMO), a risk assessment has to be carried out by relevant line agencies (respective Sectoral Competent Authorities), and a risk assessment report including risk management should be submitted to the National Competent Authority (National Coordinating Committee) for decision where decision is taken by the Sectoral Competent Authority with legal powers. Draft Biosafety Act recognises that risk analysis should be in a scientifically sound manner on LMO within a prescribed period in the prescribed manner and mode, taking into account required sciences and technologies in order to ascertain the potential adverse effects of LMO. Opportunity didn't arise for cooperation with others under article 16.5 At present Sri Lanka has expertise, laboratory facilities, technology and techniques to undertake risk assessment and risk management of GMOs and products. To obtain services of these institutes and laboratories necessary financial support needs to be provided. Further improvement of present methods of detecting GMOs, testing, risk assessment and management, updating the information base needs to be done. Awareness and training should be provided on Risk assessment and risk management concepts, finding relevant information, socio economic considerations, etc. for scientists and decision makers.

Article 17 – Unintentional transboundary movements and emergency measures

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

29. During the reporting period, if there were any occurrences under your jurisdiction that led, or could have led, to an unintentional transboundary movement of a living modified organism that had, or could have had, significant adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health in such States, did you immediately consult the affected or potentially affected States for the purposes specified in Article 17.4?	
a) yes – all relevant States immediately	
b) yes – partially consulted, or consultations were delayed (please clarify below)	
c) no – did not consult immediately (please clarify below)	
d) not applicable (no such occurrences)	X

30. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 17, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Sri Lanka has appointed an emergency contact point and notified to the BCH. Still the country lacks necessary infrastructure for regular use of BCH.

Article 18 – Handling, transport, packaging and identification

31. Has your country taken measures to require that living modified organisms that are subject to transboundary movement within the scope of the Protocol are handled, packaged and transported under conditions of safety, taking into account relevant international rules and standards? (Article 18.1)	
a) yes (please give details below)	

b) not yet, but under development	X
c) no	
d) not applicable (please clarify below)	
32. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms for direct use as food or feed, or for processing, clearly identifies that they 'may contain' living modified organisms and are not intended for intentional introduction into the environment, as well as a contact point for information? (Article 18.2(a))	
a) yes	X
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	
33. Has your country taken measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are destined for contained use clearly identifies them as living modified organisms and specifies any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information, including the name and address of the individual and institution to whom the living modified organisms are consigned? (Article 18.2(b))	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	X
c) no	
34. Has your country adopted measures to require that documentation accompanying living modified organisms that are intended for intentional introduction into the environment of the Party of import and any other living modified organisms within the scope of the Protocol, clearly identifies them as living modified organisms; specifies the identity and relevant traits and/or characteristics, any requirements for the safe handling, storage, transport and use, the contact point for further information and, as appropriate, the name and address of the importer and exporter; and contains a declaration that the movement is in conformity with the requirements of this Protocol applicable to the exporter? (Article 18.2(c))	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	X
c) no	
35. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as a description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 18, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
The legal recommendations of the NBF identifies all marketing and other commercial applications, all imports, exports and all methods of disposal of GMOs, LMOs and products should be regulated and monitored. No organism or products other than approved ones are allowed to transport and release. NBF includes country specific guidelines for import of GMOs and products, guidelines for internal transport and release of GMOs and products (information on consignee, shipper, written permit number authorizing importation, etc. required). Handling and packaging guidelines should be developed and contact points for further information should be obtained. NBF has identified all GMOs, products and products made by process involving the use of a GMO or LMO should be labeled mandatory. Further all relevant information should be made available for all the parties. The National Science Foundation of Sri Lanka has formulated guidelines for the safe use of Recombinant	

DNA technology under contained conditions. According to the Food (Control of Import, Labelling and sale of Genetically Modified Foods) Regulations 2006, effective from 2007 when approval is given to a product to place in the market appropriate labelling of the product should be done. It further provides criteria for the label. The draft Biosafety Act says Competent Authority have the power to make rules in respect of handling, transportation, packaging and identification of living modified organisms that are subject to international transboundary movement.

Article 19 – Competent national authorities and national focal points

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

Article 20 – Information-sharing and the Biosafety Clearing-House

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

36. In addition to the response to question 1, please describe any further details regarding your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 20, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
At present Sri Lanka is implementing the "UNEP-GEF project on building capacity for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing House" and will be establishing the national Biosafety Clearing House soon where information will be provided to the central portal timely.

