



United Nations
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 of the Consultation of Regional Scientists
and Technical Experts on UNEP-GEF Project for
Capacity Building for the Biosafety
Clearing-House (BCH)**

*December 13 -14, 2004,
Geneva, Switzerland*

INTRODUCTION

1. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - Global Environment Facility (GEF) Project on Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (BCH project) was initiated in March 2004. The project is the newest addition to the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects aimed to implement the GEF Initial Strategy for assisting countries to prepare for the entry into force of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety that was approved by the 16th GEF Council in November 2000.
2. The BCH project has been designed as an add-on project to the UNEP-GEF global project to assist countries to develop national biosafety frameworks in over 120 countries, and builds upon the institutional structure, trained personnel and infrastructure of that project, wherever possible.
3. This project is designed to assist 50 countries to a) strengthen human capacity through training of key stakeholders in the specific skills and knowledge required for the effective participation in the BCH; b) create an enabling environment for the implementation of the national requirement for the BCH by provision of appropriate computer hardware and software; and c) support further capacity-building through the development and dissemination of an interactive computer-based training package. The overall objective of the project is to allow the countries to effectively comply with the obligations for and actively participate in the use of BCH as established under Article 20 of the Cartagena Protocol.
4. Eligible countries for the current BCH project must have ratified or acceded to the Cartagena Protocol by the time of the first Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (COP-MOP/1). Countries may not be beneficiaries of any GEF demonstration projects for implementation of their National Biosafety Framework.
5. At the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP 7) held in Kuala Lumpur in February 2004, based on the recommendation of the First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties acting as the Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP 1), guidance was given to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to expand the eligibility of the BCH project to include all developing countries and countries with economies in transition which were Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and provided clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Cartagena Protocol through a written assurance to the Executive Secretary that the country will become a Party on completion of activities to be funded.
6. Based on this recommendation, the Secretariat for the Global Environment Facility included in their Institutional Relations (GEF/C.23/6) paper presented at the 23rd GEF Council in May 2004 the following response to the guidance "... the GEF proposes that the project *Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House of the Cartagena Protocol*, approved by the Council at its meeting in November 2003 and implemented by UNEP, be expanded to provide assistance similar to that which is now available under the project for 50 Parties to the Protocol to all countries requesting such assistance that meet the eligibility criteria approved by the COP/MOP. The GEF will present to the Council for approval a request to include in the project the necessary additional resources after consultations with UNEP on how best to meet the additional requests."
7. During the 23rd GEF Council, the extension of the project to include countries based on the guidance of COP 7 was discussed and a number of comments were made. Para 61 of the Joint Summary of the Chairs stated that "The GEFSEC and UNEP were requested to organize consultations of regional scientists and technical experts to advise on the project for building capacity for participation in the biosafety clearing house of the Cartagena Protocol before expanding the project pursuant to the guidance of the COP."
8. To respond to the request of the GEF Council, GEFSEC and UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, are organising this consultation of regional scientists and technical experts to seek advice on the project.

9. Meanwhile, a meeting of experts had been convened previously in May 2004 to investigate various ways in which the training programme for the BCH project could proceed in an expeditious and efficient manner. The two-day deliberations by these experts raised a number of important methodological issues on training programme delivery, and the project design was adjusted to reflect the outcome of the meeting accordingly.

10. This consultation therefore also follows up on that meeting of experts, specifically, to review the revised modular training package for the national BCH training sessions and the curriculum for the regional experts who will advise and conduct training sessions at the national level. Using the inputs from this consultation, these materials would be finalized in order to allow the training of regional experts to commence by early 2005.

11. The Consultation of Regional Scientists and Technical Experts on UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity Building for the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) was held at the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland, from 13 to 14 December 2004. The UNEP/GEF Biosafety Project Team, in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, convened this consultation.

12. A list of participants is attached as Annex I and the agenda of the consultation is attached as Annex II to the present report.

OPENING OF THE CONSULTATION

13. The Consultation was opened at 9 a.m on Monday, 13 December 2004. Mr. Christopher Briggs, Global Programme Manager, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, welcomed the participants to the Consultation. Noting that most of the participants had been involved in the UNEP-GEF project for Building Capacity for Effective Participation of the BCH (BCH project) through previous meetings, he expressed his appreciation for their continued support to the project in providing their extensive experience in their respective field. He hoped that the deliberations during the next two days would result in the development of the best possible training materials and methodology, so that the project could help developing countries to gain their capacity to use the BCH system for their benefit.

14. He underlined that the capacity to utilise the BCH was an essential part of the overall National Biosafety Framework (NBF) effort under the UNEP-GEF project on the Development of NBFs (NBF development project). Some countries have already completed their task under the NBF development project, with most of the remaining countries to also finalize by the end of 2005. He noted, however, that the NBF development project did not provide for any capacity-building activity to develop their technical ability to utilise the BCH. In this regard, he thanked the GEF Secretariat in assisting the countries through the BCH project in line with the GEF strategic framework.

15. Mr. Briggs briefly explained that the BCH project was initially approved with 50 eligible countries, but as a result of the decisions from COP-MOP1 and in response to the requests from interested countries, the number of beneficiary countries would hopefully be approved up to 140 countries in the future. In making this effort possible it was vital to work in partnership with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to ensure that the BCH project was promoted to and used by countries in line with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (Cartagena Protocol). Ongoing and planned collaboration with InWent, UNITAR, the United States, the EU and Switzerland would also contribute to the BCH project's effort in offering the highest expertise and experience available. He hoped that the deliberations during this Consultation would be successful also as a vital part of such collaborative effort.

16. Denny Hamilton, facilitator, introduced the method that would be used during the Consultation process. He explained the practical steps and general rules of the methodology, which was aimed to ensure all the ideas were captured from the plenary and discussion groups. Participants familiarized themselves with the methodology by using it to introduce themselves and to express their expectations and concerns in connection with the outcome of the consultation. The resulting comments are summarized in the table contained in Annex III to the present report.

17. The participants also nominated and agreed to adhere to the following set of ground rules for the Workshop:

- ❖ Put mobile phones on silent mode,
- ❖ Be concise and stay on track with the interventions,
- ❖ Submit detailed suggestions in writing to save time and
- ❖ Ensure only one person speaks at a time.

18. After reviewing the expectations and concerns, Mr. Hamilton noted that the objectives of the Consultation were generally in line with the participants' expectations. Efforts will be made to address the concerns, in particular the long-term and practicability issues regarding the BCH project, in the course of consultation.

Current status of the UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH

19. Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, BCH Task Manager, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, gave a short background on the BCH project, highlighting its goals and objectives. She reminded all of the historical context that had mandated for the organisation of this consultation as a prerequisite to the consideration of the expansion of eligibility. This was done by leading the participants through the relevant outcomes and recommendations of the First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties acting as Meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP1), the GEF Council, and the GEF Secretariat. This Consultation of experts was designed to advise on the BCH project through reviewing the draft modular training programme and receiving inputs for the training curriculum and methodology.

20. Ms. Mathur-Filipp began her presentation on the status of the BCH project by providing the chronology of the project background. The BCH project was originally submitted in June 2003 and was approved in principle by the GEF Council meeting in November 2003, which led onto the official approval in March 2004. The activities were started in May 2004. The UNEP-GEF Biosafety Team had so far developed a step-by-step operational handbook, a sample MOU for the execution of project, and held a meeting of experts and scientists in May 2004 to help develop the terms of reference for the BCH training package.

21. At the May meeting, a modular structure of the training package, the potential audience, and four of the modules were agreed upon. These modules had since been elaborated further and collaboration with a number of institutes such as InWent, UNITAR, and ITU had been established. The May meeting also recommended UNEP-GEF to use a core of regional experts and to train them for the purpose of the project in order to give the best help to participating countries.

22. She underlined that the advertisement for the regional experts' posts had been publicised with the deadline of 22 November and the selection process was currently in process. The selected regional experts were scheduled to begin their training in early 2005.

23. During the question and discussion session on the status of the BCH project, the comments from the participants focussed on a number of issues. Many of them were concerned about the sustainability of the regional experts, in particular, how to train qualified regional experts without creating a commercial "industry" out of them. Furthermore, it might also be difficult to prevent those end users in-country trained by the regional experts, from leaving the country or going into the private sector, particularly in countries where there is a high demand.

24. It was mentioned that measures have been taken to ensure that the regional trainers would remain on call, but not exclusively during the course of the project So as to reduce the risks of producing an industry of experts. For example, the number of days that the regional experts would work per year has been

restricted so that their work in the original workplace would not be jeopardised as much as possible. It was also expected that a significant number of the regional experts would already be involved in biosafety at the government and public sector levels, so that capacity would be kept in-house for many countries. The BCH project would hope to stimulate those regional experts to feel the commitment and ensure that they are providing the ability to help their own country/region.

25. The “training of trainers” approach was also aimed to assist countries to become self-sustainable in training human resources in the long run, with improvements and updates in the training materials and formats. This approach was one of the outcomes of the GEF-UNEP meeting of experts on the BCH project held in May 2004, which replaced the original plan to conduct a shorter-term training of national experts.

26. One participant commented that past examples of successful “training of trainers” approaches demonstrated that the initial effort of building a solid curriculum usually pays off well through promoting self-sustainability, mainly by the emergence of second- and third-generation trainers, even if the approach risks losing some of the initially trained trainers at the end of the project period.

27. The participants also discussed IT capability in developing countries for the management and use of the online training modules. There were concerns that matters such as computer availability, operating systems, software versions, connection speed, and heavy module contents might prevent some aspects of e-learning from operating smoothly. In this regard, it was stressed that an approach that mixes various media would be undertaken, using both e-learning platform and CD-ROM. These and other technological matters had been addressed through consulting with ITU to receive advice on the current and planned technical specifications of each project country.

28. Clarification was sought on a number of issues, in particular: how the overall project, the curriculum and the modules related; and how the coordination between the regional trainers, national authorities and specialised national institutes might be made in the training sessions.

29. It was pointed out that, since the GEF had received guidance from the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on reducing the use of international experts in order to promote national and regional experts, the BCH project must ensure that the choice of training experts would be in line with the trend.

Presentation of Training Modules 1, 2, and 3

30. Mr. Ingo Piegeler, Training Manager, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, introduced the first three modules of the training package. The work on the development of the training modules had started in May 2004 by a six-member core team of UNITAR and UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit staff members, with substantive and technical advice from SCBD. Using the modular structure agreed upon at the meeting of experts and scientists in May 2004, a total of eight modules were planned to be developed for the training package.

31. He highlighted that the training modules 1, 2, and 3 had been developed fully in the draft format and modules 4 through 7 were also close to completion. Each of the modules would be available on the BCH project Website as they become finalised.

32. Mr. Jocelyn Fenard, Programme Coordinator, UNITAR, introduced the development process of the training modules. The process started from preparing a primer, which was a comprehensive collection of relevant documents developed by experts on definitions and the basic understanding of the relevant issues. The elements of the primer were restructured and reorganised to transform them into an online training module that presented a more organised knowledge structure for the end users. The content and pedagogy were fed into the training material, taking into account the learning objectives and tool options. Training tools and materials that best met the requirements of the end users would be selected in this step, including manuals, guidelines, and online/interactive tools.

33. The target audience was identified next: institutions in countries that have ratified the Cartagena

Protocol, national authorities for various functions of the Cartagena Protocol and the BCH, as well as ministries and public institutions that might not be interacting with the BCH directly but possess human capacity with IT skills. The private sector and NGOs were identified as stakeholders. He noted that these target audiences had an operational objective to use the national and central BCH to retrieve and input information, so the regional experts would be required to have enough knowledge to answer the various questions coming from the target audience.

34. He continued to elaborate on various aspects, including the actors involved in the various parts of the module development process, the training delivery process, and the training objective of each of the first seven training modules. He demonstrated how the interactive online application looked like by demonstrating the beta version of the modules.

35. Following the presentation the participants asked questions and discussed on the general aspect of the training modules. With regard to content, a general concern was raised that the precision, sensitivities, and quality of language needed to be respected, noting that there were already a number of inaccuracies in modules 1, 2, and 3. Whether or not different degree of details were necessary for the two types of trainees was considered briefly.

36. The participants stressed the importance of taking into account various audience-specific needs, such as translation of the audio into other languages as well as “regionalising” the visual representation by using appropriate photos of crops, scenery or ethnicity, and consideration of other possible target audience such as other CBD focal points (for example, the SBSTTA focal point) or the national focal points for other relevant international instruments.

37. Issues related to the technical specifications were also discussed, including: how to address animation and audio aspects of the modules in the print format, how to avoid misleading visual and animation representations, provision of online and DVD-based version of the module, and synchronizing localised modules with the central Web server for referencing purposes.

Testing Your Understanding: Methodologies

38. In opening his presentation under the agenda item, Mr. Julian Kinderlerer, Professor, Sheffield Institute of Biotechnological Law and Ethics, UK, stated that he was assigned the task to speak on the assessment methods based on his experience of university and postgraduate education. He set out the topic of assessment by questioning the objective of assessment. Assessments would greatly vary depending on what type of achievement was being evaluated.

39. He underlined, that, although a standard assessment method did not exist in educational institutions, assessments were generally expected to look for knowledge, analytical skills, communication skills, research skills, and teamwork, although some of them may not be applicable for the purpose of this training module. He also added that additional aspects might need consideration for assessing the experts under the project, for example, the ability to recognise what one did not know when appropriate.

40. He indicated that the methods used in universities for the assessment purpose would probably not be appropriate for the target audience given the nature of the BCH project training package, and the goals and methods of the assessment needed to be carefully considered before deciding on an option. In concluding his remarks, he gave an example of a problem-solving exercise that was given to his MA students, which might be a good starting point in considering how comprehensive skills could be assessed in an effective manner.

41. During the discussion on the various aspects of assessment, many participants stressed that it was crucial for trainers and experts to distinguish the “knows” and “don’t knows” of him/herself, particularly when communicating on some aspects of biosafety that still remained heavily disputed or uncertain. Although decisions would still need to be taken under these circumstances, it was significant that the decision-makers were aware of the uncertainties when they communicate the decisions to the public.

42. On a practical note, the participants agreed that the assessment needed to vary from module to module rather than developing one comprehensive assessment exercise for the entire package. Participants also confirmed that comprehensive ability needed to be assessed rather than general knowledge on trivial facts, for example, how to analyse complicated cases of LMO uses that might trigger the BCH requirement. It was suggested that two different kinds of assessments may be required depending on the type of national experts to be trained: key concepts and application of the Protocol for the Cartagena Protocol experts, and how to interact with the BCH by uploading/downloading information, for the IT experts. Running a pilot assessment with a view to future revisions was suggested in this regard.

Working Session on Modules 1,2 and 3

43. The participants were divided into three working groups of different categories (developing country representatives, developed country representatives, and organisations/experts). Each group was assigned one module to review and comment, and was requested to answer the following questions:

- Is the content presented in a way to facilitate understanding and enable countries to participate effectively in the BCH?
- How should the testing your understanding section be incorporated in the module you are reviewing?

44. The outcome of the working group sessions were reported at the end of day 2, under the agenda item *Report back from the Group Work*.

Status of the BCH managed by the SCBD

45. Ms. Kirsty Galloway McLean, Scientific and Technical Officer/BCH, Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity, briefed the participants on the update on BCH. She gave a summary of the recent preliminary review of the BCH undertaken by SCBD. User surveys and investigation of the database contents were undertaken to look at the general trend on the usage of the BCH Website.

46. The results found that most users were satisfied with the service, adequacy of SCBD assistance, available registry options, and the general operation of the BCH. The flexibility in the system design was appreciated, as exemplified by the occasional modification of the central portal in response to user needs, technology changes and information content. The main user concerns were lack of information due to delays in the provision of national information. The SCBD was also looking into additional improvements, including timeliness of non-internet options, additional services such as the “Current Awareness Service” and the email updates, and a broader use of BCH requested by many developing countries such as for training purposes.

47. She explained that the Informal Advisory Committee (IAC) had been formed by COP-MOP1 to provide technical advice on the BCH to the SCBD, and the initial recommendations from their first meeting held in November 2004 included issues on the structure and function of the central BCH portal: (easier information search, differentiation of “information does not exist” and “information has not been reported” in cases of null-responses, continued review by surveys and usability studies); information content and management (improved user documentation, flexible common formats, experience-sharing, reminders to solicit participation, differentiation of legally required information and general information, flexibility in supporting broader MOP Programme of Action); capacity-building; and non-Web formats (capacity-build needs, low bandwidth options, training opportunities, downloading to local databases, self-guided tours to increase usability and courtesy translations).

48. She concluded by highlighting some BCH-related issues that were planned for discussion in COP-MOP2, which was likely to develop a long-term Programme of Work for the BCH activities, and stressed the need to ensure that the BCH project would remain in line with the evolving direction of the central BCH system. She also emphasised that the training modules being developed through this project

would be used to update the toolkit that is currently available on the central BCH portal. Responding to a question, she added a clarification on the membership and appointment of the IAC.

Presentation of Modules 4, 5, and 7

49. With a brief introduction by Mr. Piegeler on the agenda item, Mr. Fenard continued with his presentation on Modules 4, 5, and 7. He underlined that all the modules in the package were based on the same structure of objective, practical cases, and detailed explanation. He drew attention to the linking information on the following module that would allow the users to know where they are in the overall module package and what the next step was going to be at any point of the modular training.

50. In going through the online demonstration of modules 4, 5, and 7 in a step-by-step manner, he stressed that the media could be used in a fully interactive mode, or in a more static, guideline/book format. Effort was made to balance between presenting enough practical cases and avoiding duplication of SCBD's work on the BCH demo. Technical feasibility was being considered to create a multiple-application version that integrates the information on the existing BCH portal demo into the training module pages, so that users can jump directly between the two. He added by requesting the discussion group to consider this approach and any other ways that might be useful in linking the training module to the central BCH system.

51. Following the presentation, the participants discussed the general aspects of modules 4, 5, and 7. Some participants felt that the modules were lengthy and repetitive, and considered ways in which the length could be reduced. Other issues of discussion included: options for a low-tech version, inclusion of standard exercises for trainers and trainees, whether surfing (module 4) and using (module 5) the BCH could be combined, and how the modules could be updated efficiently in accordance with the future MOP decisions.

Working Session on Modules 4, 5, and 7

52. The participants were divided into the same three working groups again to review and comment on Modules 4, 5, and 7. Each group was assigned one module to review and comment, and was requested to answer the following questions:

- Is the content presented in a way to facilitate understanding and enable countries to participate effectively in the BCH?
- How should the testing your understanding section be incorporated in the module you are reviewing?

53. The outcome of the working group sessions were reported at the end of day 2, under the agenda item *Report back from the Group Work*.

54. Mr. Hamilton opened the consultation on day 2 by recounting the progress of the previous day. The participants had become acquainted with each other, reviewed the overall status of the UNEP-GEF BCH project, been given presentations on modules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and worked on modules in three separate working groups. He felt that the overall progress made by the groups was productive.

55. He then introduced the agenda items for day 2, which would start with presentation of country-level example on the development of national BCH systems, followed by the introduction and discussion over module 6 that is still in the process of development and therefore requires most input from the expert participants.

Country presentations on their experiences in the development of the BCH

56. Ms. Mojca Milavec, Senior Advisor, Office for the Environment, Sector for the Environment Policy, Ministry for the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy, Slovenia, gave an overview of the development of the national BCH in Slovenia and the lessons learned from the process. A national biosafety information

system was currently available in Slovenia mainly for use by the BCH national focal points, to access and input the application information and data into the central BCH of the CBD. She illustrated the structure of the Slovenian national biosafety framework in order to demonstrate how the BCH national focal point has maintained close contacts with multiple national competent authorities that are responsible for dealing with different applications depending on the types and uses of LMOs.

57. Since Slovenia had additional legal and administrative obligations as a new member of the EU, it was still in the process of re-developing the overall national biosafety system and no decisions have been made on specific LMO application so far. Most users of the BCH, including the governmental officials, felt that a good previous knowledge of the Cartagena Protocol was needed to search effectively through the BCH and understand the documents contained therein. They also thought that it had insufficient information for their needs and other information sources were used in addition to it.

58. She described that the national BCH was available on the Web in both English and Slovene languages, with larger user traffic in the Slovene version. The main visitors to the site were government bodies, notifiers, and NGOs, who utilise the database service to seek national laws and regulations. She added that the BCH will contain national decisions on individual applications as they become available.

59. She concluded by noting that the current system had worked well in terms of access to computers, the Internet, connection speed, and user feedback. Slovenia's long-term goal of updating the national biosafety information system to be in line with the Cartagena Protocol as well as with the EU obligations was a costly and lengthy effort; a more immediate goal focused on: integrating the national BCH to the central BCH; provision of additional training to the national competent authorities on their obligations to the BCH under the Cartagena Protocol; additional training to customs officers and inspectors at borders on CP obligations and online access; and general awareness-raising on BCH.

60. Ms. Inez H. Slamet-Loedin, Head of Molecular Biology Division, Research Centre for Biotechnology, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Indonesia, started her presentation by introducing the historical context of the national biosafety framework in Indonesia. Initiated prior to joining the UNEP-GEF project, Indonesia's work on the development of the BCH had included requesting the ministry of environment for official recognition of the importance of the BCH and the use of media to appeal for funding.

61. She presented the key actors on the biosafety approval framework and the mechanism for the evaluation and approval process, which consisted of the ministry of environment, directorate of agriculture, food and drug administration, and quarantine, as the competent authorities that most needed to rely on the BCH. She also mentioned that Indonesia had a number of products that have already been approved using this framework, but had some trouble in ensuring transparency and public participation. This lesson had also confirmed the importance of an effective national BCH to be in place.

