SRI LANKA

COUNTRY SYNTHESIS REPORT

Dialogue period: 4–16 May 2026

“What picture emerges across the dialogues?”

Produced by 4SD Foundation with artificial intelligence, reviewed by World Vision Sri Lanka.

October 2026

Acknowledgements

This report exists because children, parents, teachers, farmers, health workers, local officials, and civil-society representatives across ten World Vision Lanka Area Programmes — Kalpitiya, Chavakacheri, Bibila, Vaharai, Rideegama, Neluwa, Watawala, Ganga Ihala Korale, Wattala, and Rathnapura — gave their time between 4 and 16 May 2026 to talk honestly about food and nutrition in their own communities. Their willingness to name what is hard, and to propose what might help, is the substance of everything that follows. We acknowledge the local Convenors and facilitators who organised and ran these dialogues, the Record Keepers who documented them, and the World Vision Lanka national campaign team and Area Programme staff who made the ENOUGH Campaign's second phase of Nutrition Dialogues possible.

How to read this report

What this report represents

This report is a qualitative synthesis of 19 Nutrition Dialogues Feedback Forms from ten districts across Sri Lanka (Kandy, Jaffna, Puttalam, Galle, Ratnapura, Kurunegala, Nuwara Eliya, Gampaha, Monaragala, Batticaloa), held between 4 and 16 May 2026. It brings together the issues, experiences, perspectives, relationships, and proposed actions that emerge when these dialogues are read side by side. It is not a survey, and it does not claim to represent Sri Lanka, or even these ten communities, in any statistically representative sense. What it offers is a grounded, evidence-traceable account of what participants in these particular dialogues said, and what becomes visible when their accounts are considered together.

How to understand the findings

Where this report notes that an issue appeared in several dialogues, that is a statement about how often it appeared in this evidence base — not a measure of its real-world scale, severity, or importance. A concern raised in only one or two communities can still be serious and is not treated as less real for having been mentioned less often; several such findings are preserved here precisely because they matter, even though they are locally specific. Actions described in Section 7 are what participants themselves proposed or reported already doing — they are not recommendations from 4SD, World Vision, or the authors of this report. Where this report describes a connection between two issues, that connection is one that participants themselves described or that the record itself supports; this report does not add explanations of its own for why something happens. Decisions about what this evidence means for policy, programming, or further action belong to the country-level interpretation that follows this report, supported by the accompanying Interpretation Guide.

Evidence limitations

Two of the ten communities in this evidence base (Bibila and Vaharai) are represented only by Stakeholder Dialogues; no Children's Workshop from either community forms part of this evidence base, so nothing in this report reflects children's own accounts from those two places specifically. All 19 Feedback Forms were submitted in English, and how each dialogue's original spoken language was rendered into that written record is not documented for all but two of them; every account here has therefore passed through an unrecorded translation and write-up process and is not a verbatim transcript. Two records (a Children's Workshop and a Stakeholder Dialogue from different communities) share almost identical wording in their outcome sections; they are combined into one source in the findings below rather than counted as two independent communities' accounts, so as not to overstate how widely that content actually recurred. This dialogue series was also guided in part by a shared set of questions designed centrally for use across communities, including questions about the "Ditwa" cyclone and about school meals and canteens; where this report discusses those topics, it draws on what participants specifically said about their own community's experience, rather than treating how often the topic came up as a sign of its relative importance.

Executive Summary

Across ten communities and 19 dialogues held in May 2026, a consistent picture emerges of nutritious food that is often known about, sometimes available, but not reliably reaching children and families — for reasons that participants describe in remarkably concrete, locally specific terms. School canteens are present in almost every community; however, there is an opportunity to further enhance the availability of nutritious and appealing food options for children,, for two connected reasons that participants themselves separate: children say they choose what tastes good, looks appealing, and is heavily promoted; stakeholders say canteens are inconsistently monitored and sometimes run more as a business than a service. Meal programmes reach younger children far more reliably than older ones, and in one community this gap is tied directly to adolescents fainting and showing fatigue in school. Economic hardship — rising food and fuel prices, unstable farming and estate incomes, and in several places outright poverty — is named almost everywhere as the reason nutritious food, even when understood and even when locally available, does not make it onto the table. The "Ditwa" cyclone left a mark on several communities' food security and, in two of them, on the adequacy of the food distributed during displacement.