Article 21 – Confidential information

37. Does your country have procedures to protect confidential information received under the Protocol and that protect the confidentiality of such information in a manner no less favourable than its treatment of confidential information in connection with domestically produced living modified organisms? (Article 21.3)	
a) yes	
b) not yet, but under development	
c) no	X- NBF recognizes that there is no scope for confidential information
38. If you were a Party of import during this reporting period, did you permit any notifier to identify information submitted under the procedures of the Protocol or required by the Party of import as part of the advance informed agreement procedure that was to be treated as confidential? (Article 21.1)	
a) yes	
If yes, please give number of cases	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a Party of import / no such requests received	X
39. If you answered yes to the previous question, please provide information on your experience including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	

40. If you were a Party of export during this reporting period, please describe any impediments or difficulties encountered by you, or by exporters under your jurisdiction if information is available, in the implementation of the requirements of Article 21:
not applicable – not a Party of export

Article 22 – Capacity-building

41. If a developed country Party, during this reporting period has your country cooperated in the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and small island developing States among them, and in Parties with economies in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developed country Party	X
42. If yes to question 41, how has such cooperation taken place:	
43. If a developing country Party, or Party with an economy in transition, during this reporting period has your country contributed to the development and/or strengthening of human resources and institutional capacities in biosafety for the purposes of the effective implementation of the Protocol in another developing country Party or Party with an economy in transition?	
a) yes (please give details below)	X
b) no	
c) not applicable – not a developing country Party	
44. If yes to question 43, how has such cooperation taken place:	
Prof. A. L. T. Perera, National Project Coordinator of the UNEP-GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Framework for Sri Lanka under Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources as a consultant assisted and finalized the National Biosafety Framework of Maldives.	
45. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the proper and safe management of biotechnology to the extent that it is required for biosafety?	
a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	
46. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training in the use of risk assessment and risk management for biosafety?	

a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	

47. If a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition, have you benefited from cooperation for technical and scientific training for enhancement of technological and institutional capacities in biosafety?

a) yes – capacity-building needs fully met (please give details below)	
b) yes – capacity-building needs partially met (please give details below)	X
c) no – capacity-building needs remain unmet (please give details below)	
d) no – we have no unmet capacity-building needs in this area	
e) not applicable – not a developing country Party or a Party with an economy in transition	

48. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 22, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:
Sri Lanka has been participating in the regional awareness/training workshops on risk assessment and risk management, Biosafety Clearing House, etc. Sri Lanka has conducted Training Programmes on Risk Assessment and Management of Genetically Modified Organisms/Food Feed and Processed products (GMO/FFP) in 2004 including regional and local experts, and Regional Training programme on Detection of GMO, FFP, including participants from the South Asia region. Regional workshop on South Asia and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety "Sharing of Experiences with National Biosafety Frameworks" was held in 2005. The first training programme under the UNEP-GEF Project on effective participation of the Biosafety Clearing House has been conducted with local expertise, BCH/CP and IT Regional advisors, Task Manager, etc. Further, Training Programme on Risk Assessment and Risk Management on GMO/FFPs and use of Clearing House Mechanism of Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety will be held in Sri Lanka in August 2008. Both local and foreign expertise will be facilitating at this workshop; Regional Advisors on BCH, and specially the ICGEB (Dr.Reddy from New Delhi Component of ICGEB and Dr. Decio Ripandelli) is providing an expert (Dr. Wendy Craig) enhancing regional cooperation in capacity building in the region.

Article 23 – Public awareness and participation

49. Does your country promote and facilitate public awareness, education and participation concerning the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms in relation to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health? (Article 23.1(a))	
a) yes – significant extent	X
b) yes – limited extent	

