



Environment Programme

**UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity for Effective
Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House**



Global Environment
Facility

15, Chemin des Anémones, 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland

Report on the

Biosafety Clearing-House Training of Trainers Course

for

Information Technology and Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Regional Advisors

**Conducted at the Pan Pacific Hotel
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
31 January to 12 February 2005**

Prepared by
Denny Hamilton, Lead Facilitator

Narrative Summary of Workshop Proceedings

Introduction

This report presents a narrative summary of the proceedings of the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) Training of Trainers (ToT) and also describes each session of the training course. The primary purpose of the report is to provide a record of the workshop that can be used by both participants and trainers.

Where training materials are introduced, they are identified in the text as Workshop Materials with a number indicating the sequence in which they were introduced. Similarly, outputs produced by the participants are noted in the text as Workshop Outputs with a number indicating the sequence in which they were produced. The report contains three annexes, Annex A: List of Participants, Training Team Members and Resource Persons Annex B: Workshop Materials, and Annex C: Workshop Outputs.

Preparation

Three meetings involving all facilitators were held prior to 14 January 2005. These focused on revising the draft ToT schedule to include more active involvement of participants in sessions relating to training skills. As a result of these meetings, one session focusing on training skills was included in the schedule. Training skills topics were presented and discussed, and assignments given to participants, thus providing opportunities for them to practice and get feedback on their training skills. A session design format was agreed and all resource persons and trainers were invited to prepare session designs for the sessions they would deliver.

Ingo and Anil arrived a week before the workshop to begin preparations relating to the computer equipment and web connections that were required for the workshop. Jyoti and Yenny arrived on 26 January; Denny arrived on the evening of 27 January. The next day, 28 January, Jyoti, Ingo and Denny spent time revising the schedule and reviewing the draft assessment criteria and the Day One sessions. That afternoon, Jocelyn joined in and began reviewing the content of the online modules.

The training team met on Saturday, 29 January to continue its preparation. The assessment process was discussed and the assessment instrument revised. It was agreed that the instrument would be presented to the participants on the first afternoon of the workshop. They would meet in focus groups to discuss and make suggestions for how it might be modified. These modifications would then be considered in preparing a final version of the tool.

A discussion ensued on the images used in the online modules. An issue was whether, at the national level, regional experts could substitute more images contained in the online modules with more locally relevant ones.

One suggestion that emerged was that a collection of images from the International Fund for

Agricultural Development (IFAD) might be submitted to the secretariat of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) for approval. Critical to the process is ensuring images of the proper size and quality, as well as ones that do not change the intent of the verbal messages. It might be possible for regional and national experts to substitute images and submit these to a BCH image databank.

The workshop navigation process was discussed and agreed.

The assignments for the pedagogy practicum were discussed and five assignments identified. Draft assignments were produced and distributed to the team for their comments. Five groups would be formed of regional experts, with a Latin American group, an Asian group, two African groups (one anglophone, one francophone) and an Eastern European group. In addition to preparing and presenting the assignments, the members of each regional group would contribute to the overall assessment process by evaluating the participation and contribution of each group member.

Following an afternoon of individual work on training sessions, the entire team met to review the schedule, the workshop navigation process and the assessment process and to clarify roles. Appreciation was expressed for the work done by Leslie and Low, the two local information technology (IT) support staff, in setting up the computer network for the workshop and to all members of the team for their contributions in preparing the workshop.

Acknowledgements

The ToT training team wishes to acknowledge the professional assistance and support provided by a number of people.

First, our thanks to Anil D'Souza for getting everyone to and from the course and for the assistance provided with the immigration authorities for one member of the training team and one participant who had difficulty entering the country. Anil also managed the course logistics and secretariat work with a level of professionalism that has set a very high standard.

Next, our appreciation and sincere thanks to all of the resource persons who provided substantive inputs to the course, in particular, Albert Spielmann, Alain Le Duc, Chris Briggs, Donna Roy, Fee Chon Low, Keneti Faulalo, Morven McLean, Nizar Mohamed and Philippe Leblond.

The technical support team, who set up and maintained the computer, printer and photocopying machine, did an outstanding job.

Our sincere thanks and appreciation are also directed to the staff and management of the Pan Pacific Hotel (who provided many services during the workshop).

Last, but by far not least, we want to thank the participants who joined the course and displayed such a high level of professionalism, commitment, interest and enthusiasm.

Opening session

The workshop was opened by Nizar Mohamed, the Regional Coordinator for Asia UNEP-GEF (United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility) Biosafety Project. He welcomed the participants to the Training of Trainers Workshop and stressed that we were "all here to learn". He noted that we came from a range of backgrounds with a diversity of experience and that it was important that we understood that we were there to share our experience and learn from each other. The training team needed to learn from the participants' experience and the collective input would be immensely valuable to those with whom we would be working in the future.

Denny introduced *the card and chart technique* that was to be used throughout the workshop to capture ideas as they were shared. He noted that cards provide a flexibility that flip charts do not, since cards can be moved around and placed in different categories as needed. Participants were encouraged to use the following guidelines when using the cards:

- 1 "Write in large letters using a marker"
- 2 "Write one idea on a card"
- 3 "Summarize the idea"
- 4 "Grammar and spelling are not important – communicate the idea"
- 5 "Stick to the colour scheme"

The participants were invited to fill out four cards, each of a different colour, requesting information as follows:

- 1 **Yellow card:** *Indicate whether you are here as an IT expert, a CPB expert or a member of the training team. Note the number of years of experience you have with IT or CPB. (Also on this card was the participant's name and organization. If not with an organization, the participant was identified as an independent consultant.)*
- 2 **Orange card:** *Give one expectation you have of this workshop, i.e. one that you expect to get out of these next two weeks.*
- 3 **Blue card:** *Identify one training skill you would like to work on during this workshop.*
- 4 **Brown card:** *Name one concern you have about the delivery of the BCH process at the national level.*

Participants introduced themselves and shared the information they had written on the cards as well as saying which country they were from. The cards were posted on a chart and documented as Workshop Output No.1. (Please see Annex C below for a list of all workshop outputs.)

Several announcements regarding practical arrangements were made, as follows:

- Location of rest rooms
- Personal laptops: These were to be used elsewhere than in the conference room, since all power outlets were dedicated to the existing computers
- Internet access: Participants were asked to use Mozilla Firefox as the internet access link
- Pre-workshop assignments: Four paper versions of these assignments were to be posted on the boards immediately outside the plenary room
- Outputs and presentations: Documentation of all outputs and materials used for presentations were to be Yenny's responsibility. Participants who had not provided electronic copies of their pre-workshop assignments were asked to be sure that Yenny received them for inclusion in the workshop documentation as well.
- Logistical or travel arrangements were to be handled by Anil
- Informal attire was encouraged

Jyoti then presented an introduction to the ToT which included an outline of the process that was used to select the participants for the workshop. (A copy of her presentation is available as Workshop Material No.1. (Please see Annex B: Workshop Materials, which lists all materials used as part of the training course subject matter.)

After the coffee break, the opening session continued with a presentation by Jyoti. She began by explaining that three of the expectations that had been shared during the opening session would not be addressed in the workshop. One of these expectations was that we would be learning about web programming, which was not within the scope of this workshop.

Jyoti continued with a presentation on the BCH Project (Workshop Material No.2). There were several questions. It was noted that most of these would be addressed either in the afternoon session or in the administration and finance session in the afternoon of Day Two.

It was announced that there would be a cocktail reception on the 4th floor at 18h30. Denny also explained that the accommodation package included breakfast. Each participant would be responsible for their own lunch and dinner and each had received a daily subsistence allowance (DSA) for this purpose. Denny encouraged anyone who found a good place to eat to let the others know. Ingo and Jocelyn explained that photographs would be taken of each participant, and that, if agreed to by the participant, the photographs would be included in the modules. A second idea was to include everyone's picture in a biographical sketch on the website.