Children's own accounts add something distinct: a first-person explanation of why they eat what they eat, direct connections some of them draw between their diets and their own health and concentration, and — in one community — a view of traditional food that runs directly against what most other dialogues suggest. Stakeholders add what children's accounts largely cannot: concerns about farmers' access to fair prices and markets, water quality in one community, the fairness of welfare distribution in another, and family situations — migration, separation, alcohol-related strain — in which children's nutrition is affected by circumstances well beyond food itself. In several communities, mothers are described as carrying the practical responsibility for household nutrition largely alone. Participants proposed a wide range of actions of their own: better-regulated and more appealing school food, more nutrition education delivered in engaging rather than lecturing ways, expanded home gardening, and — repeatedly — stronger, fairer, more consistent government follow-through, from welfare distribution to agricultural extension to disaster preparedness. What these dialogues help us see, read together, is set out in Section 8: two genuinely complementary explanations of the same school-food problem, a nutrition "gap" that opens up specifically in adolescence, unused home food-production potential that different communities cannot use for different reasons, and a disaster whose nutritional consequences showed up differently depending on what each community had to fall back on.

1. Introduction

The Nutrition Dialogues bring participants — children and adults, across different roles and communities — into structured conversation about food and nutrition in their own lives. Read individually, each dialogue tells the story of one community's discussion on one day. Read together, as this report does, they let a wider picture come into view: what recurs across many places and what stays local to one; how participants themselves connect one issue to another; what children's accounts bring into focus that adult accounts do not, and the reverse; what participants are already doing or asking to change; and what becomes visible only once issues, connections, perspectives and actions are considered side by side.

This report follows that progression directly. Section 3 sets out the nutrition issues participants described. Section 4 turns to how participants themselves connected those issues to one another. Sections 5 and 6 look specifically at what children's dialogues and stakeholder dialogues each contribute. Section 7 brings together what participants proposed, or reported already doing. Section 8 draws out what becomes visible only by reading all of this together. This is the first, country-review version of the report: it is intended to be checked by the World Vision Lanka country team against their own knowledge of these dialogues before it is finalised for wider use.

2. About the Nutrition Dialogues

This synthesis draws on 19 Feedback Forms from Nutrition Dialogues convened across ten World Vision Lanka Area Programmes between **4 and 16 May 2026**: Kalpitiya, Chavakacheri, Bibila, Vaharai, Rideegama, Neluwa, Watawala, Ganga Ihala Korale, Wattala, and Rathnapura. Eight of the nineteen were Children's Workshops, bringing together school-aged children, mainly from farming, fishing, estate, or low-income urban households; eleven were Stakeholder Dialogues, bringing together varying combinations of parents and caregivers, women's groups, farmers, educators, civil-society representatives, and — in two communities — local government officials specifically. Two communities, Bibila and Vaharai, are represented in this evidence base only through Stakeholder Dialogues. One community, Ganga Ihala Korale, is explicitly recorded as including both Sinhala- and Tamil-speaking children from rural and tea-plantation backgrounds; ethnic and linguistic composition is not documented in comparable detail for the other communities. Participant numbers per dialogue ranged from 7 to 26.