c) no	
50. If yes, do you cooperate with other States and international bodies?	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	X
51. Does your country endeavour to ensure that public awareness and education encompass access to information on living modified organisms identified in accordance with the Protocol that may be imported? (Article 23.1(b))	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
52. Does your country, in accordance with its respective laws and regulations, consult the public in the decision-making process regarding living modified organisms and make the results of such decisions available to the public? (Article 23.2)	
a) yes – fully	X
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
53. Has your country informed its public about the means of public access to the Biosafety Clearing-House? (Article 23.3)	
a) yes – fully	
b) yes – limited extent	X
c) no	
54. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 23, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
With the financial assistance of UNEP/GEF funded NBF project several awareness programs and training programs has been conducted successfully. One of the objectives of National Biosafty Policy is promote dissemination of knowledge in the safe use and probable hazards of modern biotechnology. Policy principles states public awareness, education and participation in the decision-making processes shall be made essential for ensuring the judicious use of modern biotechnological applications, practices and products for socio-economic development, without jeopardizing the environment, biodiversity and human health. Policy statements further states public awareness of modern biotechnology in relation to assessment of potential risks/benefits and management techniques shall be enhanced, involving the community at large, including policy makers, legislators, administrators, the private sector and biotechnology industries. Special courses in natural sciences, technology and ethics shall be offered to personnel, who in their professional activities come into contact with biosafety issues and their ethical applications. According to the regulatory regime of the NBF, there should be transparency and public participation on decision making. Before making a decision there should be public inspection/comments and mandatory period for public comments has to be given by law. The right of appeal should include the applicant and all those who have made comments, observations, objections, etc. The decision once conveyed to the applicant should be informed to the public as well.	

The Draft Biosafety Act recognizes that Risk assessment and management reports should be made available by publishing a notice in the gazette and in a news paper each in all languages where such reports are available for inspection by public. If considers appropriate an opportunity will be granted for being heard of such comments. When licence are granted. Approval will be published in the gazette and in a news paper each in all languages.

Article 24 – Non-Parties

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House**.**

55. Have there been any transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
56. If there have been transboundary movements of living modified organisms between your country and a non-Party, please provide information on your experience, including description of any impediments or difficulties encountered:	
Not applicable	

Article 25 – Illegal transboundary movements

See question 1 regarding provision of information to the Biosafety Clearing-House.

57. Has your country adopted appropriate domestic measures to prevent and penalize, as appropriate, transboundary movements of living modified organisms carried out in contravention of its domestic measures? (Article 25.1)	
a) yes	
b) no	X
58. Have there been any illegal transboundary movements of living modified organisms into your country during the reporting period?	
a) yes	
b) no	X
59. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences in implementing Article 25, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
In the NBF, Guidelines for internal transport and release of GMOs and products states consignments will be released only if it is fully complying with conditions noted in import permit, otherwise the consignment will be destroyed at the importer's expense. It further states, no organisms or products other than approved ones are allowed to transport and release. The Draft Biosafety Act recognizes that regulations can be made to prevent introductions of living modified organisms without observing the procedure specified in the Act.	

Article 26 – Socio-economic considerations

60. If during this reporting period your country has taken a decision on import, did it take into account socio-economic considerations arising from the impact of living modified organisms on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, especially with regard to the value of biological diversity to indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.1)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	
d) not a Party of import	X
61. Has your country cooperated with other Parties on research and information exchange on any socio-economic impacts of living modified organisms, especially on indigenous and local communities? (Article 26.2)	
a) yes – significant extent	
b) yes – limited extent	
c) no	X
62. Please provide further details about your responses to the above questions, as well as description of your country's experiences and progress in implementing Article 26, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
A training program on risk assessment and management has been conducted in the country with foreign expertise presenting lectures on socio economic aspects in 2004. Country still lacks experts on socio economic aspects related to biosafety.	

Article 28 – Financial mechanism and resources

63. Please indicate if, during the reporting period, your Government made financial resources available to other Parties or received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions, for the purposes of implementation of the Protocol.	
a) yes – made financial resources available to other Parties	
b) yes – received financial resources from other Parties or financial institutions	X
c) both	
d) neither	
64. Please provide further details about your response to the above question, as well as description of your country's experiences, including any obstacles or impediments encountered:	
Sri Lanka received funding under the UNEP - GEF Global project on Development of 100 National Biosafety Frameworks for development of the NBF for Sri Lanka and UNEP-GEF project for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing House. Sri Lanka has suceesfully implemented the NBF development project and at present expediting the latter project.	

Other information

65. Please use this box to provide any other information related to articles of the Protocol, questions in the reporting format, or other issues related to national implementation of the Protocol:

Comments on reporting format

The wording of these questions is based on the Articles of the Protocol. Please provide information on any difficulties that you have encountered in interpreting the wording of these questions:
