

Report on the 3rd
BCH Training of Trainers Workshop for Information
Technology and Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Conducted at:
Geneva, Switzerland
5-9 February 2007

Prepared by:

Lamine Sano, IT RA
Ileana Catalina Lopez, CPB RA

List of Acronyms

AIA	Advanced Informed Agreement
ANUBIS	Another UNEP Biosafety Information System
BCH	Bio-safety Clearing-House
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CEE	Central East Europe
CGIA	Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research
CNA	Competent National Authority
COP	Conference of the Parties
CPB	Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFP	Food, Feed & Processing
FSP	Full Size Projects
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
IPS	Identity Preservation System
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
LMO	Living Modified Organism
MOP	Meeting of the Parties
MOODLE	BCH Data Base with Training Materials
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Medium Size Projects
NBF	National Bio-safety Framework
NBSAP	National Bio-safety Strategy and Action Plan
NFP	National Focal Point
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
RA	Risk Assessment
RAF	Resource Allocation Framework
RM	Risk Management
SCBD	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
SRSG	Special Representative of the Secretary General
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Summary.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Methodology.....	5
Narrative Summary of Workshop Proceedings	
Day One – Monday February 5, 2007	6
Day Two – Tuesday February 6, 2007.....	9
Day Three – Wednesday February 7, 2007.....	11
Day Four – Thursday February 8, 2007.....	13
Day Five – Friday, February 9, 2006	16
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	19
Annex A: List of Participants.....	20
Annex B&C: Compilation of Materials and Outputs.....	22

Summary

This report presents a summary of the facilitation services provided as IT and CPB Regional Advisors at the workshop held at Geneva, Switzerland 5-9 February, 2007. The report describes each session of the training course.

The main purpose of the meeting was to train potential new Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and Information Technology Regional Advisors from Asia and Francophone Africa to assist the BCH training activities at these regions. Assistants to the meeting were 4 participants belonging to Asia and Francophone Africa.

The workshop covered the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, highlighting the importance of the Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism. The event forms part of the Project for the capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH).

The UNEP-GEF workshop methodology consisted of presentations, group discussion & hands-on training and regular feedback sessions. The regional advisors were hired during the duration of the workshop acting as facilitators. They were responsible for developing training sessions, and assisting participants with special focus at the CPB, Operational Handbook, Presentation Skills, IT technologies and share experience as Regional Advisors.

Acknowledgements

First, our appreciation and sincere thanks go to all of the resource persons who provided substantive inputs to the course in particular, Fee Chon Low, Leonard O'Garro, Ingo Piegeler, Alex Owusu-Biney, Lydia Eibi-Kamolleh, Frédéric Vogel, Prakash Bista and Yenny Ezquerro.

We want to especially thank the RA trainees who joined the course and displayed such a high level dedication, interest and enthusiasm.

Introduction

UNEP, under the impulsion of GEF, realized the potential shortcomings in terms of RA availability for the Francophone Africa and the Asian regions with respect to the upcoming and scheduled training workshop activities to be undertaken at the national and regional levels. In fact, for the Francophone region, only one IT-RA and CPB-RA are actively engaged on the field. Furthermore, with activities on the field now shifting from technical consultation work of MoU negotiations, to capacity building through training workshop activities, the CPB-RA shortcoming needed be urgently addressed for Francophone Africa especially. Just like the IT-RA, one CPB-RA resource was deemed not to be enough to tackle the coming workload in the Francophone Africa region. In that regard, a third ToT was hastily organized to train potentially new RAs identified in the database of already submitted CV for the First and Second ToT events. Invited to participate to this training were 5 ITs and 2 CPBs. In the end, 4 participants showed up for the training, 3 from Africa, and 1 from Asia.

Methodology

1. Planning

Context setting and support for planning storyboard and methodology for the workshop.

2. Developing Material for Training

A power point presentation including experiences as RA was prepared before attending the workshop. Material was elaborated at the workshop including list of commonly used acronyms, instructions for navigation meeting. Additional material were prepared to introduce trainees with presentation skills, an assignment was prepared to evaluate this session.

3. Workshop: Facilitation and support was provided through out the duration of the workshop.

4. Report writing

Narrative Summary of Workshop Proceedings

DAY 1 – Monday February 5, 2007.

Opening session

The workshop was opened by Mr. Ingo Piegeler, training manager on behalf of the UNEP –GEF Biosafety Clearing House Project (United Nations Environment Programme-Global Environment Facility). Mr. Piegeler welcomed the participants to the training and introduced the resource personnel. He explained that Mr. Christopher Briggs, Global Development Project Manager and Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Philipp, BCH Project Manager were participating in a meeting held at the Nairobi Offices.

Mr. Piegeler presented an overview of the workshop main objectives, training methodology and agenda for the duration of the workshop and indicated that there would be some adjustments as the program unfolded (Annex 1 Agenda)

Cathy 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"

The participants were invited by Ms. Lopez to fill out two cards, each of a different color, requesting information as follows:

- 1 Yellow card: *Give one expectation you have of this workshop, i.e. one that you expect to get out of these training course.*
- 2 Orange card: *Name one concern you have about the delivery of the BCH process at the training course.*

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 B below for a list of all workshop outputs.)

Cathy explained the different types of evaluations to be used during the workshop. She mentioned that even the RAs and BCH personnel will be evaluated. She also explained that every morning a recapitulation of sessions covered during the day was going to be presented by one RA. List of responsibilities during navigation meetings and Recap sessions was pasted in the wall. Workshop Ground rules were established with participants.

Introduction to the UN System: UNEP, GEF and CBD

Ingo began this session by explaining when the UN was formed and noted that it was the third effort to form a community of nations to deal with global issues. Using a power point presentation (D01) he indicated that UNEP is in response to the recognition that the environment is both a local and a global concern. He outlined UNEP responsibilities. He continued by referring to the global conference on the environment and to the subsequent development of the Convention on Biological Diversity The convention established a secretariat, which is an organization that services the convention and is guided by the parties, e.g. those nations that are signatories to the convention. He explained that there are 188 countries and 132 parties to the convention and outlined the establishment of GEF and noted that there are three organizations that implement GEF supported activities –UNEP, The World Bank and UNDP.

Introduction to the Biosafety Projects

Fee Chon Low made a presentation on the three UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects to implement the GEF strategy. She explained the Development project assisting 123 countries to develop a draft national biosafety framework (NBF); Eight Demonstration projects, with the objective of establishing operational national biosafety frameworks (NBFs) and the Biosafety Clearing House project created as an ADD ON project to assist 50 countries to participate in and benefit from the BCH. She noted that the NBFs must not only look good, more importantly, they have to work. 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 emphasized the importance of drafting a flexible law that can accommodate changes in regulations.

Coffee Break

Introduction to Biotechnology and Biotechnology Issues – Parts 1 and 2

Leonard presented a session on Biotechnology and the Environment (D01). He explained biosafety, the background of biotechnology, modern biotechnology and biodiversity. He indicated that the evolution of biotechnology has progressed through three “waves”. The first was the use of microorganisms to produce, through fermentation of products such as wine and cheese. The second wave was the use of biotechnology to produce antibiotics and the third and most recent is genetic engineering. He explained the differences between traditional biotechnology and transgenic manipulation, LMOs and GMOs. He noted that not historical information of these new forms of life is available, unlike the forms we have seen before. Each event behaves differently and we can not do broad generalizations. Some concerns currently expressed by the scientific community are: spreading of transgenes by GMOs to closely related domesticated or wild relatives; spreading and invasion into natural ecosystems by GMO; spreading of transgenes from GMO to unrelated species; development of herbicide resistance to weeds and development of insecticide resistance to pests. Concerns are covered at the CPB. The presentation was done in two parts and was greatly appreciated by the participants.

Introduction to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Fee Chon used power point slides (DAY 01) to introduce participants to the topic Cartagena Protocol on Bio-safety. For IT participants, it was the first exposure to the topic and was very important. She delivered an interesting presentation based on her experience and anecdotic examples. It was a very good learning experience for all the team.

Interactive Module 1 on Cartagena Protocol

Cathy presented the session on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Subsequent to this presentation, participants used the electronic Interactive Module 1 to reinforce their understanding of the Protocol. Ms. Lopez and Mr. Sano assisted participants with questions during this interactive exercise. Subsequent to this computer-based exercise, participants had the opportunity to ask questions, make comments and discuss the Protocol as well as the exercise itself. It is recommended that potential new RA candidates need to be encouraged to repeat the exercise at their own pace the master the material.

Bio-safety Acronyms

Cathy prepared written material on a flipchart board to raise awareness of some of the terminology and acronyms that were introduced during day one. Participants appreciated the resource provided as they were not familiar with the terminology (Output No.)

Workshop navigation meeting

Cathy explained the workshop navigation process and invited the four participants to gather, to select a reporter 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 15 minutes, a representative of the group met with the training team and shared their feedback. A discussion ensued about several of the issues raised. The session concluded with a report on the workshop navigation meeting. The first day the participants were exhausted for the intense amount of new material. Corrective measures were implemented next day to attend participants concerns.

DAY 2 – Tuesday February 6, 2007.

Opening

Charles Aubin began with a recapitulation of the session held the first day. He highlighted the main points covered the day before. It was agreed that a summary of the previous day would be presented by one of the participants every morning.

3rd Session on Biosafety

Leonard continued explaining several aspects of biotechnology and the environment. He explained the different GMOs currently produced and potential environmental impacts.

First Introduction of BCH Operational Handbook, BCH-MOU

Cathy presented an overview of the (D02) Bio-safety Project Operational Handbook. The steps in the Bio-safety Project Cycle and the outcomes of each step were presented and discussed. It was explained that the Handbook provides a rationale for the BCH Project; briefly outlines the reporting options; clarifies the roles of the NEA, the NEA Focal Point, the BCH Task Force, and the IT staff. Each participant had a copy of the handbook and reference was made throughout the presentation to the 10 forms that are found in the manual and which must be completed by the participating countries as they proceed through the process of moving toward compliance with the Cartagena Protocol. During the presentation Lydia, Ingo, Lamine and Alex intervened complementing the presentation as it was developed.

Questions and comments were encouraged throughout the session. A document on the MOU was distributed (D02). Following Cathy's presentation Lydia then took the participants through key points of the MOU including the forms that must be filled out by the country in order for it to qualify for funding from the project. It was emphasized that Regional Advisors may be invited to assist a country before work begins on the MOU, while work is underway and after it is completed. Once again, the role of the advisors was reinforced – they are to serve as advisors and not as decision makers. Upon satisfactory completion of the MOU, 75% of the funds requested are released and the 12 months project cycle begins. Lydia emphasized that Countries that need assistance from the Bio-safety Project must sign the MOU.

Introduction to the BCH

Lamine presented the session on the Introduction to the BCH. After the presentation, participants used the electronic Interactive Module 2 to reinforce their understanding of what the BCH was and how Parties to the Protocol should use it to fulfill their obligations under the Protocol. Subsequent to this computer-based exercise, participants had the opportunity to ask questions, make comments and discuss the BCH as well as the exercise itself.

Finding Information Using the BCH

Lamine began this session with a power point introduction (D02) and requested the participants work through two case studies. Participants went directly to their computers. This session was facilitated using Case Studies 1 and 2 (D02), which had been developed as part of the BCH training material. The sessions went well. A brief feedback session on the two case studies was conducted at the end of the session and the participants felt the two cases were very helpful.

Workshop navigation meeting

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

DAY 3 –Wednesday February 7, 2007

The morning began with a recapitulation of the session held the second day by Chantal. She highlighted the main points covered the day before.