62. The initial effort of the national BCH began with the collection of relevant information, which was then presented on the Web. Showing how the actual Website looked, she described that the next step in their work was to involve different stakeholders to inform of the national BCH and to collect feedback. On the basis of recommendations received the BCH was improved through the expansion of the database to include a biotechnology directory and peer reviewed papers; public participation; and encouraging active participation of the competent authorities in providing decision documents; standardization of the online risk assessment summary; and the convening of the open discussion forum,

63. She informed that the efforts have so far been met with enthusiasm from NGOs and competent national authorities that showed support by advertising the national BCH to their respective audience. The national BCH was also able to obtain formal and legal support at the government level, which placed it in a secure position by gaining access to sustainable national funding. In the future, the national BCH needed to improve its system through the use of a common format to upload information, translation of the Website into English, and integration to the central BCH.

64. The participants asked questions regarding the country experiences that were presented and discussed about the development of national BCH in general. Topics included how the communication between the national and central BCH were maintained, the difference in the oversight between the national biosafety information system and the national BCH system, engaging public participation, ensuring that the information provided matched information demanded by the users, translation of national BCH contents from the local language to English, and ensuring sustainability.

65. On the last point, Indonesia's success in securing government support through a sustainable funding was appreciated as a positive effort. The use of non-governmental institutions for developing and managing the national BCH was discussed in detail, particularly to learn any lessons gained in overseeing government bodies to ensure that they provided adequate information. Good communication and coordination between different government and non-government actors in the BCH system, as well as a clear division of functions and responsibilities in the overall biosafety system seemed vital in the smooth flow of information/data management tasks.

66. Some concern was raised by one participant that some of the national BCH efforts being undertaken by countries had used an inappropriate approach. In particular, an apparent lack of an initial coordinated vision and a broader overall strategy in bringing together different actors of the national BCH development was pointed out, and the "piecemeal approach" of dealing with needs and situations as they arose was criticised.

67. In this regard, it was stressed that each developing country faced a different situation that dictated their approach and process of their national BCH efforts that could not fit into a single format. The particular difficulty in countries that needed to balance their national priorities with their new obligation to a particular regional economic structure (such as the EU or the Mercosur) was highlighted. For example, the experience of Slovenia in their difficult effort to incorporate the Cartagena Protocol, the EU Directives, and the EFSA system into the national strategy was invaluable in learning how the complex combination of these obligations affect the national process and would help many other developing countries that might face similar situations in the future.

Module 6: Country Participation in the BCH

68. In introducing the next agenda item on module 6: country participation in BCH, Ms. Mathur-Filipp reminded the participants to keep in mind the two previous presentations, as their experience in the national BCH development demonstrated the real situation that developing countries faced. The BCH task force of each project countries would be facing similar challenges to decide on their IT and human capacity needs. She stressed that module 6 was still under development and required most inputs from the participants at this consultation.

69. Mr. Fenard gave the overview on module 6, noting that this module might be considered as the most vital step for the countries as they must decide the technical means in which their national BCH would interact with the central BCH system of the CBD. He emphasised that the training component must remain flexible enough to accommodate the various technical solutions that the countries might decide.

70. Mr. Alexis Roussel, Programme Assistant, UNITAR, continued the overview by providing the details of the module, which followed the process described in the handbook on choosing the different types of information transfer system at the national level. He put forward the four different options described in the module:

- Registering data in the central portal using the management centre;
- Registering data locally using database templates and sending it to the central BCH;
- Making data available through a website and allowing the central BCH portal to "crawl" to retrieve the metadata; and
- Storing data on the national BCH database and actively making data available through the

central BCH portal using the BCH interoperability protocols.

71. He described the information flow process as well as the technical requirements for each option, adding that the countries may choose one of them or opt for their original system depending on their technical capacity. In concluding the presentation, he stressed that some countries might require assistance from the UNEP-GEF project team to assess their existing national capacity so that the technical and skills requirements in order to achieve a given technical solution could be clarified.

72. Extensive discussion and exchange of viewpoints followed the presentation. One of the major focuses of discussion was whether the module should only address the technical requirement aspects of linking the national BCH with the central BCH, independent of the effects that the policy decisions may have on the technical requirements. Some participants felt that the two were interrelated and could not be considered in isolation of each other; the module should therefore describe how a certain national policy decision on the information ownership/maintenance could determine which technical options were available to achieve the particular policy. Meanwhile, other participants thought that such a decision could be left up to the countries to decide prior to, and outside of the training module. There was also a suggestion that such issues could be implied by including some example case studies in this module.

73. The discussion centred on the module's focus on the technical specification, and the omission of references to the national policy needs that should be the real driving force the whole process. The module only provides guidance on giving information to the central BCH, rather than exploring the country's needs and benefits that could be fulfilled by linking the national BCH to a central system.

74. The participants were reminded that the BCH project was expected to utilise and build upon the foundation of inter-agency coordination and biosafety information policy development established through the UNEP-GEF NBF development project. Since the BCH project was expected to continue the work of the preceding project by allowing the countries to learn how to manage the information according to the existing policy and administrative framework, the countries are presumed to have already determined their policy needs and benefits from the BCH.

75. A developing country participant offered a country example to demonstrate the point: the country first developed their national database based on their own national regime, then investigated the options of how the country wanted to connect to the central BCH system, both as part of the NBF development project. Since the NBF development project ended there and did not support for the further stages, the BCH project was expected to begin by implementing the technical option chosen during the previous project.

76. On a similar note, it was pointed out that the capacity/asset assessment, which determined the IT solution currently available to a country, should be integrated into the needs assessment for a longer-term IT goal that took into account sustainability issues. It was suggested that such progression of overall policy decision to needs to technical options might best be represented in a flowchart. Some participants also raised the need to consider the possibility that a country might decide to move from one technical option to another, as changes in the IT and policy situation of a country often occur over time.

77. On the discussion as to whether the module should include a section on public participation in the national BCH, it was argued that the public participation was outside of the mandate of the BCH project. It was stressed that the BCH project aimed to fulfil the minimum requirement of the Cartagena Protocol to ensure that a national BCH system was place and government officials were trained to access/use the BCH. It was truly an add-on to the NBF development project, in which the countries learned the BCH requirement under the Cartagena Protocol but did not provide any means for setting up a national information management system to actually implement the Protocol obligations. Any other activities were left up to the countries to undertake themselves, using this project as a first step towards the development of a fully functional, sustainable, and nationally invested BCH system.

78. A suggestion was made to modify the current content of module 8 on knowledge management in order to address many of the concerns raised during these discussions, although this might be restricted by financial and time constraints of the BCH project. An alternative was to include references in the

introduction section of the module, describing that the BCH must be integrated within the overall decision on biosafety information management and public participation. A possibility was also raised to note in the same reference, that the countries had the right to decide whether to stay within the obligations of the Cartagena Protocol or to have a higher degree of regulation, which would also provide context to the technical specifications.

Working session on Module 6

79. The participants were divided into three groups to review Module 6. Each group was asked one of the following questions to summarise their comments:

- (1) What should this module incorporate to assist countries to assess their human capacity and their capacity needs in order for them to make a choice of national BCH system?
- (2) What should this module incorporate to assist countries to assess their national IT capacity and their IT capacity needs in order for them to make a choice of national BCH system?
- (3) What should this module incorporate to assist countries to assess their national IT capacity and their IT capacity needs in order for them to make a choice of national BCH system?