Denny facilitated a session on presentation skills, which began with a brainstorming exercise in which the main elements of an effective presentation were identified. Each of these elements was then discussed in detail. This was followed by a discussion of interpersonal feedback in which the STARCODE acronym, which identifies the main elements of effective feedback, were reviewed. Copies of the summary of the elements covered -- namely, a presentation skills checklist, an outline linking training to theatre and the STARCODE

document (Workshop Materials Nos.3, 4, and 5) -- were distributed later in the day.

At the conclusion of the session, participants were assigned to prepare a 3 to 5 minute presentation on a topic related to biosafety or IT. These presentations would be made the following morning. The assignment also required that they use some form of non-electronic visual aid.

Introduction to UNEP-GEF projects on biosafety, the project on development of national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) and the NBF implementation projects

The afternoon began with an introductory presentation by Nizar Mohamed on the UNEP-GEF biosafety projects. He covered the overall strategy, and mentioned the project development process (which may ultimately reach 130 countries) and the implementation project which were covered in more detail later. The aims of the projects are to prepare countries for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol, to assist with the development of the NBF in participating countries, and to promote regional and subregional cooperation.

The four phases of the process were introduced and information on the current global status was given. Currently, 28 countries have completed their NBFs.

In response to a question about benchmarks and lessons learned, Nizar explained that there are no standard benchmarks, because the process in each country is unique. Lessons learned are being researched by Ms. Su Chin Teoh, a contracted consultant, who was present and was introduced to the participants.

A question was raised about the regional designation for the countries of Central Asia. It was noted that although the countries in Central Asia fall into the Asia region, because of language similarities to countries in Eastern Europe, they might be serviced by consultants from Europe.

Finally, in response to a question about African countries involved in the NBF process, it was noted that they are divided into francophone and anglophone countries.

A second presentation was made by Keneti Faulalo on the specifics of the national biosafety frameworks. He noted that the process is guided by input from the COP/MOP. He explained that the NBF has five components: policy, regulation, systems to handle requests, follow-up monitoring and enforcement, and public awareness and education. Using the analogy of a house, he explained that while the basic elements of all houses are the same, each house may be uniquely constructed. This is how NBFs have developed: they have basic elements, but these are dealt with differently from one country to another.

The final presentation was made by Fee Chon Low on the implementation of NBFs. She noted that the NBFs must not only look good, more importantly, they have to work. The challenges of implementation are huge. Developing an NBF is considerably easier than implementing it. The aim is to produce fully operational NBFs. Fee Chon explained the elements of an operational NBF and also mentioned some national level activities. Finally,

she addressed the role of UNEP. There were questions about where the IT expert comes in and it was noted that the IT people in this ToT are concerned about the establishment of the BCH and not with the implementation of other NBF components. That having been said, a number of possible roles were identified having to do with systems and database development, for example.

(Copies of all three PowerPoint presentations are included among the Workshop Materials as Nos.6, 7 and 8.)

Introduction to the workshop

The final session of the afternoon dealt with several aspects of the workshop. Ingo began by presenting the information contained in the participants' folders and the materials included in the workshop soft case. Jyoti provided a brief overview of the curriculum and mentioned the four-part assessment process that would be used. Denny followed with the distribution of materials relating to the morning session on presentations and a detailed review of the schedule for the first week.

The final activity of the session was the formation of five focus groups, which was done by having first the IT and then the CPB participants count off by five and then by inviting all the ones to form one group, the twos another group, and so on. The draft assessment criteria were distributed to each focus group and 40 minutes were spent reviewing this. In plenary, the groups presented their suggestions for modifying the criteria. Their suggestions were appreciated and subsequently included in the final version of the assessment form (Workshop Output No.2).

Workshop navigation meeting

Denny explained the workshop navigation process and invited each focus group to meet, to select a rapporteur and to discuss the events of the first training day. Comments on any aspect of the training were appreciated, including the venue, the facilitation, the content of the sessions, and so on. After 20 minutes, the representatives of each group met with the training team and shared their feedback. A discussion ensued about several of the issues raised. These were clarified and some resolved on the spot (Workshop Output No.3).

Day Two: Tuesday, 1 February

Opening

The morning session began with a report on the workshop navigation meeting held the night before. Denny distributed a copy of the report to all participants so that they would be familiar with the format, since, as of the following day, Wednesday, the reports would be written by

one of the participants attending the meeting.

Presentation skills session

Denny distributed a second copy of the presentation skills checklist and suggested that the participants use it as a guide for preparing their feedback on the presentations of their colleagues. The participants were divided into three groups of eight and each participant had an opportunity to deliver the presentation they had prepared and to receive feedback from their peers.

Biosafety and the environment

Fee Chon introduced a session on biosafety and the environment (Workshop Material No.10). She explained key concepts in biosafety, biotechnology, modern biotechnology and biodiversity and gave an introduction to living modified organisms (LMOs) and genetically modified organisms (GMOs), which were then discussed. Fee Chon also provided background information on the process leading up to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB), which began with the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, to the Conference of the Parties in Jakarta in 1995, and to the summit in Montreal in 2000, where the Cartagena Protocol was adopted. She noted that, with the fiftieth national signatory in 2003, the CPB had entered into force.

The goals of the CBD were explained as being (1) the conservation of biodiversity; (2) the sustainable use of the components of biodiversity; and (3) the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. Fee Chon noted that this last goal was the most difficult one to pursue. The presentation generated a spirited discussion of modern biotechnology.

The key concepts of the CPB, that is, biosafety and the precautionary principle, were introduced and explained as were the objectives of the protocol. The elements for operation of the CPB were presented and it was explained that these would be discussed in more detail as the workshop proceeded.

Administration and finance

The afternoon was devoted to administration and finance issues. Jean-Louis and Ingo presented an overview of the institutional environment, the fund management process and the link of the UNEP-GEF BCH Project to the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) and to the United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG). They explained what a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is and how it would be developed for this project. The BCH facilitator selection process was reviewed as was the process of setting up the BCH Facilitation Service (Workshop Material No.10).

The first of two group work assignments were introduced and participants met in working groups to prepare their responses to the following question: *Explain how you would prepare for your mission in chronological steps from the moment you receive your Mission Order to*

the moment you arrive in the country. Each participant then presented the results of their work (Workshop Output No.3) in plenary and these presentations were followed by a plenary discussion.

A second assignment was then given and groups worked on these for 40 minutes. The assignment was as follows: *Formulate a general outline of the activities schedule of your first mission to the country, e.g. a) what are the main objectives of each meeting ; b) what kinds of problems / constraints / obstacles may likely occur; and, c) in what ways would you deal with these potential difficulties.* Again, the focus groups presented the results of their work (Workshop Output No. 4) in plenary, and a lively discussion continued until the conclusion of the day.

Workshop navigation meeting

The workshop navigation process continued, beginning with focus group meetings and followed by a navigation meeting.

Day Three: Wednesday, 2 February

Opening

Diana Ponce-Nava presented the outcome of the previous evening's navigation meeting.

Anil D'Souza presented four options for excursions on Sunday and explained that from the Tuesday of the following week the Chinese New Year celebrations would begin and most shops in town would be closed, so that people interested in shopping should do so before Tuesday. (It was later announced that everyone would have dinner together on Friday evening, 4 February.)

Pre-workshop assignments

A brief session of comments and questions was held, which provided an opportunity to discuss the pre-workshop assignment posters on display in the entrance. Denny congratulated all those who had prepared an assignment and encouraged anyone who had not done so already to make sure that Yenny had an electronic copy of all assignments so that they could be included in the workshop documentation. He also offered to provide personal feedback on the posters for those who were interested. (Nine participants took advantage of the offer during the day.)