Using the Central Portal/Registering Information

Lamine facilitated the two main sessions of the day to introduce participants to the use of the central portal with the help of a Power Point presentation (D02) and four case studies (D02).

He explained what the Management Center was. The Management Centre can be accessed by people with login credentials. He talked about the two categories of users that can add and delete information at the Management Centre, i.e. the BCH-NFP and the NAU. BCH-NFP account cannot be created by a national authorized user. The BCH-NFP account is created by Secretariat of the Convention through an official request letter sent by the Party to the protocol. The BCH-NFP is the only role responsible for publishing and ensuring its integrity. Each country has its unique way to administrate the BCH according to national decisions. Only the BCH-NFP can create NAUs. He showed how to create a NAU.

National authorized users –NAU

Explanation of data ownership, how to edit public records, data entry, etc. was presented.

In order to use the Training Site, a BCH training account is required for the RA. By default, such an account is created for all IT RAs. When the account is activated, the system issues a temporary password which grants access.

He explained that for the training site, generic accounts are created at the request of the RA ahead of the mission, in contrast to the production BCH system which uses the email address as a username for communications reasons between the system and users of the management center. It was explained that some fields are required when creating NAUs. The roles assigned to the newly created NAU control what records this user could manage in the BCH database. Therefore, there exists the possibility for the BCH-NFP to ensure the correct access by defining the granularity through the role attribution.

Participants had to play different roles related to input and retrieving information. The feedback showed that the exercises were seen as very useful. It was stressed that alternative back up methods are available in a CD ROM in circumstances where the internet communication is not available.

IT RA: Introduction to Common Formats and Controlled Vocabularies

This topic was briefly talked about, but not in details. It was not a presentation on its own, as initially planned, but was instead rolled into the presentation on the 4+1 options for data exchange with the BCH.

The idea was to have future IT RAs understand that the Central Portal of the BCH was engineered around the concept of common formats and controlled vocabularies as far as data architecture goes, with the clear intent to have some consistency of the data

organization at the physical and the logical level to facilitate data management in a more effective and efficient manner.

They were also referred to the central portal for specific details and structure of the data dictionary; Lamine also mentioned the other type of help and reference documentation available on the site of the BCH-CP, especially Web Services specifications.

CPB – BCH RA Case Studies

Case studies developed by Alex and Anastasia at the Bangkok meeting were used on a practical hands-on training. The participant used the BCH central portal to complete the assignment.

Options for Information interchange with Central Portal

Lamine presented a session to explain the different Options for Information interchange with Central Portal. He also talked about the different donor applications.

Workshop navigation meeting

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

Interviews

Each of the new IT and CPB RAs was interviewed by Ingo, Fred, Prakash and Yenni.

DAY 4 – Thursday February 8, 2007

Patrick Aubin presented the outcome of the navigation meeting the evening before.

IT RA: Lab Work on Options 3 and 4 (main room)

Lamine and Fred setup a hands-on lab so that IT RAs get a feel for the options presented the previous day, and for them to familiarize themselves with one of the donor applications. It was decided that the nBCH application be used for that lab, as it is a versatile tool which allowed several options to be executed, such as option #2, 3, 4, +1. Computers were prepared to have two groups work on the application. The documentation was handed out to them, with a small guidance on the system, and it was requested that at the end of the exercise, they successfully register a record of their choosing with the BCH through the application, using the “holy see” account to that effect.

The second part of the hands-on training was to have them establish a web presence and display the content of the database by customizing the ASP template included in the package. The prerequisite task involved setting up IIS (Web Server on MS Windows) properly to effect that task.

It is to be noted that some computers and laptops were not fully configured, but the 2 computers on which the lab could be successfully completed were identified, and the two groups were directed to these machines to ease the process.

CPB RA: Cathy presented to Chantal an overview of the 4 options to make national information available at the BCH central Portal. She also explained coaching skills, work relationships and collaboration in carrying out National workshops. A deep explanation of the EPA, USDA and FDA agencies was provided. Cathy noted some frequently asked questions at the National workshops and provided information at different web sites. She noted the responsibility for accuracy of information delivered to participants. Each of the main articles of the CPB was reviewed in detail and drafted hypothetical case studies. Important aspects discussed and reviewed were labeling, transit and public awareness.