80. The outcome of the working group sessions were reported at the end of day 2, under the agenda item *Report back from the Group Work*.

Presentation of Regional Experts Curriculum and Methodology for Training of Trainers

81. Ms. Mathur-Filipp introduced the agenda item on the curriculum for the regional experts training course. She requested the participants to consider: what more should be added or deleted in the curriculum, and knowing the methodology to be used for the training, to suggest some concrete exercises for the Regional Experts to test their understanding of issues.

82. She gave a conceptual background of the development of the training curriculum, highlighting that major changes in the design of training delivery had come out of the Workshop on Development of Training Materials held in May 2004. In particular, the use of well-trained, regional experts, rather than national trainers with a shorter training period, had been strongly suggested as the preferred methodology for the training programme delivery.

83. The actual process of elaborating the curriculum was undertaken in close collaboration with InWEnt, UNITAR and the UNEP-GEF team. The expected outcome of the curriculum was to train a core of regional experts that could offer technical advice and training sessions so that the developing countries would have the in-country skills and knowledge to meet the BCH obligations under the Cartagena Protocol.

84. Ms. Mathur-Filipp briefly introduced the methodological concept of the issues that the regional experts would be expected to learn from the training session, and described the main components of the draft curriculum, noting this can be modified with inputs.

85. Ms. Alice Eymard-Duvernay, Senior Project Manager, InWEnt Capacity Building International, continued with the detailed explanation of the overall methodological approach of the regional expert training curriculum, with particular focus on the information contained in Unit 3: basics of training methodology.

86. She noted that training adult professionals required a distinct approach, as the trainees would already have their own experience and expertise to contribute, as well as their own expectations for improving their work performance that differed with the socio-political nature of their specific workplaces. As a result, the training must be interactive and performance-oriented, integrating the knowledge, skills and experience of the trainees. An “experimental learning cycle” would be used to allow the trainees to understand and handle new content, while a mission-oriented evaluation approach would be needed to ensure that the trainees would achieve the specific objective, which was to earn the skills in offering adequate support for participation in BCH at national level.

87. Focusing on Unit 3, the trainees would learn the basic methodological necessities to become capacity-building trainers through the application of facilitated presentation techniques. Stressing that the unit would be closely linked to the other units of the curriculum through communication/presentation/planning techniques, she described the elements of Unit 3, detailing the sequence of topics that would be covered under each element.

88. The unit would mainly follow a participant-oriented teaching/learning process, where the trainees would actively use and handle the training materials with the occasional mediation and guidance from the facilitator.

89. Following the presentations, the participants asked questions regarding a number of issues, including how the curriculum related to the national training modules, how the regional experts in IT and the Cartagena Protocol would be selected, whether and how the two types of experts would interact during the training sessions, and the qualification and role of the facilitators. Some detailed questions on the individual units of the curriculum were also raised.

90. The participants were reminded that the regional experts were required to have previous IT skills or knowledge on the Cartagena Protocol in order to attend the training. They were not being trained on their respective areas *per se*, but on how to train others in bringing specific IT solutions to meet the BCH obligations under the Cartagena Protocol.

91. The possibility of certifying the regional experts at the end of the training session was discussed extensively. In this regard, the objective of the certification was questioned particularly in conjunction with the sustainability of regional experts in the longer run. Some participants concerned whether certifying regional trainers would encourage them to use the status for purposes other than that under the BCH project. It was also pointed out that since there was a possibility that the trainees would fail to become recognized regional experts at the end of the training session the certification would become necessary.

92. A number of questions on the mode of work of the regional experts were raised. Under the BCH project, regional experts that successfully completed the training session would become available to offer their services to the project countries through formal national training workshops as well as by request of the countries at different times of the project period. For both options the BCH project countries would be able to choose the individuals from a roster of regional experts, depending on factors such as geographic location and language.

93. The participants were then divided into three working groups to review and comment on the regional experts training curriculum. In particular, each group was asked to consider the following questions:

- Keeping in mind the 2-week training course, what more do we need to add in the curriculum to help regional experts deliver capacity at the country level? e.g. organizational management, networking, etc.
- What can we remove from this curriculum?
- Knowing the methodology to be used, could you suggest some concrete exercises for the regional experts to test their understanding of the issues?

94. The designated rapporteurs of the groups reported to the plenary on the outcome of their group's deliberations. The results in the working groups are contained in Annex VI through X of the present report. During the discussion of the work of the focus groups, the following points and issues were raised:

Report Back from the Group Work

95. The designated rapporteurs of the respective groups that reviewed the BCH online training modules reported to the plenary on the outcome of their group's deliberations. The comments from the working groups

as well as the plenary discussions under each Module are contained in Annex IV through X of the present report.

96. The participants noted that the comments and suggestions gathered in the past two days have been immense over a vast range of issues. It was suggested that a prioritised approach needed to be taken as it was clearly impossible to include all comments in one revision. The participants were requested that any substantive detailed comments be submitted in writing by 7 January 2005 to be reflected in the module revision.

Evaluation Exercise and Closure of the Consultation

97. Mr. Hamilton informed the participants that their comments on the consultation would provide important feedback to help the Biosafety Team learn about the process, and invited them to evaluate in the following method:

- Degree of fulfilment of expectation, in a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high)
- Comments on the overall process
- Comments on the participation and the participatory nature of the project
- Comments on the outcomes of the consultation

98. In concluding the consultation, Ms. Mathur-Filipp, on behalf of the Biosafety Team, thanked all the participants for their hard work. She believed that the contributions and the comments were extremely useful in furthering the work of the project. She remind the participants that any written detailed comments would be appreciated and would also be incorporated into the modules and the training curriculum, adding that the first regional expert training was scheduled for January or February 2005.

99. In expressing his thanks to the experts, developing country participants, the CBD, the GEF Secretariat, and the resource persons, Mr. Briggs confirmed the deep sense of commitment of the UNEP-GEF biosafety team in ensuring that the BCH project would be run in its true objective of assisting the participating countries to fulfil their obligations to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in an effective and sustainable manner, and appreciated the continued guidance and cooperation of the rich expertise that was available during this consultation. After the customary exchange of courtesies, the Workshop closed at 6.00 p.m. on Tuesday, 14 December 2004.