Consultation skills

Denny conducted a session on consultation skills which began with focus groups discussing and listing the skills and attitudes they felt were important for a consultant. These were presented, posted and discussed in plenary. The outputs were combined with the materials

prepared in advance and distributed later as Workshop Material No.11. At the conclusion of the session, Denny told a story about “chickens and chiefs” to illustrate the role of the consultants from this project. Participants were asked to count off by six to form six groups. Each group then received an assignment to prepare one of six consultation role plays, to be presented the following morning, each to be approximately seven minutes long. Denny explained that the role plays were organized in a loose sequence and would be thus presented, that is, beginning with group one and going through to six in total.

Introductions to Modules 2 and 3

After the coffee break, Denny turned the plenary over to Jocelyn Fenard, who introduced a session on Modules 2 and 3 of the BCH online training modules. Two brief brainstorming sessions were held: the first, to generate a list of the kinds of actors that might be involved in the development of training materials, and the second, a quick exercise to generate a list of steps that might be involved in creating training materials. The list of possible actors was:

1. Institutions
2. CPB/IT experts
3. Training centres
4. Commercial providers
5. Software providers
6. BCH staff
7. Media personnel photographers
8. Politicians
9. Parliamentarians
10. Translators
11. Interpreters
12. End users
13. Focal points
14. Decision makers
15. Non-governmental organizations
16. Web designers
17. Technical writers
18. Graphic artists
19. Note takers
20. Lawyers

The focus then turned to the steps involved in developing training materials, as listed below.

1. Link with the BCH Team
2. “Go” decision
3. Clarification of the overall purpose of the training.
4. Work planning
5. Review of prototypes
6. Training needs assessment
7. Input from stakeholders

8. Information gathering
9. Compilation
10. Documentation
11. Review of regulations
12. Identification of frequently asked questions
13. Preparation of promotional and publicity materials
14. Identification of end users
15. Setting of specific training objectives
16. Preparation of user friendly materials
17. Testing and revision of materials
18. Conducting training with targeted participants
19. Assessment of training process and materials
20. De-briefing with client
21. Preparation of mission report

Following a verbal introduction, participants began working their way through the modules using a set of exercises. Working individually the participants explored modules. At the conclusion of the session, participants met again in plenary to share feedback on their experience with the module. The output of this session is given below.

Comments and questions on Modules 2 and 3

The following questions and answers were heard: *(Please note that these are given verbatim).*

- How much detail should we go into in our review of the modules? Go through the entire module if possible, because we need your feedback on the whole.
- We need to differentiate between institutional and administrative arrangements.
- Remarks: Some operational areas of section 5, Module 2, do not respond to the “click”.
- In section 6, Module 2, we are only able to see part one of a two-part answer.
- Will importers receive general advice all at once or will it be on a case-by-case basis?
- For the review session tomorrow (Thursday, 3 February) we should have both IT and CPB experts.
- The language of No. 5 of the BCH Module needs to be revised.
- There are some spelling mistakes.
- How do we get a list of the competent national authorities (CNAs) for a given country?
- Who will be the users? (1) Yourselves. (2) The modules may be disseminated and we need to be sure the content is right.

- When you make an incorrect response, it should be possible to see right away what the correct response is.

- The modules are user-friendly and the sound clips contribute to the package.

Plenary open forum

The original plan had been to continue after lunch with an introduction to Modules 4 and 5 but this was changed when a power failure prevented the use of the computers. Nizar, Feechon and Keneti were the members of a panel arranged to provide an opportunity for participants to raise issues from the first days of the training course. Nizar began by noting that the panel would not be dealing with finance issues, but would address any other issues the participants wished to raise. The main questions and answers during the discussion were as follows:

Q. Who are competent national authorities?

A. People from one or more government agency or institution who participate in the approval of food, feed or environmental products or of field trials.

Q. Can we get a list of the competent national authorities for each country?

A. All parties are required to submit a list of CNAs to the Central Portal of the BCH.

Q. How will importers be informed of who are the CNAs? (See above).

Q. What happens if we do not have a CNA? Are we then not in compliance with the Protocol?

A. (1) Countries may simply say they do not accept any application; (2) countries can establish interim measures until CNAs are in place; (3) some countries have effectively used voluntary guidelines, which can be useful learning tools for setting up formal guidelines; and (4) some countries may operate under the auspices of a time-limited government or ministerial decree.

It is important to know how the national biosafety framework (NBF) is designated, but the process differs between one country and the next and will have been done before our regional experts enter the country.

Q. Could we have a session on the real BCH?

A. We will get to the BCH Central Portal this afternoon (Wednesday, 2 February) and tomorrow.

Q. What is the difference between GMOs and LMOs?

A. We have had a spirited discussion about GMOs and LMOs. Reference has been made to the Protocol – essentially, a LMO is a GMO. An LMO is just that – an organism that is alive, perhaps in a dormant state as in the case of seeds, which is capable of producing or reproducing another organism. A GMO need not be living, it may be an organism that has

been genetically modified, but it is not capable of growth or reproduction. A gene is not a living organism, it is a part of a DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) molecule.

Clarity and consistency of terms used in the NBF is crucial. Regional experts should familiarize themselves with the NBF definitions in client countries.

Q. The establishment of the national biosafety clearing-house (nBCH) process in each country is a project. Are there benchmarks?

A. There are no standard or fixed benchmarks other than the five steps of the BCH project cycle. Each project should take approximately 18 months.

Q. What key information do we need to know before going into a client country?

A. Most important is that both CPB and IT consultants be conversant with basic terminology of IT and CPB.

Q. How do we deal with the fact that we may encounter limited available data on risk assessments?

A. Some countries have not contributed much on risk assessments, but they are obligated to submit a summary to the central portal. Note that the central portal is not very populated at the moment. We will have a chance to explore this on Thursday (3 February).

Q. Is there a policy on the transfer of biotechnology?

A. Policy is driven by the country. Liability is the issue. One approach has been to work through regional organizations. In Africa, for example, there is AATF, the African Agricultural Technology Foundation. Another is ISAAA, the International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications, who, among other things, serve as brokers. In the context of the BCH, IT experts could help in establishing links with such organizations.

Q. What is the relationship of the BCH to the CHM?

A. CHM is the Clearing-House Mechanism established as part of the CBD. The Cartagena Protocol is a specific elaboration of the elements of the CBD that relate to biosafety. The biosafety clearing-house is the information collection, storage and retrieval mechanism for the Cartagena Protocol. There are other protocols to the CBD and there may be more to come. We are very likely to find that some of the persons in our client countries who are working with the CHM will also be assigned the responsibility for the BCH. We may also find a different scenario in which the responsibility for the BCH is assigned to a different agency or organization than that which deals with the CHM. Whatever the system is in a given country, there may be and, perhaps, must be, a link between the BCH and the CHM.

Q. Does each party “own” a space in the BCH? Can they put whatever they want in their space?

A. The space in the BCH belongs to the country. There are guidelines for inputting their data and information and there are specific formats, but how these formats are used depends on decisions made at the national level. What a country submits to the BCH is theirs and the BCH focal point is the gatekeeper. Among the decisions that can be made by the BCH

focal point is what information is to be made available for public consumption. Countries designate the focal point using a locally agreed system and they are obligated to inform the Secretariat of who the focal point is.

One area of focus for the regional BCH facilitators is supporting the establishment of a sustainable nBCH, which includes a mechanism to assure sustained involvement of and transfer of responsibilities among those who serve as the BCH focal points.

Introduction to Modules 4 and 5

After the power failure had been repaired, the final session of the day was conducted by Morven, who distributed two sets of materials: (1) An Introduction to the Biosafety Clearing-House; and (2) A User's Guide to the Central Portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Workshop Materials Nos.12 and 13). After a brief introduction, the participants began working individually on the computers, exploring the modules.

After an hour of work, a general discussion was held relating to the experience with the two modules. In the interest of trying to conclude on time, the session was wrapped up just before 18h00.

Workshop navigation

The workshop navigation process concluded the day.

Day Four: Thursday, 3 February

Opening

Denny opened the workshop session and turned the floor over to Alex Owusu-Biney, who presented a report on the workshop navigation meeting held the evening before.