Presentation skills session

Cathy facilitated a session on presentation skills, beginning with a brainstorming exercise highlighting the main elements of an effective presentation. The main elements of an effective presentation (content, audience, venue, delivery, visual aids and choreography) were discussed in detail as the cards were read and a copy was shared with the participants (D04). A Presentation Skills Checklist was also distributed.

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

Cathy distributed a copy of the presentation skills checklist and suggested that participants use it as a guide for preparing their feedback on the presentations of their colleagues.

Training and Management Material and Tools

Fred Vogel presented a basic outline of MOU and related forms. He explained the kind of information found at Anubis such as financial, task force group, workshops calendar, etc. ANUBIS stands for a new UNEP biosafety information system. The site stores information on Country MOU, forms, dates, missions.

Before a mission a FORM 9 is uploaded in the system with TOR and RA choice. Form 9 refers to mission request. The Security Clearance is done by the Task Manager. When you are back from mission you need to do a mission report.

The country delivers a mission report and you complete a certificate of payment. All these three documents trigger payment.

Interactive Modules and NETOP

Lamine Sano described the process of being chosen by the country to facilitate their national workshop and as such what it entailed in terms of technical preparedness.

One aspect that was explained to participants was the importance of having sufficient time to test the network, computers, and room settings, and of the utmost importance, the quality of the Internet link, which could make or break the training workshop activity...

The importance of planning the trip with MKI to get on the field at least 1 full day ahead, such that all of these technical potential issues are sorted out before the start of the workshop was repeatedly stressed. The national contact also need be informed of the necessity of ensuring that the facility is made available 1 full day ahead of the scheduled dates and strongly encouraged to select a quality Internet service provider with a reasonable speed service.

Lamine then proceeded to showing participants how to deploy the workshop material on the computer, i.e. the Flash Interactive Modules, and more specifically Netop School software.

He explained the advantages of having control over the workshop activity by forcing participants to follow presentations and discussions instead of being distracted by internet browsing activities. Netop School was perfect in that regard as it allowed facilitators to have control of the computing environment.

Installation and features of Netop School software were showcased, its numerous functionalities gone over, and participants were given the possibility of trying it out for themselves.

BCH OFFLINE CD-ROM Version

Fred Vogel talked about and demonstrated the new tool available in the arsenal of the RAs to assist in situations where the internet connection is lost, or performing poorly. This was especially needed, as numerous reports, complaints showed the absolute need for such a tool. Several requests were also made in that regard.

The Offline CD-ROM is a reliable copy of the production BCH-CP at a specific given time. It is a quarterly snapshot release of the BCH. It comes in very handy, and feedback has been positive so far as to its usefulness.

Fred showed in a live demonstration the several features available on the portable BCH, and its limitations, for example, it is only available in English at the moment, and it is impossible to simulate data entry labs using the offline version.

Workshop navigation meeting

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

DAY 5 – Friday February 9, 2007

Patrick Pee was invited to present a summary from the previous day.

Presentation of the Assignment Presentation Skills

Each participant had an opportunity to deliver the presentation they had prepared and to receive feedback from their peers. Ingo noted that each presenter used a creative manner to deliver their presentations. Several suggestions were made to improve the presentations such as timing, gestures, voice modulation. It was explained that all of us is still working to improve our skills.

Workshop Deployment Methodology

Cathy brainstormed with participants a BCH Training workshop deployment methodology and tips. A flipchart was used to summarize the main methodological aspects that participants considered were important in the preparation of a workshop. Mr. Sano y Ms. Lopez complemented and reinforced the concepts and methodological steps for a successful planning. After the introduction participants were given one example of session design and one hour to complete individual assignments where the planning will be applied in an hypothetical situation according to their IT or CPB expertise (Anex --).