ANNEXES

Annex I List of Participants

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | Ms. Esther Argote Pelegrino
Centro Nacional de Seguridad Biológica
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente
La Habana, Cuba | 2 | Ms. Nasrin Esmail-Zadeh
Ministry of Science, Research and Technology
National Institute for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology
Tehran
Iran (Islamic Republic of) |
| 3 | Mr. Mostafa Fouda
Director of the Biodiversity Sector
Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs,
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency, Nature Conservation
Cairo, Egypt | 4 | Ms. Mojca Milavec
Senior Advisor III
Environmental Policy Section Environment Directorate
Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy
Ljubljana
Slovenia |
| 5 | Mr. Louis Traore (Burkina Faso)
Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie
Ouagadougou
Burkina Faso | 6 | Mr. Jose Luis Gerhartz Muro
SIDSNet Information Officer for the Caribbean
University of the West Indies Center for Environment & Development
Kingston. JAMAICA |
| 7 | Mr. Alain Le Duc
Information Architecture and Systems Analyst
Quebec, Canada | 8 | Mr. Han De Koeijer
Assistant, Developing Countries Partnership
Brussels, Belgium |
| 9 | Prof. Julian Kinderlerer
Professor of Biotechnology Law
Sheffield Institute of Biotechnology
Law and Ethics
University of Sheffield
England | 10 | Dr. Anne Kapuscinski
Institute for Social, Economic and Ecological Sustainability (ISEES)
University of Minnesota
United States of America |
| 11 | Ms. Kirsty Galloway McLean
Scientific and Technical Officer/BCH
Secretariat to the Convention on Biological
Montréal, Québec | 12 | Mr. Alex Owusu-Biney
National Project Coordinator
UNEP-GEF Project on "Development of National Biosafety Framework"
Ghana Atomic Energy Commission
Accra, Ghana |
| 13 | Mr. Albert Spielmann
Scientific Adviser
Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape
Berne, Switzerland | 14 | Ms. Morven A. McLean, Ph.D.
AGBIOS, Inc.
Merrickville, Ontario
Canada K0G 1N0 |



United Nations
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

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| 15 | Ms. Donna Roy
IT/GIS Project Manager
USGS - BRD,
USA | 16 | Mr. Marc Auer
Bundesministerium fuer Umwelt, Naturschutz und
Reaktorsicherheit
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Division/Referat N II 4,
Biotechnologie/Genetechnik,
Biotechnology/Genetic Engineering,
Bonn, Germany |
| 17 | Ms. Maddalena Querci, Ph.D.
European Commission - DG Joint Research Centre
Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
Biotechnology and GMOs Unit
Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
European Commission
Ispra (VA), Italy | 18 | Ms. Antonia Rana
Information and Communication Technology
Scientific Area
Biotechnology and GMOs Unit
Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
European Commission
Ispra (VA), Italy |
| 19 | Ms. Paz Valiente
Senior Environmental Specialist
Biodiversity team
Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Washington D.C.
U.S.A. | 20 | Mr. Mario Ramos
Program Manager, Biodiversity
Global Environment Facility (GEF)
Washington D.C.
U.S.A. |
| 21 | Ms. Inez Slamet Loedin
Head of Molecular Biology Division
RC Biotechnology - Indonesian Institute of
Sciences (LIPI), Jl, Raya Bogor km 46, Cibinong
Indonesia | 22 | Ms. Alice Eymard-Duvernay
Senior Project Manager
InWEnt Capacity Building International
Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Zschortau
Germany |
| 23 | Janis Ancans
Latvian Food Center
National Project Coordinator | 24 | Mr. Jocelyn Fenard
Programme Coordinator
Decentralized Cooperation Programme
United Nations Institute for Training and Research
(UNITAR) |
| 25 | NGO Representative
Ms. Christine von Weizsacker
Spokesperson on Biosafety Issues
Federation of German Scientists
Bonn, Germany | 26 | Denny Hamilton (Facilitator) |
| 27 | Haruko Okusu (Report Writer) | | |

UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity Building for the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)
Consultation of Regional Scientists and Technical Experts (*December 13 -14, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland*)

UNEP-GEF

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| 28 | Mr. Christopher Briggs
Global Programme Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 29 | Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Regional Coordinator, Africa
UNEP-GEF Coordination Division
Nairobi, Kenya |
| 30 | Ms. Liina Eek
Assistant Regional Coordinator
Central and Eastern Europe
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 31 | Jyoti Mathur-Filipp
BCH Task Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland |
| 32 | Mr. Ingo Piegeler
Training Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 33 | Ms. Alessandra Sensi-Nori
Programme Officer
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland |
| 34 | Mr. Frédéric Vogel
BCH IT Specialist
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 35 | Mr. Nizar Mohamed
Regional Coordinator, Asia Pacific
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland |
| 36 | Ms. Yenny Ezquerro
Administrative Assistant
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | | |

Annex II Agenda

Day 1

8:30 – 9:30	Registration
9:30 – 10:00	Opening of the Consultation
10:00 – 10:20	<i>Coffee break</i>
10:20 – 11:20	Current status of the UNEP-GEF Project for <i>Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH</i>
11:20 – 12:30	Presentation of: <i>Module 1: Biosafety and the Environment</i> <i>Module 2: Introduction to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</i> <i>Module 3: Introduction to the Biosafety Clearing-House</i>
12:30 – 14:00	<i>Lunch</i>
14:00 – 14:30	Testing Your Understanding: Methodologies
14:30 – 15:30	Working Session on Modules 1, 2 and 3
15:30 – 15:50	<i>Coffee break</i>
15:50 – 16:30	Status of the BCH managed by the SCBD
16:30 – 17:30	Presentation of Modules 4, 5 and 7 <i>Module 4: Surfing the BCH</i> <i>Module 5: Finding Information on the BCH</i> <i>Module 7: Entering Information to the BCH using the Management Centre</i>
17:30 - 18:30	Working Session on Modules 4, 5 and 7
18:30	<i>Reception</i>

Annex III Expectations and Concerns

Expectations	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good discussion in a mutually supportive environment • Clarity about intermediate steps and goals • Opportunity to strengthen training module • High participation from all partners for different opinions and contribution • Understand better capacity needs in BCH • Disseminate as much as learned about BCH back national level • Useable training materials • Useful or useable training materials • Ensuring complementarities with BCH and implementation projects • Interactive, get much information possible for self and national level • Training requirements for training trainers • Learn, not sitting and listening • Contribution and learn • Learn and know more about BCH and distribute at national level • Simplicity and efficiency for everybody to be useable • Getting ideas together, project could enter practical phase to see how it works • Learn how to conduct regional training at practical level • To be well informed on BCH • Synthesized into BCH, then into implementation • Better understanding of BCH product to countries • Get feedback to module to make it useable • Know how BCH cap-build for Latin America • Meet special requirements for SIDS and LAC • Develop training materials • Clear understanding on BCH cap-build module • Work together improve module • Increase knowledge on BCH policy aspect • Improve knowledge on project • Learn more about modules and see how to contribute • Receive guidance on training part of module • Learning developing countries needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot to do in a little time, need to stay on track • Trainee-driven priorities • Materials need to meet need of countries • Methodology. Can we achieve with the short time? • Am I going to be a trainer or trainee? • Much confusion in methodology • Spending too much time doing other things • Nice module, but no exercise, what will the countries do? • “Straitjacketed”, new ideas, flexibility that would allow national inputs at implementation • Measurement of achievement, testing, certification, knowledge-based? • Practical usefulness of the materials • Able to run national BCH properly • Viability in long-term for developing countries • Training module to be country-driven and meet each country needs • Can we reach agreement on common understanding? • Lot of work with short time • how to effectively get product to countries • Not enough time for discussions • Lot of ideas, not enough time • Bringing together different views and positions to resolve some conflicts • Technical needs and understanding insufficient • Variety of solutions exists that countries can use for BCH, module must be able to meet different needs • Whether module sufficient technical training for country or regional • How to make best use and make training long-lasting activity • Selection of trainers, how to meet specific requirements • Need to move quickly and finalise training • Ensuring that training modules are useable

Annex IV Summary of working group comments on the regional experts training curriculum

Questions:

1. Keeping in mind the 2-week training course, what more do we need to add in the curriculum to help regional experts deliver capacity at the country level? e.g. organizational management, networking, etc.
2. What can we remove from this curriculum?
3. Knowing the methodology to be used, could you suggest some concrete exercises for the regional experts to test their understanding of the issues?