After being introduced, Petra and Alice, the two resource people representing InWent (and who were to conduct the training skills sessions on Friday and Saturday), shared background information about themselves.

Biosafety clearing-house forum registration

The first 30 minutes of the morning were devoted to getting all participants registered with the BCH Central Portal forum. Denny introduced the simple instructions and explained that, on one hand, the forum provided a space where comments from participants could be shared and that, on the other hand, it would be used as a site to gather feedback on the modules as the participants continued to work with them.

Consultation skills

- 1 Denny invited the first of the six consultation role play groups to present their role plays. When all six role plays had been completed, a brief plenary discussion was held to highlight the key points raised. Some of the main points noted were as follows:
- 2 The importance of building a personal relationship from the moment of the initial interaction between CPB/IT consultants and national counterparts.
- 3 Trying to use the local access to the internet in a hotel or elsewhere to get an idea how it works and then comparing the findings with what is available with the potential nBCH.
- 4 Allowing the national counterpart to take the lead in initial discussions. (Much more is learnt by listening than by telling).
- 5 Exploring issues by asking questions, not by making statements.
- 6 Keeping in mind that we are there to assist the national counterparts. Seeking to build a mutual relationship of trust that allows us to work together effectively.
- 7 In explaining what the BCH has to offer in terms of equipment and support for training, it is important to avoid creating the impression that we have a large budget. For example, it is better to say that the project has limited support than to say we can provide “free equipment”.
- 8 Building support for the BCH at all levels. The technicians cannot make much progress without management support.
- 9 Being clear, but diplomatic, in explaining that the BCH project cannot provide funding for any staff positions.
- 10 Avoiding the use of ‘should’. (Instead of saying, “You should do this or that”, we can say “You might consider....”)
- 11 In a way we are detectives. We are looking for clues in the environment that will help us understand the current situation, which includes the nature of interpersonal relationships, inter-agency rivalries, the level of commitment, etc.
- 12 Before we can begin to provide training or support a learning process, we must first be learners. It is important to find out what the circumstances are, e.g. how many people are involved, how many need to be trained, the level of supervisory interest and support, etc.
- 13 Formulating questions that will get our counterparts to share their knowledge, not only of bio-safety and IT issues, but of working relationships, policy support, etc.
- 14 Consultants are “content” neutral. Their task is to help identify issues, raise options for discussion and facilitate a decision-making process. Consultants are not there to make a decision for the country.
- 15 Awareness that national counterparts may be under pressure from a number of sources that may influence how they respond to your mission.
- 16 If questions are raised to which you do not know the answer, say you don’t know, but that you will find out. Seek support from Geneva or other sources.

Technical review of Modules 2, 3, 4 and 5

The second session of the morning began by splitting the participants into two groups. The CPB consultants met with Morven in one room and the IT consultants remained in the plenary room with Jocelyn. The participants received a specific assignment and began reviewing the modules. There was a review at the completion of the session. The outputs of that session were photo-documented and were also captured by Jocelyn (Workshop Output No.5). Morven guided the CPB participants through two case studies that had been prepared to provide an opportunity to work through Modules 4 and 5. The response of the participants to that work with the case studies was very positive.

After lunch, participants remained in the same rooms with Jocelyn joining the CPB group and Morven working with the IT consultants.

At the conclusion of the split session, the two groups rejoined each other. Each group presented the results of its work and discussions were held in plenary.

Self-assessment and an afternoon off

Denny explained that Jean-Louis had prepared an Excel spreadsheet for the self-assessment and that the forms, to be completed by the end of the day, were on the server and could be accessed through the desktop.

Owing to the intensity of the workshop thus far, participants were clearly tired. This was recognized by the training staff at the end of Day Three and it was decided that the participants needed an afternoon off. The session that day concluded at 15h40 and the workshop navigation meeting was postponed until the following afternoon.

Day Five: Friday, 4 February

Opening

Denny opened the session and reviewed the schedule for the day. The participants then moved into the training room that had been reserved for the training skills session.

Introduction of the training skills unit

Following an introduction of the session objectives, Petra introduced a large schematic, which, when completed, contained all the components of a training process and the links between them. Working in three groups, participants took cards with the training components on them and worked to complete the “puzzle”. Their outputs were presented and discussed in plenary and photo-documented (Workshop Output No.6). The participants then formed six small groups with each group exploring one of the six key elements of the training process that trainers must consider: content, the training environment, training media and material,

objectives and the trainer him or herself. These too, were presented and discussed in plenary (Workshop Output No.7).

Training skills sessions two, three and four

The second session began with the introduction and discussion of the adult or experiential learning cycle. It then moved on to a discussion of training design, with another exercise involving group work.

The third and fourth sessions focused on the domains of learning and on training objectives.

At the conclusion of the session Workshop Materials No.14 (Basics of Training Methodology) and No.15 (The Training Process and the Task of Trainers) were distributed to participants.

Workshop navigation

The workshop navigation process concluded the day.

Day Six: Saturday, 5 February

Opening

The results of the workshop navigation meeting the evening before were presented by Honore Assamoi.

Training skills session review, revision and delivery

Denny then facilitated a session in which he was joined by Petra and Alice. The feedback from the participants in the workshop navigation meeting had been mixed, but generally negative. Denny suggested the group explore what trainers could do when faced with this kind of feedback. A number of suggestions were noted and documented (Workshop Output No.8). The trainers then presented a revised schedule for the day. They asked the participants to meet in focus groups to review the proposed schedule and make suggestions for changing it. The groups all agreed with the proposed revision.

The trainers presented and described five training tools. Participants used three dots each to indicate their priorities. Three tools were selected. Each of these was introduced in detail and then participants, working in three groups, prepared demonstrations of the three tools, namely, a Fish Bowl Discussion, Pro-Pro Discussions and Collegial Advice. Notes were made on two of these sessions and they were documented as Workshop Output No.9.

The outputs of the Collegial Advice exercise (that is, when to use it for a concrete problem) were as follows:

“For me and my team”
“Get new impulses”
“Good that you don’t see the advisers”
“Good instrument for coaching”
“Can other people take advantage of your not knowing?”
“‘Colleagues’ means ‘peer group’.”

The next element of the session dealt with training dilemmas. In groups of three, the participants identified training dilemmas, each of which being the subject of a brainstorming session to explore ways that a trainer might deal with them.

Training skills assignments

Following a brief lunch the final three dilemmas were discussed. The trainers then introduced the steps they use when planning a training session and it was suggested that participants use these when working on the assignments they were about to receive.

Five new groups of participants were formed based on five geographic regions. Each group was then given an assignment (Workshop Material No.16) and invited to prepare a presentation of their assignment on Monday morning. The trainers remained available throughout the afternoon to assist the participants with their assignments. In addition, focus group member assessment forms were distributed to each participant. The forms were explained and the participants were invited to complete one form for each member of their working groups and return them to Denny on Monday morning.

Day Seven: Sunday, 6 February – Day Off

Training team meeting

The training team met on Sunday afternoon to meet the new resource people who had arrived, to review and revise the schedule for the coming week and to discuss the performance of the participants. It had been agreed during the preparation that, if there were any participants about whom the team had any concerns, the team would identify those participants and discuss the circumstances. Since there were some participants whose behavior had given rise to concern, it was agreed that Denny would talk with each person and share the team’s reflexions.

Day Eight: Monday, 7 February

Opening

The second week of the course began with welcoming the resource persons, Albert, Alain, Philip, Chris and Frederick, who had arrived to assist with the training. They each introduced themselves and shared the topic they were to cover.

The schedule for the week was introduced and the revisions to the original programme explained. The programme for the day was outlined.

Presentation and discussion of training assignments

The five regional groups then began the presentation of the training assignments that had been given on Saturday. These included the design of a BCH national workshop; the design of two specific training sessions; the design of a BCH session for parliamentarians; the design of a BCH workshop for traders; and a BCH-related case study. Each presentation involved all members of each group. The presentations were followed by a brief period for the audience to complete feedback forms, which were handed to the presenting group, and a brief statement from the group on their assessment of the presentation they had done. The plenary discussion on feedback on the presentations and the content presented was conducted before the next group took its turn (Workshop Output No.10).