Assignment:

Country-Level deployment of training and capacity building

Based on the example of session design sheet for the 'US database and website template', come up with a plan for a country-level deployment of training (e.g. it should include an agenda, objectives and a storyboard) on the following:

IT Regional Advisors:

- You are visiting Freelandia to meet with the BCH Task Force for the first time to explain the 4 options as well as the BCH project in general. A CPB Advisor will not accompany you on this mission.

CPB Regional Advisors:

- You are visiting Freelandia to meet with the BCH Task Force for the first time to explain the CPB and the BCH project in general. Only a CPB Advisor has been requested.

In plenary session participants presented their assignments. Comments and feedback were given to each presenter.

After coffee break the participants were divided in two groups and given directions to prepare two role play assignments the first one illustrating the process of building new relationships between a CPB consultant and IT consultant with BCH personnel at national level, and the second one about the local capacity for sustaining the national link.

At the end of the session the team shared their experiences as IT or RA Regional Advisors. Cathy presented a power point presentation entitled “My experience as CPB regional advisor”. Ingo, Prakash, Alex, Lamine and Fred complemented the presentation. Comments and questions were raised as the presentation was developed.

ROLE PLAY ASSIGNMENT “Consultation Skills”

Role Play 1

Create a role-play illustrating the first meeting between a CPB consultant and an IT consultant with two persons who represent the BCH personnel of a national government. Illustrate how you would begin **building this new relationship** and focus the discussion on identifying and coming to an **agreement on the current bio-safety situation** in the country.

- ◆ Find out in advance if the MOU has been signed
- ◆ Get clear on any details of the mission in advance
- ◆ Check with the Regional Coordinator
- ◆ Important to emphasize the national benefits of pursuing the BCH Project
- ◆ Be clear that inputting data is often a less challenging process than countries anticipate and that the BCH is very valuable for retrieving information
- ◆ Again, be clear that any decisions have to be made by the country.

Role Play 2

Assume that a relationship has been developed between the consultants and national counterparts. The process of developing the national link to the BCH is underway. The consultants are **concerned about the local capacity for sustaining the national link**, because they have learned that one of the IT people they have been working with has a possibility of a high paying job in the private sector and will likely leave the government soon. The government representatives are also concerned about staff turnover. The discussion should focus on identifying ways that back-up personnel can be prepared to take over the functions performed by the current national BCH staff.

- ◆ It is important to clarify roles of all the actors as early in the consultancy as possible
- ◆ Our role as RAs is to help the country select options – what are the advantages, disadvantages (long and short-term), costs, staffing implications of selecting an option
- ◆ Important to have prior contact with the BCH Project before the consultation mission
- ◆ Countries will push you to make a decision because they need an urgent solution to an issue
- ◆ The nBCH may not be well prepared
- ◆ On the issue of sustainability, explore transition options – who will run the system if a current key person leaves?

Report Writing

Cathy brainstormed with participants the steps to complete successful report writing. Each step of the report writing process was discussed. The workshop session on report writing was a good introduction to a workable standard reporting format.

Overall Synthesis, Evaluation and Closure

The workshop concluded with comments from several of the participants who expressed their appreciation of the training team. Lamine and Cathy thanked the participants for their continued hard work, enthusiasm and commitment and for making it a truly pleasant workshop. The workshop ended at 17:30 PM. However the participants were still taking care of the DSA arrangements with Ingo.

Review of Expectations and Concerns

Pictures

Individual and Group pictures were taken for the workshop records.

Participant's Evaluation

All participants were asked to fill out evaluation forms to appraise the level and quality of participation of their peers. These forms were collected by Prakash.

Course Evaluation

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked to fill out evaluation forms. These were collected and evaluated by Prakash.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The workshop objectives were successfully met but additional practice is required by participants prior to accomplish a mission individually. Specifically, participants' knowledge on the Cartagena Protocol was consolidated. They became familiar with the structure and content of the BCH, Central Portal, software applications and different options available to make available information to the central portal and how to use the BCH to fulfill national obligations under the Cartagena Protocol. They were given all training materials and guidance on how to replicate this training exercise for other national groups.