Community	Children's Workshop	Stakeholder Dialogue(s)	Event date(s)
Kalpitiya	Yes	Yes	4–5 May 2026
Chavakacheri	Yes	Yes	5, 16 May 2026
Bibila	—	Yes (two)	7 May 2026
Vaharai	—	Yes	6 May 2026
Rideegama	Yes	Yes	6 May 2026
Neluwa	Yes	Yes	12 May 2026
Watawala	Yes	Yes	8 May 2026
Ganga Ihala Korale	Yes	Yes	7, 15 May 2026
Wattala	Yes	Yes	12 May 2026
Rathnapura	Yes	Yes	13 May 2026

Full dialogue-by-dialogue detail is provided in Annex A.

3. What nutrition issues emerge across the Dialogues?

Many school canteens still face challenges in providing food choices that consistently support good nutrition.

In nearly every community in this evidence base, canteen food came up as a problem — described slightly differently depending on who was speaking, but pointing at the same thing. Children in Neluwa, Kalpitiya, Watawala, Chavakacheri, and Rathnapura named specific foods on sale — noodles, paratha, fried rice, kottu, sugary drinks, burgers and pizza — and were candid that these are what they actually want to eat, not merely what is available. Stakeholders in several of the same communities, and in Bibila specifically, described the other side of the same problem: canteens that are inconsistently monitored, sometimes prioritise profit over food quality, and in some cases lack basic hygiene infrastructure. In Bibila, local government officials described inconsistent monitoring of students leaving school premises to buy food from outside vendors, alongside uneven enforcement of existing rules from school to school.

Meals reach younger children far more reliably than older ones

A second, closely related pattern recurs across several communities: structured school meal programmes are described as well established for younger, primary-age children, but largely absent for secondary students. In Chavakacheri, stakeholders connected this directly to a consequence: without equivalent hot-meal facilities in secondary schools, adolescent nutrition — particularly among children from already vulnerable families — is given less focus to the point of causing fatigue and fainting at school. In Ganga Ihala Korale, children made the same coverage gap explicit in their own words: only primary-school children receive meals. Kalpitiya and Neluwa stakeholders both proposed extending meal programmes to secondary level as a direct response.

Taste, appearance and marketing shape what children choose to eat

Children across several workshops were unusually direct about why they eat what they eat: taste, appearance, and aroma, as the Watawala Children's Workshop put it in almost exactly those terms, matter more to them in the moment than nutritional value. Heavy promotion of fast and processed food, and — in two communities — a perception that traditional food has become less socially attractive than modern alternatives, were named as reinforcing this. This is children's own explanation of their choices, not an adult inference about them.

Rising prices are making nutritious food harder to afford

Almost every dialogue in this evidence base, across both children's and stakeholders' accounts, named economic hardship as a central constraint: rising food and fuel prices, unstable income from fishing, farming, tea and other daily wages, and — in several places — the knock-on effect of global economic pressures on local costs. In Neluwa, children traced this chain themselves: international events pushing up fuel costs, which push up food prices, which in turn make it harder for families to provide nutritious meals.

The "Ditwa" cyclone left its mark on food security in several communities

A cyclone referred to throughout these dialogues as "Ditwa" is described, in a number of communities, as having disrupted agriculture, livelihoods, and access to food, with two communities — Kalpitiya and Rideegama — describing in some detail how food distributed in safety centres during displacement (commonly rice, dhal, potatoes, and soya meat) did not meet the specific needs of infants and young children, and how attention to proper nutrition tended to decline the longer families remained displaced.

Home gardens sit unused, for different reasons in different places

Several communities describe home-gardening potential that exists but goes unused — though for genuinely different reasons from place to place. In Watawala, participants pointed to land shortage specifically. In Rathnapura and, more generally, around Rideegama, participants pointed instead to crop damage from

monkeys, peacocks and other animals. In Kalpitiya and Vaharai, the barrier described was less about physical constraint and more about time and motivation. This is not one problem with one fix; it is the same missed opportunity showing up for different, locally specific reasons.