A working lunch had been planned and everyone had something to eat between the fourth and last presentations. It was the general consensus of the group that the presentations were well done and that the content was very good and would be useful for training courses that might be required in-country during the BCH process.

BCH Module 7

The afternoon was devoted to an exploration of Module 7. Jocelyn and Fred began with a role play which served to introduce the basics of the module and then, after some initial remarks, participants went to work on the module. The practical work on the module continued after the coffee break. A plenary discussion, in which the participants shared comments based on their experience, concluded the day (Workshop Output No.11). (Please note that Module 7 and handouts are available on CD-Rom.)

Workshop navigation meeting

Focus groups met and representatives joined the training team for a navigation meeting.

Day Nine: Tuesday, 8 February

Opening

To begin the day, Denny invited Donna Roy to introduce herself. She explained her background and noted that her session would be presented on Day 10.

The workshop navigation report was presented as was the schedule for the day. It was noted that the group would be meeting a bus in front of the hotel to travel to Lake Titivangsa for dinner out together.

United Nations System overview – UNEP-GEF

This session began with a brief overview of the United Nations System that was facilitated by Denny. The general organizational structure was discussed and programmes and funds were introduced, as were the Specialized Agencies. The composition of the country team and its role in the Common Country Assessment (CCA) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) processes concluded the overview.

Chris then presented a PowerPoint overview of UNEP-GEF (Workshop Material No.17). It was a very good presentation followed by intense discussion. After the discussion, participants agreed that it would have been preferable for the session to have been scheduled for the first day of the course. The main points, including questions and answers, that emerged from the discussion following the presentation were as follows:

Question and answer session on UNEP-GEF presentation by Chris

- (1) Why is the BCH Central Portal located in Montreal?
 - It is managed by the CBD Secretariat.

- (2) Why is the Biosafety Unit located in Geneva?
 - a. Many other United Nations organizations are located there, which facilitates inter-agency communication
 - b. Ease of travel to a range of countries
 - c. Concern about the quality of connectivity in Nairobi
 - d. Most countries in Africa are still handled from Nairobi (4 staff)

- (3) How do GEF projects get funded?
 - Project proposals are submitted to GEF by an implementing agency – only those which are linked to global concerns have the chance to get funded.

(General remark: It was agreed that his session should have been presented earlier in the training course.)

Regarding regional advisers: It was noted that those who successfully completed the ToT would be referred to as "advisers" since the term "experts" creates more problems than it

solves. Designating someone an expert creates expectations that may not be realistic.

(4) Can we expand the terms of reference beyond a specific region – some of us may be able to provide assistance to countries in other regions than our own?

- Yes.

(5) It is important for the project to keep us as busy as possible so we don't get lost to other opportunities.

- At this point we have no real idea of how much consulting time it will take to accomplish the objectives we have set. In the end, how many we will need will depend on the needs of the countries.

(6) The capacity needs of the countries should be listed in the BCH.

- They can be. There is a website on the BCH for this purpose.

Once an LMO goes on the market it seems that it will be hard to avoid transboundary movement.

Countries submit their own list of experts and there are guidelines and limitations as to who and how many can be included – the limit at the moment is 50 persons. Most are included by the CBD focal point.

(7) What does a country do when it is not a party?

They can voluntarily contribute information, as does the United States – the process is the same.

Country participation in the BCH

Jyoti presented this session in which an overview of country participation in the BCH was reviewed. She began with a general introduction and then presented the stages at which countries are likely to have contact with the BCH (Workshop Output No.12).

nBCH options

Philippe, who was the creator of the BCH system, conducted a session in which the four options that are available to parties for interfacing with the BCH were presented and discussed (Workshop Material No.18). Following the presentation, participants worked on computers to explore aspects of the options. A question and answer session followed the computer work. A number of very good questions were raised and some equally good suggestions made, as documented below:

Questions and answers on the BCH options

(1) Why not use UML?

UML is a Unified Modeling Language based on XML designed for modeling applications, workflows, etc. UML is not a Remote Procedure Calling protocol. SOAP is a Remote

Procedure Calling protocol based on XML.

(2) What is the difference between XML and HTML?

Both XML and HTML are based on the same language (SGML). HTML is for web pages. XML is a general-purpose language that can easily be read by both humans and computers.

(3) Does the CBD Secretariat provide the XML Schemas for the different common formats?

Yes, the CBD Secretariat provides the XML Schemas for each common format. They can be found at: <http://bch.biodiv.org/Forums/ShowPost.aspx?PostID=20>

(4) With option 3, do all files need to be available online or just the new ones?

All files need to be available online.

(5) What about system security?

Authentication is done via a username and password. Both the BCH Management Center and the BCH Web Service can be accessed using HTTP over Secure Socket Layer (SSL).

(6) Can we use Microsoft Excel?

Excel files are not designed for interoperability.

Be aware that there are some discrepancies between SOAP libraries. At the moment the BCH is compatible with most libraries.

(7) Can we see a demonstration on libraries?

Yes, but not in this session.

(8) Is there software for XML?

Yes – most modern development languages and platforms support XML.

The advantage of option 1 is that it is a simple system. Options 3 and 4 may be preferable when the country wants to fulfill its obligations for public awareness and education.

(9) What do you (Philip) see as the role of the IT consultants?

- To explain and help countries choose an option.
- To analyse needs and available resources
- To identify any special needs the country may have

(10) How do we assure information is validated in options 3 and 4?

Option 3 – We assume it has been validated before being posted.

Option 4 – BCH focal point will have to validate the information if a National Authorized User account is used.

(11) What is the minimum process time for data that is submitted?

Most often it is seconds.

(12) Can we have any examples from developing countries?

In Uganda we used a fax to register the focal point and then got an email confirmation. We are using the management centre at the moment, while we explore other options.

It is much the same story in Ghana.

Consultant roles / Steps leading to selection of options

After lunch, the participants were assigned to work in several groups – CPB advisers in some groups and IT advisers in others. The CPB groups were assigned to identify the kinds of services that advisers might be required to provide in-country. These were presented in a round-robin fashion with all groups contributing to the output (Workshop Output No.13). The IT groups presented their outputs in the same way and a step-by-step process was identified along with a range of IT services that might be provided in-country (Workshop Output No.14)

Administrative tools, instruments and guidelines

As a follow-up to the session on administration and finance held on the second day of the course, Ingo conducted a session on administrative tools, instruments and guidelines (Workshop Material No.19). The session included time for questions and these were answered in the course of the session (Workshop Output No.15).

Workshop navigation

At the end of the session, the participants met in focus groups and shared feedback on the day. One representative of each group met with the training team to share their feedback.

Dinner out

The training team and participants traveled to a restaurant on Lake Titivangsa for dinner.

Day Ten: Wednesday, 9 February

Opening

The day began with a report on the workshop navigation meeting held the evening before.

Consultation skills – Dilemmas

Denny facilitated a session on consultation dilemmas, which was initiated by the presentation and discussion of the basic roles and functions of a consultant (Workshop Material No.20). In the next part of the session, the participants divided into 12 groups, each group taking one of 12 dilemmas that had been copied from a slide presentation to be given later in the session.

Each group discussed possible approaches to resolving these dilemmas and then presented their approaches in a plenary session. The dilemmas were displayed on a screen and accompanied with the same descriptions as used in the discussions. Each dilemma was discussed as it was presented (Workshop Output No.16).

nBCH Applications – the US Model

Following a coffee break, Donna conducted a session on the US application for the BCH. She began by outlining the steps that had been taken to bring the US agencies involved with biosafety together to agree on, and provide information for, the US contribution to the BCH. This was documented as Workshop Output No.17. Donna then distributed information on the application (Workshop Material No.21). After a presentation of the basic information, participants worked on computers to familiarize themselves with the module. The session and the training day concluded at 14h00 with a lunch provided by the hotel. (There was no navigation meeting owing to participants having the afternoon off.)