Group 1

What should be incorporated into / deleted from the curriculum?

- Planning an entry strategy for the regional experts when going into countries (Unit 5)
- Introduce experts in developing networks among regional experts
- Concrete experience for learning from countries: examples and difficulties
- How to moderate (e.g. use of the SCBD forum)
- How to go from theory to practice based on real-case scenarios
- How to assess a BCH network – what are the coordination mechanisms for national BCH network? (Unit 4)
- Context and scope of the BCH project – what are the operational objectives and limitations? What are the experts' tasks, to whom to refer if they don't know the answer? (Unit 5)
- Role and action framework for regional experts (specific TOR) (Unit 2, 5)
- Cost-effectiveness and sustainability of BCH in the country to be able to give more valuable advice re: Options

General comments on the curriculum:

- Modules 4, 5, and 7 do not appear clearly in the curriculum
- Brief session on giving & receiving feedback from countries and UNEP-GEF (Introduction & Unit 3)
- Topic 2&3: consider communication for persons that need to translate what they have learned into mother tongue
- Explain to regional experts issues that arise to relevant resource persons
- General / cross-cutting issues
- Full curriculum to include “free time” to allow topics that come up as the training continue; perhaps on daily basis

- Having more flexibility in the overall organization of contents
- keep keywords consistent regardless of language used

Group 2

Concrete exercises for regional experts to test understanding of issues

(to test and develop understanding of issues)

- use the multiple-choice parts of modules for intermediate self-assessment (not the final assessment) to ensure understanding of text
- concrete examples to test what one has to do in a given situation
 - give time for preparation and homework during training
- regional experts attending the training prepare regional case studies:
 - participants explain problems from own country, and another participant from a different country provide a solution
 - active feedback exercise followed by the original participant revisiting the country problem
- communication between the two types of experts (IT explaining to CP expert, vice versa) to mutually discuss IT and CP issues to each other

Group 3

- need for testing for certification purposes
- pros and cons of testing:
 - test in the beginning/middle/end of training have advantages and disadvantages
 - testing methodologies: essay, presentation on modules, individual/group testing, multiple-choice testing, specific case, example of procedures (AIA, FFP, unintentional, transgenic fish, etc.)
- not enough time to come to conclusion yet, require more time to consider further

Some concrete suggestions that started to emerge:

- exercise to both contribute to and search through BCH
- beginning test to see basic knowledge/aptitude of participants; mid-session test to see progress, end-session for certificate (individual)

General discussion on the curriculum in the plenary:

- giving the trainees chance to come up with the test methods
- working on case-studies: also could be peer-assessed (designing and presenting regionally-relevant exercises)

- objective of assessment and what will be done with the assessment results need to be informed to participants
- why and how participants are assessed, then think specific exercises for each topic
- opportunity for participants to assess the facilitators or "teachers"
- participants to provide feedback on the training curriculum (design, structure, delivery etc.)
- communication of the outcome of the training curriculum against the result of the consultation exercise
- how will the revision of the modules 1-3 affect the overall curriculum of the training?
- Modules 1~3 must stay loyal to the Protocol and use existing materials (IUCN Guide) so as not to reinvent wheel

Annex V Summary of comments on Module 1: Biosafety and Environment

- 1-2 case studies throughout the modules to explain “real-life” situations in conveying specific technical terms. Legal status of the real-life situation need to be considered to ensure not to confuse readers
- graphics would be useful to understand some technical/scientific concepts.
- Use of large boxes in PDF files might distract the reading flow; text-wrapping around boxes or putting boxes to the side might be better
- Some sections of the electronic version have too much animation that might be distracting.
- Audio (narration) was too fast.
- Sections of electronic version to link to the PDF document, and/or PDF document to have links to detailed information
- Glossary of terms
- Overall language was easy to understand
- Content of the module needs to be peer-reviewed to ensure accuracy and consistency with the Cartagena Protocol
- Consistency of the use of terms throughout the documentation (e.g. LMO vs. GMO)
- More examples in “text boxes”, but not to break flow of the document
- Content:
- Less focus on “Benefits of biotechnology”
- “Genes and wild population”: needs editing and additions to update to the current scientific debate
- “biosafety and precaution”: more emphasis on RA and RM, particularly RM is insufficiently covered; precaution as one element of decision-making; text box on the description of “precautionary approach” needs revision (or addition of a new text box)
- “international agreements”: addition of OECD; secretariat of each international agreement mentioned in the section to review the text for accurate, updated information; diagramme on last page problematic as it suggests hierarchy

Learning section?

- No, there is no need for testing
- There should be a Q&A format with questions that are not too easy and in a randomised order

General discussion in the plenary:

- Distinction of “modern biotechnology”(general), “LMO” (what is covered in the Protocol)
- Clear idea of what information needs to be known for the purpose of the module, and what is better omitted
- Consistent use of “genetic modification” or “genetic engineering” with strong preference of former
- Careful consideration of which “international agreements” to list, depending on what historical/inter-relational aspects needs to be conveyed to the audience
- Definition of biotechnology is incorrect (in text box)
- Reference on OECD guidance on unique identifiers incorrect; links to relevant references
- Inclusion of CBD as one of the “actors” in the “international agreements” section

Annex VI Summary of comments on Module 2: Introduction to the Cartagena Protocol on
Biosafety

- Cannot be isolated from Module 1
- Scope is ok, but as it now the module does not reaching learning objectives and gap between module 1 (very general history, but not context) and 2 (very detailed)
- Some connecting material needed

Suggestion of a new “context” module

- Situation in the world
- Article of CPB with regards to BCH
- Relationship between CPB with other international agreements
- Why CPB is needed
- List of articles in a clear order with overview, noting relevance to BCH if any
- Unintentional introduction of environment and FFP mentioned, but contained use is not mentioned as option for BCH consideration
- History of CPB
- Whether introductory/conceptualising module needed at the beginning, whether it is in scope of the training

General comments

- General glossary (what is a “protocol”? What is a “Party”?)
- Sorting of the module re: different obligations under different BCH solutions
- Writing needs to be improved (e.g. Using/referring to the IUCN guide, more precise wording)

Assessment

- Multiple-choice not best choice
- Pose a problem on decision-making and reporting to BCH, start with simple problems and progress to more complex cases
 - Solve tricky problems
 - Situations close to reality
 - IT and CPB experts to work together
- Group work tests
- Pool introductory module by group problem-solving exercises
- Scientific angle of problems

Annex VII Summary of comments on Module 3: Introduction to the Biosafety Clearing-House

- Simplify the language: too technical for those unfamiliar with BCH, modified language for decision-makers (less details on scientific terms, focus on obligations)
- Add section on What is the BCH? Who can put information on BCH?
- Different modules for different level of people (beginners/intermediate/experts), and different stakeholders, summary for each level audience
- CPB Parties must know BCH is obligatory
-
- Who are the real beneficiaries of BCH
- Way to publicise BCH to appeal to the responsible persons (stakeholders of CPB) to use it – motivate their full participation and improve their commitment
- Information placed on BCH on RA limited
- Presentation of module is more important than content itself