What counts as "nutritious" is not always agreed on at home

Several dialogues point to gaps and disagreements in nutrition knowledge that shape what actually gets served. Stakeholders in Chavakacheri, Bibila, and Vaharai described young parents in particular as lacking confidence or skill in preparing traditional, nutritious meals. In Ganga Ihala Korale, children described a specific belief held by some parents in their own community — that only meat, eggs and fish count as truly nutritious food, with home-grown leafy greens and vegetables undervalued by comparison, despite being available in many of the same households' gardens.

In Chavakacheri, some children see it the other way around

Most children's accounts in this evidence base treat traditional food as healthy but increasingly displaced by modern, processed alternatives. The Chavakacheri Children's Workshop is a clear exception: children there described a perception that traditional foods are *not* healthy, and that current, more modern foods are the nutritious choice. This runs directly against the more common pattern elsewhere and is preserved here as a genuine difference of view, not smoothed into the majority account.

In Neluwa, some families worry that support meant for them does not reach them fairly

One community's stakeholders raised a concern not echoed elsewhere in this evidence base: a perceived lack of transparency in how welfare (Samurdhi) beneficiaries are selected, and a preference for receiving essential food items directly rather than cash, so that support reaches its intended purpose. This is a single community's account, raised by participants themselves rather than independently verified, and is noted here briefly because it bears directly on whether nutrition-relevant support actually reaches the households it is meant for; it is not generalised beyond Neluwa.

In Bibila, concerns reach beyond the school gate, to water and to markets

Bibila's stakeholders raised two locally specific concerns not prominent elsewhere: water quality poor enough to be linked to kidney-related illness in the community, and a market system in which intermediaries, rather than farmers themselves, largely set the price of locally grown vegetables — leaving farmers with limited financial return even where their produce could otherwise support household and community nutrition.

4. How do these issues connect?

When secondary schools offer no school meals, some older children go without — and it shows

In Chavakacheri, participants described a clear difference between primary and secondary school provision. Primary schools generally provide hot, structured meals, while secondary schools generally do not. For adolescents from vulnerable households, participants connected this gap to visible fatigue and fainting at school. This consequence was described in Chavakacheri and should not be assumed to occur with the same severity in every community where secondary-school meal coverage is limited.

Global price shocks travel quickly to the local plate

In Neluwa, children described a short, direct chain in their own words: international conflict and global economic pressure raise local fuel costs; higher fuel costs raise food prices; higher food prices make it harder for families to provide nutritious meals.

When parents are absent, grandparents step in — not always with the same support

In Vaharai and Wattala, stakeholders described a similar sequence: parents unable to be present — through migration for work, family separation, or in one case teenage pregnancy — leaving children in grandparents' care, with caregiving in these arrangements sometimes described as inconsistent or inadequate. This evidence base includes no children's workshop account of this pattern from either community.

Displacement lingers longer than the emergency response does

In Rideegama, stakeholders connected two observations about the aftermath of the Ditwa cyclone directly: the food distributed in safety centres was limited in variety, and the longer families remained displaced, the more attention to children's proper nutrition seemed to decline. Kalpitiya's stakeholders also described the same limited food-basket problem, without the duration element; the underlying composition issue may therefore be more widespread even where its longer-term drift has not been separately documented here.

Mothers carry the nutrition load in several communities

In Kalpitiya, Vaharai, and Ganga Ihala Korale, participants — stakeholders in the first two, children themselves in the third — described mothers as the default household decision-makers for nutrition, with fathers comparatively less engaged. The reasons given differ: in Kalpitiya, this is tied specifically to fathers' extended absence for fishing work; in Vaharai and Ganga Ihala Korale, it is described in more general terms.

5. What do children tell us?

Children's own accounts, across eight communities, make several things visible that adult accounts do not reach in the same way.

Children explain their own food choices in their own terms

Rather than adults describing why children eat unhealthily, several workshops captured children saying so themselves: taste, appearance and aroma come first, ahead of nutritional value, and marketing and easy availability reinforce this. This is most directly stated in Watawala, where children named specific favourite foods — instant noodles, fried rice, kottu — in the very first icebreaker of the session, before the discussion had even turned to nutrition as a topic.