Day Eleven: Thursday, 10 February

Opening

Denny opened the day with a review of the schedule.

Introduction to coaching skills

The session began with a question for the participants about what kinds of topics might be the subject of a coaching relationship. The IT and CPB groups each identified several topics, as listed below.

Potential topics for IT coaches	Potential topics for CPB coaches
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platform management • Project management • Data entry • Reporting • Analysis and design • Troubleshooting • Networking • Security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Networking • Administration and institutional issues • Harmonization between institutions • Estimating future needs • Decision-making • Technical to common language • Legal frameworks

Following the introductory brainstorming, Denny presented a slide programme covering the basics of coaching and coaching skills (Workshop Material No.21). Each slide was discussed as it was presented.

Consulting workdays and fees

Chris facilitated a discussion of consulting fees. Among the points made during the session are the following:

- 1 The 20 days per country is only the best estimate we can make – it may be more, it may be less, we do not know for sure.
- 2 Advisers will be paid from Nairobi.
- 3 More than 100 countries will probably have a BCH implementation project.
- 4 There are many variables to consider.
- 5 Many countries are planning levels which will require investment
- 6 A few countries may not need a regional adviser.
- 7 It has taken Mexico three years so far to get to the present level. Twenty days per country will not be enough.
- 8 A flat rate for all advisers would be best.
- 9 We will explore the possibility of a 10-day minimum contract.
- 10 Efforts will be made to give advisers a minimum of three weeks' advance notice.
- 11 We do not know if 70 days over a two-year period is enough.
- 12 Agreement on \$300 per day with the potential for increases with effective performance.

nBCH Applications – the Canadian Model

Alain took the stage and conducted an introduction to the application Canada is developing for the BCH. He started with the background, which was presented using PowerPoint slides (Workshop Material No.23). He then provided additional documents on the system (Workshop Materials No.24) and explained the application. Participants spent part of the morning and some of the afternoon working with the application. During the latter part of the afternoon, the CPB participants were given the option of either remaining in the most IT-related session or working on a review of the specific content of Module 2. Several joined the Module 2 group and they worked together until the close of the day. At the conclusion of the computer work, a question and answer session was held during which issues relating to the use of the application were discussed.

Report writing

At the request of the participants in a discussion on Tuesday, a report writing overview had been included in the schedule as an optional evening session. Since Alain's session finished at 17h30, the participants asked for the report writing overview to be given then. Denny began the session with a discussion of what a report is and what the regional advisers would be reporting. He distributed a set of materials (Workshop Material No.25) which identified and provided the main contents of several different kinds of reports. An outline of what the generic contents of a regional adviser's mission report might be was generated and each section of the report was discussed. Emphasis was placed on a number of points, such as: the reader is more important than the writer, so one must think about who will be reading the

report; acronyms and local terms must be identified; sentences should be short and to the point, not vague and convoluted; language should be clear and simple; conclusions must arise from the body of the report and recommendations must be linked to the conclusions. When on mission, the names of any persons contacted and interviewed, and of all persons who receive training, should be noted in the mission summary, which can be included as an annex. Evaluations of any training events should be carried out and documented. The basic rule of networking, i.e. 'never leave the company of one person you have met without getting the name of someone else who might be able to provide another perspective or additional information', was discussed.

It was agreed that the BCH team in Geneva would send out the format for mission reports during the following week.

Workshop navigation

Prior to the focus group meetings, the workshop evaluation form was distributed and participants were asked to fill it out over the next day and return it on Saturday at the closure of the workshop. A navigation meeting was held at 18h10 during which feedback on the work of the day and the previous day was shared.

Day Twelve: Friday, 11 February

Opening

The workshop navigation report was presented and discussed.

Group juggle

Denny invited the group to join him on the tennis court for an exercise. He formed the group into a circle with the net dividing them into two semicircles. He announced that the exercise they were about to do was called a group juggle. He explained the rules, which were that he would start and toss (underhand) not throw (overhand) the ball to someone across the circle. The person, who received the ball was then to toss it to another person across the circle. When a person had received and then tossed the ball, they were to indicate that they had received it by crossing their arms across their chest. After a practice round, the juggle began with one ball and then additional balls were added so that in the end four tennis balls and a basketball were making the circuit across the group. At the conclusion, Denny invited the participants to reconvene in the training room.

A discussion was held about the exercise. Denny asked what happened during the exercise and participants noted that balls were dropped, or not on target and some people were temporarily out of the circle. Some balls were tossed to the wrong person. Denny suggested that suppose the balls were messages being sent from one person to another in an organization. The same thing often happens to messages as happened to the balls. They get

sent to the wrong person, receipt of the messages is not acknowledged, or messages get dropped or forgotten.

If we are attempting to improve the way we toss the balls, what might we do? We could participate in training to improve our tossing and catching skills. If the balls were messages, we could work on the way we send and receive messages. We could send copies of the messages to ourselves or to a third party. We could acknowledge receipt of the message or request the receiver to acknowledge receipt. We could let the person know a message was being sent. After the discussion of the exercise, Denny introduced a simple diagram to illustrate how difficult communication can be. The diagram below illustrates the essence of the session. The sender constructs the message with all of the background that influences the message. The message has to pass through all the noise in the environment and is then received by a person who has all kinds of biases and has to pass back through the noise to the sender.

Characteristics of the Sender / Receiver	Characteristics of the Receiver / Sender
Past experience Religion Gender Culture Age Hierarchy Language Bias Preoccupation	Past experience Religion Gender Culture Age Hierarchy Language Bias Preoccupation

Coaching skills – Entry plan

At the start of this session, Denny presented a coaching skills session planning guide and a blank form (Workshop Material No.26). He then asked for two CPB and two IT volunteers. They were asked to prepare a role play demonstrating how a coach may enter a coaching relationship with a client. While they were working on the role play, the other participants worked in small groups to prepare a coaching session outline for which they each selected one of the topics that had been identified in the previous coaching session the day before.

The two role plays were conducted and discussed and the five small groups handed in the results of the work they had done on the session guides (Workshop Output No.18).

nBCH Applications – the Swiss Model

The final application, developed by Switzerland, was presented by Albert. He distributed materials (Workshop Material No.27) and introduced the application. The session then proceeded much as the other two on applications had. Participants had the opportunity to explore the model on computers. They worked at using the application for options 1 and 2

before lunch and then worked on options 3 and 4 after lunch. Albert's presentation was so clear that only a very brief Q and A session was needed at the conclusion of the session.

Working with the US application

Donna took the stage again for a session in which the IT participants had the chance to work through some of technical elements of the US application. At the conclusion of the work session there was an opportunity for discussion.

Dinner out

After a brief trip to China town, the group arrived at the Saloma Restaurant for dinner. A cultural show was presented during dinner. Following the cultural show, the group had the dining room to themselves and Denny began the group skits by reading a poem "An Ode to the BCH ToT" (see below). He then had everyone join in singing "Jamaica Farewell." The training team followed with a skit about the training team preparation in which they carried on a conversation using mostly acronyms. They then talked about some things the participants could be assessed on. The Latin America and Caribbean group did a skit on the ToT Academy Awards. Prizes were presented for the best story of the workshop and the best or worst dressed person. The francophone Africa group performed a skit about difficulties with immigration; the anglophone Africa group told a story and sang Malaika. Boris told a story for the Central and Eastern Europe group.

Ode To the BCH TOT

By Denny Hamilton 12-2-05

Came out to Kuala Lumpur
Why? We weren't so sure
BCH Advisors from the regions
Arrived at the hotel in legions
From all over the place
A smile on each face

Computers for each
Within easy reach
A great training team
Though maybe not "dream"
Introduced BCH and CPB
Modules from Alpha to Z

Presentations on modules
And modules and more
Consultation and Coaching
To even the score
Training Skills hit a bump
But we got over the hump

More people joined us
Some came and some went
And we struggled on
With will and intent.
We got the applications
Canada, US and Swiss
Sometimes we wondered
Can we really "get" this?