Participants need be encouraged to practice the training modules and material delivered.

Not all invited participants were able to attend due to visa requirements.

Recommendations

Participants need to practice the materials covered prior to initiate the National workshop replication.

For the new RAs first mission, team them up with more senior RAs for a practical learning experience, and for coaching on the field. Monitor their performance and progress through countries and the RA team leader's feedback.

Lessons Learnt

We again learnt that is very important to be flexible and adopt the schedule to current situation. During workshop several changes were made to the schedule to have more time for discussions and activities deemed critical to the success of the new RA trainees on the field.

Navigation meetings proved to be efficient to identify potential issues and to take corrective measures as necessary as suggested by participants.

Participants were very appreciative of Interactive modules as an effective way to learn, and requested additional such training material in other areas such as biotechnology.

Observations

There were problems with the prompt payment of the DSA due to inefficient work of MKI.

All of the materials, photos and outputs were captured on a CD and given to the participants at the end of the training.

Annex A:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

- 1 Ms. Chantal Andrianarivo
Chargé de la Recherche et de la Biodiversité
Ministère de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts
Association Nationale pour la Gestion des Aires
Protégées (ANGAP)
BP 1424
101 Antananarivo
Madagascar

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2 Mr. Charles Aubin KOUASSI
IT Consultant
23 BP
4173 Abidjan 23
Côte d'Ivoire | 3 Mr. Kouadio Hervé Patrick KOUASSI
IT Advisor Specialist
BP 202
Bingerville
Côte d'Ivoire |
| 4 Mr. Patrick Pee
Information Management Specialist
22 Jalan 20/24, Petaling Jaya
46300, Selangor D.E.
Malaysia | |

RESOURCE PERSONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| 5 Ms. Ileana Catalina Lopez
Regional Advisor
Km. 15.8 Carretera a El Salvador
Condominio la Alhambra, Casa No. 7
Santa Catarina Pinula, Guatemala | 6 Mr. Lamine Sano
Regional Advisor
BP 1340 Cidex 1
Abidjan 06
Côte d'Ivoire |
| 7 Alex Owusu-Biney
Regional Coordinator for Africa, Biosafety
Division of GEF Coordination
P. O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya | |

UNEP-GEF

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|
| 7 | Ms. Fee Chon Low
Project Manager
UNEP-GEF Implementation Project of
National Biosafety Frameworks
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 8 | Mr. Leonard O'Garro Ph. D
Caribbean Regional Biosafety
Coordinator
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Barbados |
| 9 | Ms. Lydia Eibl-Kamolleh
Fund Manager
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Nairobi, Kenya | 10 | Mr. Ingo Piegeler
BCH Task Manager for Africa
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland |
| 11 | Mr. Frédéric Vogel
BCH IT Specialist
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | 12 | Mr. Prakash Bista
BCH Task Manager for Asia and CEE
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland |
| 13 | Ms. Yenny Ezquerro
Administrative Assistant
UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit
Geneva, Switzerland | | |

Annex B

Expectations:

Find and search additional expertise and input to fully implement the BCH project in the respective regions.

Be able to know the topic.

Knowledge sharing.

Understand CPB issues better

Share and exchange experience

Ras will be equipped for their job at the end of the workshop

Clarity, encompassing real life situations.

Understand Article 20 and to be able to explain clearly

Understand what countries most need to know about BCH

Help people to live well in a safe environment with BCH-GEF Project

Concerns:

We have only one week and therefore we need to maximize use of time

Practical aspect / Technical implementation

Insufficient time

Time Frame

Successful delivery of the BCH Project in a short time

To be able to be good and come in periodically

Counterparts, commitment, exposure

Comply work / Task to Ras

How to make sure BCH projects fit in with other biosafety projects

Succeed after the workshop

To be in a team to convince countries to accept the implementation of the BCH