Some children draw a direct line from diet to their own wellbeing

In Rathnapura and Kalpitiya, children connected poor diet directly to outcomes they experience themselves: impaired growth, reduced concentration and learning ability, greater susceptibility to illness, and — in Kalpitiya specifically — poor eyesight, dental problems, and fainting at school. In both communities, children named these practical stakes of nutrition for themselves, without adult prompting.

Children see the household economics adults describe, from the inside

Several children's workshops showed a clear-eyed awareness of financial constraint at home: families unable to afford nutritious food consistently, fuel and food prices rising together, and — in Ganga Ihala Korale — a specific, named belief among some parents that only meat, eggs and fish count as properly nutritious, leaving home-grown vegetables undervalued even where they are available. Children in the same workshop also noted, plainly, that "fathers were not included in the family nutrition most of the times" — an observation that connects to what stakeholders in Kalpitiya and Vaharai said about gendered caregiving (Section 6).

Children do not all agree with each other

Most children's workshops describe traditional food positively — healthy, but losing ground to more attractive modern alternatives. Chavakacheri's children workshop is the clear exception, describing traditional food as

the less healthy option and modern food as the nutritious one. Children in different communities do not necessarily see this the same way, and that difference is itself part of what these dialogues show.

Children describe unequal access within their own schools

The Wattala Children's Workshop drew a specific contrast between urban schools, with larger canteens offering more variety, and village schools, with smaller and more limited ones — and separately noted that children who had left mainstream school for vocational training lose access to structured meal programmes altogether. This kind of within-country, within-system comparison came from children themselves, not from an external assessment.

6. What do stakeholders tell us?

Stakeholder Dialogues bring into view dimensions of the country picture that children's accounts do not reach directly — institutional, agricultural, and, in some cases, family-situation dimensions that sit behind a child's plate rather than on it.

Institutional and governance gaps sit behind some of the same problems children describe

Where children describe canteens as full of unhealthy but appealing food, Bibila's local-government stakeholders described the institutional side of the same picture: monitoring of student food purchases is inconsistent from school to school, existing rules are unevenly enforced, and canteens sometimes operate more as a business than a service. This is not a contradiction of what children said; it is a different, complementary vantage point on the same problem.

Farmers describe a livelihood that does not reliably convert into household nutrition

Across several communities — Bibila, Watawala, Rathnapura, and, more generally, the area around Rideegama — farmers and other food producers described real constraints on turning agricultural work into food on their own tables: prices set by intermediaries rather than farmers themselves, land too limited for meaningful home cultivation, crop losses to wildlife, and, in Bibila specifically, difficulty meeting the formal market requirements (such as packaging and barcoding standards) that would let farmers reach better-paying buyers. These are locally specific constraints, not one generic story of "farming is hard."

Family situations that children's accounts do not reach directly

Stakeholders in three communities — Kalpitiya, Vaharai and Wattala — raised the effect of alcohol-related household spending on the funds available for children's food, described carefully and without naming individuals. In two of these communities, Vaharai and Wattala, stakeholders also described children left in grandparents' care following parental migration, separation, or other family disruption, with caregiving in these arrangements sometimes described as inconsistent. Both observations come only from stakeholder accounts in this evidence base; no children's workshop record describes them.

Two locally specific institutional concerns, each raised in a single community

In Neluwa, stakeholders raised a concern about fairness and transparency in how welfare support is distributed, and suggested that essential food items, rather than cash, might better guarantee that support reaches its intended purpose. In Bibila, stakeholders separately raised water quality serious enough to be linked to kidney-related illness in the community. Both are single-community findings, raised by participants rather than independently verified, and are recorded here because each bears directly and specifically on food and nutrition outcomes in the community concerned.