We persevered through
More coaching and all
Played a game on a court
With some tennis balls
We talked about workdays
And buzzed about fees
We finally agreed and
We'll get more, if we please

Focus groups and navigation
And three dinners out
We were finally understanding
What its about
Saving the environment
Stopping the skid
Making the earth a
Better place for our kids

Tomorrow as friends
We will part
We've a biosafety
Revolution to start
Building up systems
That's what we do
Legal stuff, computers
And biology too

We came here as strangers
We leave here as friends
Our paths will cross again
Before our trails end
And biosafety
Is the message we'll send

Day Thirteen: Saturday, 12 February

Opening

By mutual agreement with the participants on the bus returning from dinner the evening before, the morning session began at 10h00 with a group photo session. At 10h30 the participants returned to the plenary room, where Denny reviewed the schedule for the day, since there had not been a navigation meeting the evening before.

nBCH experience

The first part of the session of the day was a series of presentations from four participants who introduced the nBCH situation in their country. Ileana began with a presentation on Guatemala. Manorajan followed with the situation in India. Each of these presentations was delivered using PowerPoint and were included among the Workshop Materials as Nos.28 and 29. Anastasia then presented the nBCH in Tajikistan. The final presentation, on Ghana, was done by Alex. There were some questions and a few comments on each presentation. Everyone agreed that it was very useful to see how things are being done in different developing countries.

Action planning exercise

Denny invited each person to draft a personal action plan for pre-mission preparation. For example, "What could I do between now and getting an assignment?" and "What could I do once a mission request arrives?" (for example, What information do I need? What contacts do I need to make? Documents I need. Materials, equipment and supplies I need.) Participants worked individually on these action plans for about 30 minutes and then shared their ideas in a plenary session in which common lists were generated, as follows:

Before the assignment

- 1 Review workshop documents and information-sharing with regional partners – better understanding of BCH
- 2 Create template presentations for meetings in anticipation of mission
- 3 Create regional portfolios – Common Country Assessments (CCA)
- 4 Read the documents and review definition articles
- 5 Check regional database of countries and contacts in our region
- 6 Clear my desk so that I am ready to go
- 7 Prepare simulations and solutions
- 8 Review the four options and practice BCH modules and website
- 9 Contact NBF people
- 10 Rest
- 11 Review CPB / Learn
- 12 Network with regional advisers
- 13 Apply methodologies learned in local trainings
- 14 Get a fax and a scanner at home
- 15 Analyse applications
- 16 Learn about finance and administration capabilities of the country
- 17 Learn more about modern biotechnology
- 18 Identify regional stakeholders in biosafety
- 19 Visit relevant websites for updates

Materials, equipment and supplies	Contacts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presents for people • My laptop • Adapters • USB Flash • Local sim card • Camera • Drivers • Call phone • LCD projector • Status of technical capabilities and research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jyoti, Ingo, Chris • MKI • NBCH contact • IT manager in country • UNDP contact information • Own country’s commission or embassy address • My boss’s contact numbers • The embassy of the mission country in my own country • UNSECOORD or other security

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring an external disk drive • 5 meters of network cable • 5 meter extension cord • Facilitation supplies (cards, black, red and blue markers, masking tape, scotch magic tape, glue) 	<p>personnel FSO – (Field Security Officer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colleagues, relative and friends in the mission country • My partner (BCH CPB or IT Adviser) – Geneva will let us know if we are going in as a team. • Denny’s contact information
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Information I need	Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country profile • CCA • Update on BCH status • Terms of reference • Draft work plan in through communication with contact persons • Immigration requirements • Travel options • Bio of NFP • Documents and handouts • Check on availability of copy services • Information on accommodation • Security update • Vaccinations required • Local UN contacts • Power system in the country – plugs • Political situation • Exchange rates, transport costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft schedule of visit • Previous mission reports • Regional Advisers Handbook • Memorandum of Understanding • Terms of reference • Travel documents • Lonely Planet Guide • Invitation letter • Assessment forms • National Biosafety Framework Report • Previous presentations • Manuals for applications • E-copies of this workshop’s documents • Economist or CIA reports

Next steps

Denny, Jyoti and Ingo facilitated a session in which immediate future steps were identified. The steps were listed as follows:

- 1 Denny’s report to be completed and sent to Jyoti on Monday.
- 2 Regional advisers biographies sent to Jyoti as soon as possible – Monday or Tuesday.
- 3 Report reviewed, posted on the website and distributed within a couple of weeks
- 4 Biographies compiled and sent to UNON beginning next week.
- 5 Three weeks or so after biographies are sent to UNON, regional advisers should begin to hear from UNON.
- 6 Check regional coordinators schedules to see who will be traveling to which

- countries
- 7 Put bios on website and send to countries.
 - 8 Specific notes sent to countries.
 - 9 Formation of regional networks.
 - 10 Submission of suggestions for other potential regional advisers from this group to BCH project office.
 - 11 30 May to June 4 – COP/MOP Meeting in Montreal
 - 12 ToT 2 in September

Closing session

Workshop evaluations (which had been distributed on Thursday afternoon in order that participants would have time to complete them), were collected (Workshop Output No.19).

Denny invited spokespersons for each regional group to share their thoughts about the training course.

David spoke on behalf of the anglophone Africa Group; Mohammed for the francophone Africa group; Manorajan for the Asia and Pacific group, Boris, for the Central and Eastern Europe group and Malachy for the Latin America and Caribbean group. Each spokesperson thanked the training team and the other participants for their contributions to the workshop. It was clear that everyone had gained a great deal from the workshop, that they appreciated how well it had been organized and managed and that they now felt prepared to move on to the next step.

Ingo expressed his appreciation to the participants and to all those who had been involved in the workshop.

Jyoti thanked her team, Denny and Anil, all resource persons, the technical staff and the participants, and complimented each on their contribution to the workshop.

Denny thanked everyone and suggested that the group was unique in the world. He noted that no one had done what we are trying to do. He said he was confident that years from now if we were to sit in our rocking chairs on a porch and look back on this training course, we would be able say that we had made a difference in the world.

Exit interviews

The workshop concluded in the afternoon with individual exit interviews with each of the participants. In accordance with the assessment process, the training team, keeping in mind the inputs from each individual and their participation in the focus groups, and considering input from the resource people also present, informed participants if they had been selected as regional advisers.

Annex A

List of Participants, Training Team Members and Resource Persons

EXPERTS - IT

Africa

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Mr. Lamine Sano
BP 1340 Cidex 1
Abidjan 06
Côte d'Ivoire | 2 | Mr. Souaibou Diallo
BP E3168 Bamako
Mali |
| 3 | Mr. Appia Honore Assamoi
BP 154 Dakar
Senegal | 4 | Mr. Hamed Kouruma
BP 3418 Dakar
Senegal |
| 5 | Mr. Ali Ayub Kalufya
Adviser
PO Box 4302, Dar Es Salaam
Tanzania | 6 | Mr. Hope Webber
De Vriesstraat 36, 2593 XJ
The Hague, The Netherlands |

Asia

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7 | Mr. Ketankumar Trivedi
Adviser
11/5, Sector 22
Near Panchdev Temple
Gandhinagar, Gujarat
India | 8 | Mr. Edmund Revilla
Adviser
Unit 1206 Cityland dela Rosa
Condominiums
7650 Dela Rosa St. Brgy
Pio del Pilar, Makati City 1200
Philippines |
| 9 | Mr. Kapeni Matatia
Adviser
PO Box 634, Apia
Samoa | 10 | Mr. Rohit Khanna
PO Box 761, Victoria
Seychelles |