Testing

- More examples on the benefit of BCH for stakeholders need to be emphasized
- If BCH is part of CHM, how that concept can be applied at national level (especially if run by different institutions)
- Sending information by email

General discussion in the plenary:

- Differentiation of stakeholders and “responsible persons” needed
- BCH definition must adhere to CPB
- How to make BCH an “incentive” rather than “option”: expansion of use of BCH must be promoted
 - Obligation to BCH and benefits of BCH needs to be distinguished
 - Is “promotion of BCH” part of the objective of the project, or is project limited to make countries be consistent with CPB obligations?
 - Encouraging beyond NFPs (e.g. CAs) to use BCH?
- Network of BCH components (central-national): conceptual understanding of how the overall BCH system works
- Discussion on different management of BCH (which ministry)

- Obligations and rights of Parties to BCH need to be more clearly mentioned in the introductory modules
- The goal of a “functioning BCH” needs to include promotion of benefits
- COPMOP1 extended BCH to use by parties to CBD: i.e., obligations/benefits for CPB Parties, benefits to the others
- Obligations to BCH mentioned in separate module from use of BCH or overall CPB, issues of benefits/obligations may need to be included in FAQs

Annex VIII Summary of comments on Module 4: Surfing the BCH

Improvements to the module

- Scope of module is needed (objective and structure): introductory paragraph needed before the “welcome page”
 - Link introduction to relevant parts of other modules
 - What is the BCH
 - Why is it important
- Interactive component is important to learn to use the application
- Do not show where to click next, but rather explain functions
- Structured vocabulary to be explained: e.g. Title: “overview of the central portal” rather than “surfing the portal”
- Bibliographic use allows search in different language articles
- Site map with explanations might be included in addition of the overview, in order to explain the structure of central BCH
- Use of FAQ of SCBD as a comprehensive part of the module
 - As element of meta-level information
- Reasons for null-responses to search to be included
- Boolean search options need to be explained
- Explanation of additional tools (databases, mailing lists, etc.)

What is missing in module (module 8)

- Modules 4, 5, 6 on central portal, but different possible technical options need to be addressed
- Interoperability and flexibility in evaluating different options
- How to move from one option to the other (evolution) and choice of options
- Search options
- Knowledge management in context of CPB
- Which parts address which audience?
- Show the trainers how to decide on the strategy for finding information

Comments on overall package of modules

- Invite not only assessment but also feedback
- FAQ as response to question during training
- How to tailor courses for particular needs of the region?

UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity Building for the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH)
Consultation of Regional Scientists and Technical Experts *(December 13 -14, 2004, Geneva, Switzerland)*

- What to do if there is a novel question? (knowledge management)
- New ideas/tools on the BCH training needs to be fed back

Assessment

- Should be problem-based
- No separate assessment for this particular module needed, final assessment at end of module 6 recommended

Annex IX Summary of comments on Module 5: Finding Information on the BCH

- Module too lengthy? Too technical? Too complicated?
- Division into 2 parts suggested, if length cannot be reduced
- Need for one regional format (rather than repeating same format for each region in the module), common vocabulary
- Define common ground (?)
- Partnership
- kind of information needed in the module, language
- more exercise is needed: simple situation progressing to more complex exercises
- what to do with the information searched
- application of information
- what to do in case of not finding information, or information is not available
- NFP as the authoritative body for inquiries
- Resources: what kind of resources needed for conducting workshops – equipment, space, human resources, timing (min. 1 week)
- What can the participants take home as “action plan”, or financial/material contribution
- Follow-up of participants through newsletters, etc.

General discussion in the plenary:

- Reporting back on how the requested information was retrieved might be useful

Summary of comments on Module 6: Country Participation in the BCH

- Explanation on different options and implication
- Suggestion on the makeup of the team should be incorporated
- Conditions for changing from one option to another: consequences, resources, etc. for the change
- Who does the training in the country
- Countries must decide the best options
- Strategic impact of information to be placed in the portal
- What kinds of info. Should go on the national BCH?
- What other Websites could the module refer to as examples? How did the sites get set up? Constraints? How to solve them?
- Decision on the choice of national IT system (not “country participation in the BCH”)
- Some wording in option 2 not appropriate, to make it consistent with CPB/CBD (also refer to operational manual)

- case studies or examples of websites developed
- type of IT expertise to be trained depend on the IT option chosen
- policy impact on the IT choice needs to be emphasized
- list of advantages/disadvantages of different options
- CBD toolkit to be added as reference
- Stress that country's choice of option is not final, and can be changed
- Language from the operational manual (pp. 4,5) to be included in the module

Assessment of human capacity & capacity needs

- Repeat obligations under CPB with respect to this section
- Use the vocabulary of CPB
- Should be able to plan an open-ended structure to ensure long-term vision (evolution)
 - Do you have the capacity in-house to develop the chosen national BCH?
 - If not, is the capacity available in-country?
- Guidelines on how to assess competence and reliability needed (if outsourcing to companies)
- Guidelines on how to make a contract (legal document)
- Monitoring and testing of outsourced services
- Structure and policy are under development and not final, may give uncertainty which influence the design of BCH (strategy needed)
- Human resources:
 - Policy implications: even outsourced, there must be an in-house policy person (policy communicator)
 - Clear TOR needed for trainees
- Assessment of quality of human and IT resources
 - Not only quantity
 - Which IT, functioning
 - What persons, how long will they stay in-house
- Identify all stakeholders who will use the BCH
- How to ensure BCH trainees incorporate what had been learned in the NBF training (knowledge-/information-gathering)

General discussion in the plenary:

- Contract development for outsourcing should not be covered by the modules (reference to toolkit sufficient)

Annex X Summary of comments on Module 7: Interacting with the BCH Management Centre

Questions:

1. Is the content presented in a way to facilitate understanding and enable countries to participate effectively in the BCH
2. How should the testing your understanding section be incorporated in the module you are reviewing?

General

Add Page numbers

Number Steps sequentially, then use letters

Exercises! Lots of them

Format and content

Need Interactive Training

Potentially use BCHDEMO as interactive training

Break into Interactive Sections

Use actual entries as entry examples

Need exercises

Make the complexity increase from exercise 1 to section x

Show Right answers and alternative options

Use Real Case Scenario throughout the Exercises

Make the complexity increase from section 1 to section x

Layer complexity of examples

Add Introduction to Module 7 explaining 4 connectivity options

Cover all four options for data entry? (fax & diskette for example)

Explain Common Format field by field

Examples of what should be filled in each field

Include impacts of searchable in each field

Capacity Building section: more explanation of fields

More explanation on Article 11 including examples

Provide links to original text of protocol where necessary

Explain Language Buttons

What to enter

Considerations for the base language (what is it?)

On attaching documents

Explain how to attach, discuss size versus bandwidth

Provide guidance on formats of attached document: word vs. PDF, jpg vs. TIF, etc.

Need more information on Validation (screen shot)

Explain the flow of an entry through the process

Explain the roles of the players: national user, national Focal Point, etc

Explain responsibilities of the roles

Explain responsibility of the country in QA/QC

Managing Data

Explain Save as a Draft function (include screen shots)

Explain how to get back to saved data and search for it after it is validated

Explain Confidential Business Information and Link to article 21

BCH and BCHDEMO

Explain distinction between real and demo sites

Train on BCH Demo?

(for SCBD) Differentiate colour or visual appearance of

BCH Demo and BCH