Stakeholders name the same gendered caregiving pattern children observe

Stakeholders in Kalpitiya and Vaharai described a similar pattern in their own communities: mothers carrying primary responsibility for household nutrition, with fathers comparatively less engaged — in Kalpitiya tied specifically to men's extended absence for fishing work. The same pattern appears in children's own account from Ganga Ihala Korale (Section 5).

7. What actions do participants propose?

The actions below are what participants themselves proposed, or reported already doing. They are not recommendations from 4SD, World Vision, or the authors of this report, and they are grouped here by the area of change they target, not by which dialogue raised them.

Changing what schools offer and how it is managed

Participants across many communities proposed making school and preschool meal programmes more nutritious, diverse and appealing — several specifically mentioning better presentation and variety, not only nutritional content — and extending structured meal coverage to secondary students, where it is currently thin or absent. They proposed stronger, more consistently enforced regulation of what canteens and nearby vendors sell, including restrictions on sugary drinks and fast food; better hygiene standards, sometimes suggested to be guided directly by health authorities; and, in Bibila specifically, treating canteens explicitly as a service to students rather than a commercial operation, alongside measures such as prefect-led monitoring recognised through certification. Several groups proposed more engaging, practical nutrition education — cooking demonstrations, food exhibitions, nutrition clubs, and games rather than one-way instruction — as more likely to change children's own food choices than awareness messaging alone.

Making better use of what households and communities already have

Home-gardening promotion recurred as a proposed action in many communities, alongside, in some places, more specific ideas: reviving school gardens and linking their produce directly to school meals, promoting locally available traditional foods (naming specific items such as idiyappam, kadala, green gram, and jackfruit-based preparations), and encouraging shared parental responsibility for children's nutrition rather than treating it as a mother's task alone. In Rathnapura and Watawala, participants also proposed small-scale livelihood diversification — mushroom cultivation, candle-making, poultry-rearing, and similar income-generating activities — as a way of strengthening a household's ability to afford nutritious food, not only its knowledge of what to buy.

Strengthening markets, agriculture, and disaster preparedness

Farmers and other stakeholders proposed stronger farmer organisations for those growing fruit and vegetables specifically, fairer and more transparent pricing arrangements, better access to agricultural extension support and soil testing, and improved market access, including infrastructure such as roads and transport. On disaster preparedness, several communities proposed strengthening local structures such as Village Child Development Management Committees, and, in two communities, establishing a more structured system of psychosocial support for families affected by displacement.

Asking government and service systems to follow through more consistently

A recurring theme across many communities is a request not for new programmes so much as more consistent delivery of existing ones: stronger and more transparent welfare-beneficiary selection processes, including external oversight where trust has broken down; more consistent government field presence and follow-up, including addressing frequent staff transfers that disrupt continuity; expanded and better-resourced health services, including more nutritionists and dietitians in the health system and strengthened support for Public Health Midwives; and, more broadly, stronger implementation, coordination and monitoring of nutrition-related policy already in place, rather than the introduction of policy where none exists.

8. What do the Dialogues help us see?

Two true explanations of the same canteen problem, not one

Children explain unhealthy school food through their own preferences — taste, appearance, marketing; stakeholders explain the same problem through weak monitoring and inconsistent enforcement. Children's preferences and institutional oversight are shaping the same outcome from two different directions at once: addressing canteen food quality by regulation alone, or by nutrition messaging to children alone, is likely to leave the other half of the problem exactly where it was.

A gap opens specifically in adolescence

Early childhood nutrition — growth monitoring, primary-school meals — and adult-level concerns — livelihoods, household economics, disaster response — both appear repeatedly across these dialogues. What sits comparatively thin between them is adolescence: the age at which structured meal support recedes just as academic and social pressures on food choices intensify. Chavakacheri's stakeholders describe this gap causing fatigue and fainting at school; Ganga Ihala Korale's children describe the same coverage gap in their own words, without the same health consequence being named there.