Central and Eastern Europe

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | Mr. Srdjan Mihaljevic
Kralja Nikole 202, 81000, Podgorica
Serbia & Montenegro | 12 | Ms. Vida Marolt Parabucki
Adviser
Puhova 14, 1000 Ljubljana
Slovenia |
| 13 | Mr. Boris Korotkov
Adviser
Mirobad distr., Barchinovi st. h.31
Tashkent, Uzbekistan | 14 | Mr. Damir Amirov
Yangi Zamon str., dom 2, kv. 21
Tashkent 700105
Uzbekistan |
| 15 | Mr. Boris Anoshenko
27, Akademicheskaya Str. | | |

Minsk, Belarus

Latin America and the Caribbean

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16 | Mr. Paulo Siqueira
Rua Ana Alvim 196
Sao Paulo 04710-100
Brazil | 17 | Mr. Ernesto Ocampo
Adviser
Avenida del Parque M36 S07
Shangrila Ciudad de la Costa
15001 Canelones
Uruguay |
| 18 | Mr. Oscar Fiestas-Tejada
ICT Adviser
16, rue de La Baronne d'Oberkirch
Domaine de La Rotonde – La
Robertseau
67000 – Strasbourg, France | | |

EXPERTS - CPB

Africa

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19 | Mr. Alex Owusu-Biney
Biotechnology & Nuclear Agriculture
Research Institute
Ghana Atomic Energy Commission
P. O. Box LG 80, Legon, Accra, Ghana | 20 | Mr. Mohamed Eyles Kchouk
Unit Head
Unité Plantes Aromatiques & Médicinales
INRST.
BP95. Hammam-Lif 2050. Tunisia. |
| 21 | Mr. David Hafashimana
Ministry of Water, Land and
Environment
PO Box 7096, Kampala
Uganda | | |

Asia

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 22 | Mr. Manoranjan Hota
S-52, HUDCO Place
Andrews Ganj
New Delhi-110 049
India | 23 | Mr. Dilip Nandwani
Adviser
PO Box 854, Majuro MH 96960
Marshall Islands |
| 24 | Mrs. Anastasia Idrisova
Naberejnaya street 14
Dushanbe 734003
Tajikistan | | |

Central and Eastern Europe

- 25 Mr. Aleksej Tarasjev, PhD
University of Belgrade
Department of Evolutionary Biology
Institute for Biological Research
Despota Stefana 142
11000 Belgrade
Serbia and Montenegro

Latin America and the Caribbean

- 26 Mr. Malachy Pilgrim Dottin, Ph.D
Advisor
Happy Hill P.O St George's Grenada
W.I.
- 27 Ms. Ileana Lopez
Advisor
Km. 15.8 Carretera a El Salvador
Condominio la Alhambra, Casa No. 7
Santa Catarina Pinula
Guatemala
- 28 Ms. Diana Ponce-Nava
Paseo de la Hacienda 85 - 503
Paseos de Taxqueña
Coyoacán, D.F.
México, CP 04250

Resource Persons

- 29 Ms. Donna Roy
IT/GIS Project Manager
USGS - BRD,
12201 Sunrise Valley drive,
MS302, Reston VA 20192, USA
- 30 Ms. Morven A. McLean, Ph.D.
AGBIOS, Inc.
106 St. John Street, P.O. Box 475
Merrickville, Ontario
Canada K0G 1N0

31 Mr. Albert Spielmann
Scientific Adviser
Swiss Agency for Environment,
Forests and Landscape
3003 Berne, Switzerland

32 Mr. Alain Le Duc
Information Architecture and Systems
Analyst
351 St. Joseph Blvd, Gatineau, Quebec,
Canada, K1A0H3

33 Ms. Alice Eymard-Duvernay
Senior Project Manager
InWent Capacity Building
International
Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Lindenstr. 41, Zschortau
D-04519 Rackwitz
Germany

34 Ms. Petra Becker-Hauser
Consultant
InWent Capacity Building International
Altenburgstr. 17
53125 Bonn
Germany

35 Mr. Jocelyn Fenard
Programme Coordinator
Decentralized Cooperation Programme
United Nations Institute for Training
and Research (UNITAR)

36 Mr. Philippe Leblond
Computer Information Systems Officer
SCBD
Montreal, Canada

37 Mr. Denny Hamilton (Facilitator)

38 Mr Hari Ramalu Ragavan
UNDP Programme Officer
Damansara Heights, Kuala Lumpur
UNDP Malaysia

NGO Representative

39 Ms. Li Lin Lim
Third World Network
2-1 Jalan 31/70 A
Desa Sri Hartamas
50480 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia

UNEP-GEF

40 Mr. Christopher Briggs
Global Programme Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

41 Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp
BCH Task Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

42 Ms. Feechon Low

43 Mr. Nizar Mohamed

Implementation Projects Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

Regional Coordinator, Asia Pacific
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

44 Mr. Keneti Faulalo
Assistant Regional Coordinator for
Asia-Pacific
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Apia, Samoa

45 Mr. Jean Louis Balladier
Fund Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

46 Mr. Ingo Piegeler
Training Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

47 Mr. Frédéric Vogel
BCH IT Specialist
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

48 Ms. Yenny Ezquerro
Administrative Assistant
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland

Annex B

Workshop Materials

1. An Introduction to the BCH Training of Trainers (Jyoti)
2. Presentation on the BCH Project (Jyoti)
3. Presentation Skills Checklist (Denny)
4. Training as Theatre (Denny)
5. Feedback STARCODE² (Denny)
6. Introduction to UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects (Nizar)
7. National Biosafety Frameworks (Keneti)
8. Implementation of the NBF (Fee Chon)
9. Biosafety and the Environment
10. Process of Setting Up the BCH Advisory Services (Jean Louis and Ingo)
11. Consultation Skills (Denny)
12. An Introduction to the Biosafety Clearing-House (Morven)
13. A User's Guide to the Central Portal of the Biosafety Clearing-House (Morven)
14. Basics of Training Methodology – InWent
15. Training Process and the Task of Trainers – InWent
16. Training Skills Assignment (prepared by Denny, distributed by Petra and Alice)
17. Overview of UNEP-GEF (Chris)
18. Introduction to the BCH Options (Philippe)
19. Administrative Tools, Instruments and Guidelines (Ingo)
20. Consultation Dilemmas (Denny)
21. Materials on the US Application – CD Rom and Materials (Donna)
22. Coaching Skills for Regional Advisers (Powerpoint) (Denny)
23. The Canadian Application, Introduction (Alain)
24. The Canadian Application (Alain)
25. Report Writing (Denny)
26. Guide to a Coaching Session and Blank Form (Denny)
27. The Swiss Application (Albert)
28. The nBCH in Guatemala (Ileana)
29. The nBCH in India (Manorajan)

Annex C

Workshop Outputs

1. Workshop Introductions and Expectations
2. Regional Advisers Assessment Form
3. Steps to Follow after receiving a Mission Order
4. Outline of Mission Activities in-country.
5. Outputs of Technical Review of Modules (photo-documented)
6. Main elements of a training process (from the InWent session on Friday -- photo-documented -- also contained in training materials No.12 provide by inWent)
7. Trainer Concerns about Main Elements of a Training Process -- InWent session (documentation distributed to participants)
8. Steps Trainers May Take When a Day of Training Has Not Gone Well (InWent Session) (documented by Alice)
9. Outputs of the Fishbowl Discussion
10. Feedback on Training Assignments
11. Comments and Questions from the BCH Module Session done by Fred and Jocelyn
12. Overview of Country Participation in the BCH -- Jyoti's session (photo-documented and computer-documented by Yenny)
13. Potential Services to be Provided by Regional Advisers (photo-documented)
14. Steps in Selecting a BCH Option (photo-documented)
15. Comments on Administrative Instruments -- Ingo
16. Consultation Dilemmas and Solutions (documented by Yenny)
17. Steps in Establishing the US BCH Application
18. Output of Group Discussions on Planning a Coaching Session (these five sheets were documented by Yenny)
19. Workshop Evaluation