The same missed opportunity, for different local reasons

Under-used home food-production potential appears across many communities, but the specific reason differs each time — land shortage in one place, wildlife damage in another, time and motivation in a third. Any effort to unlock this potential would need to start from what is actually limiting a specific community, rather than assuming the same lever works everywhere.

One disaster, felt differently depending on what a community had to fall back on

The Ditwa cyclone's nutritional consequences did not show up as one uniform story. In some communities, the account centres on agricultural loss and rising prices; in two others, specifically, it centres on the adequacy of food distributed during displacement itself, and on how nutritional attention can drift as displacement continues. The same shock, refracted differently depending on what each community's food system already looked like before it hit.

Mothers carry much of the responsibility for children's nutrition

Children in Ganga Ihala Korale and stakeholders in Kalpitiya and Vaharai describe mothers as carrying most of the practical responsibility for household nutrition, with fathers comparatively less engaged. In Kalpitiya, this is tied specifically to fathers' extended absence for fishing work; in Vaharai and Ganga Ihala Korale, it is described in more general terms.

9. Conclusion

Read individually, these 19 dialogues are ten communities' honest accounts of their own experience with food and nutrition in May 2026. Read together, they show a picture in which nutritious food is often understood, sometimes available, but does not reliably reach children — held back by a combination of what children themselves are drawn to eat, how consistently canteens and schools are able to offer something better, how far household incomes stretch under rising prices, how recently and how hard a community was hit by the Ditwa cyclone, and, in specific and locally documented ways, by gaps in market fairness, service delivery, and family circumstance that sit behind the plate rather than on it. Participants did not simply describe these problems; across every community, they proposed concrete, often modest changes of their own — better canteens, revived gardens, fairer prices, more consistent government follow-through — that reflect a clear sense of what would help. This evidence base cannot show how common or severe these patterns are beyond the 19 dialogues it draws on, and it does not attempt to. What it can show, and what this report has tried to set out plainly, is what participants in these ten communities said, how they connected what they said, and what becomes visible only when their accounts are read side by side.

Annex A — Dialogues Included in the Synthesis

Dialogue ID	Type	Community	Event date	Participants (recorded total)
60225	Children's Workshop	Kalpitiya	2026-05-04	26
60230	Stakeholder Dialogue	Kalpitiya	2026-05-05	10
60236	Stakeholder Dialogue	Chavakacheri	2026-05-05	11
60243	Stakeholder Dialogue	Vaharai	2026-05-06	13
60249	Stakeholder Dialogue	Rideegama	2026-05-06	13
60252	Children's Workshop	Rideegama	2026-05-06	16
60246	Stakeholder Dialogue (Government)	Bibila	2026-05-07	8
60260	Stakeholder Dialogue	Ganga Ihala Korale	2026-05-07	16
60263	Stakeholder Dialogue	Bibila	2026-05-07	7
60266	Stakeholder Dialogue	Watawala	2026-05-08	16
60278	Children's Workshop	Watawala	2026-05-08	24
60269	Stakeholder Dialogue	Neluwa	2026-05-12	9
60275	Stakeholder Dialogue	Wattala	2026-05-12	18
60285	Children's Workshop	Neluwa	2026-05-12	15
60292	Children's Workshop	Wattala	2026-05-12	22
60272	Stakeholder Dialogue	Rathnapura	2026-05-13	14
60295	Children's Workshop	Rathnapura	2026-05-13	9
60282	Children's Workshop	Ganga Ihala Korale	2026-05-15	17
60289	Children's Workshop	Chavakacheri	2026-05-16	22

Note: the Rideegama Children's Workshop (60252) and the Ganga Ihala Korale Stakeholder Dialogue (60260) share near-identical outcome text in the underlying Feedback Forms (see How to Read This Report) and are treated as one combined source in the findings above, not as two independent community accounts.