



United Nations
Environment Programme

UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity Building for the Effective
Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)



Global Environment
Facility

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

**Report on the
4th BCH Training of Trainers Workshop for
Information Technology and Cartagena Protocol
on Biosafety Regional Advisors**

Conducted at:
Geneva, Switzerland
8-12 October 2007

Prepared by:

Vida Marolt, IT RA
Ileana Catalina Lopez, CPB RA,
Stephen Vitoria, IT RA

Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Summary	4
Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
Methodology	6
Narrative Summary of Workshop Proceedings	
Day One – Monday October 8, 2007	7
Day Two – Tuesday October 9, 2007	11
Day Three – Wednesday October 10, 2007	15
Day Four – Thursday October 11, 2007	16
Day Five – Friday, October 12, 2007	17
Conclusions and Recommendations	18
Lessons Learnt	19
Other Lessons Learnt and Recommendations	19
Annex 1: Agenda	22
Annex 2: Workshop Objectives	25
Annex 3: Workshop Evaluation Summary	26
Annex 4: List of Participants	27
Annex 5: Participant’s Expectations and Concerns	30
Annex 6: Terms of Reference	32

List of Acronyms

AIA	Advanced Informed Agreement
ANUBIS	A New UNEP Biosafety Information System
BCH	Bio-safety Clearing-House
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEE	Central East Europe
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

Summary

This report presents a summary of the facilitation services provided as IT and CPB Regional Advisors at the workshop held at Geneva, Switzerland 8-12 October, 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 Latin America, Pacific Islands and Asia to assist the BCH training activities in these regions. Thirteen participants from these regions attended the meeting.

The workshop covered the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, highlighting the importance of the Biosafety Clearing House mechanisms. The event forms part of the project for "Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety".

The UNEP-GEF workshop methodology consisted of presentations, group discussions, hands-on training, role plays, assignments and regular feedback sessions. Regional advisors were hired for the duration of the workshop to act as facilitators. They were responsible for developing agenda, training sessions, and assisting participants with special focus on the CPB, Operational Handbook, Presentation Skills, IT technologies related to the CPB and shared experiences as Regional Advisors.

Acknowledgements

First, our appreciation and sincere thanks to all of the Resource Persons who provided substantive inputs to the course in particular, Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Leonard O'Garro, Ernesto Ocampo, Ingo Piegeler, Frédéric Vogel, Prakash Bista, Sharon Oseku, David Duthie, and Pascale Unger.

We want to thank especially the participants who attended the course and displayed such a high level of dedication, commitment, interest and enthusiasm.

Introduction

The UNEP-GEF BCH project organized the 4th Training of Trainers workshop. Thirteen potential new Regional Advisors were identified and invited to participate in this workshop. The aim of the workshop was to build capacities of participants to enable them to provide support and advice to countries. Participants belong to Latin/America, Pacific and Asia.

Methodology

1. Planning

Ms. López was in charge of first drafting of Agenda and Storyboard, context setting and support for planning storyboard and methodology for the workshop. She also prepared all sessions related to presentation skills and workshop assignments.

2. Developing Material for Training

Before attending the workshop Ms. López prepared a power point presentation including experiences as RA. She also prepared an activity to deliver commonly used acronyms, instructions for navigation meeting, card and chard technique. Additional materials were prepared to introduce trainees with presentation skills, and two assignments were prepared to evaluate this session. She also prepared a chart with responsibilities for personnel in charge of delivering the workshop.

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 October 8, 2007

Opening session

The workshop was opened by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Project Manager from the UNEP – GEF Biosafety Clearing House Project (United Nations Environment Programme - Global Environment Facility). Jyoti welcomed participants to the training and introduced the resource personnel.

Mr. Fred Vogel presented an overview of the workshop main objectives and agenda.

Ms. López introduced the training methodology 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 three cards, each of a different color, requesting information as follows:

1. Orange Card: Write your Name, Country and Professional Background.
2. Yellow card: *Give one expectation you have of this workshop, i.e. one that you expect to get out of this training course.*
3. 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 and documented in ANNEX 5 – Participants Expectations and Concerns.

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 posted on 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 he indicated that UNEP was formed 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 the UNDP.

GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety

David Duthie made a presentation on the three UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects to implement the GEF strategy. He explained the Development project which is 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. He noted that the NBFs must not only look good, but more importantly, they have to work. Developing an NBF is considerably easier than implementing it. The aim is to produce fully operational NBFs. David explained the elements of an operational NBF and also mentioned some national level activities. Finally, he emphasized the importance of drafting a flexible law that can accommodate changes in regulations.

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 received Assignment No. 1. Participants had 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.

Giving and receiving feedback was introduced with a role play presented by Vida and Stephen.

Introduction to Biotechnology and Biotechnology Issues – Part 1

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, products such as wine and cheese. The second wave was the use of biotechnology to produce antibiotics and the third and most recent wave is that of genetic engineering. He explained the differences between traditional biotechnology and transgenic manipulation, LMOs and GMOs. He noted that no historical information of these new forms of life is available, unlike the forms we have seen before. Each event behaves differently and we cannot apply 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 GMOs; spreading of transgenes from GMO to unrelated species; the development of herbicide resistance in weeds and the development of insecticide resistance in pests. These concerns are covered by the CPB. The presentation was done in two parts and was greatly appreciated by the participants.

Introduction to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

Cathy used power point slides (DAY 01) to introduce participants to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. For IT participants, it was the first exposure to the topic and was very important. She encouraged participants to review the hard copies of the CPB as she was mentioning the different articles.

Interactive Module 1 on Cartagena Protocol

Subsequent to the CPB presentation, participants used the electronic ‘Interactive Module 1’ to reinforce their understanding of the Protocol. All RAs assisted participants with questions during this interactive exercise. Following 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 and master the material.

The following points were raised by the participants during the Q & A session:

- The participants generally thought that the interactive module on the Cartagena Protocol was a comprehensive and effective teaching tool.
- The questions and lessons should be supported by references to the particular protocol article(s) to which the question or lesson applies. This makes cross

referencing the interactive module's lessons with the actual protocol much easier, and leads to a much deeper understanding of the protocol.

- When marking questions, the response, "That's not completely right." was felt to be ambiguous and not a proper description of the answer. A more explicit description of the result should be stated, eg: "*You answer is only partially correct. See above for all the correct answers for this question.*"
- A short quiz could be included after each module to test knowledge of that module only.
- In Spanish, the term "Commercial Growing," could be confused with "Cultivation", and one of the participants expressed a belief that this was confusing, as they are not the same thing.
- The English language of the questions is sometimes too complex, eg: question 5: "When is the precautionary principle applied? When there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty..." and then the participant has to select the correct sentence fragment to complete the question. These exercises are complex due to the complexity of the English sentence, not the complexity of the subject material. It was felt that simpler English would make the questions much easier to answer, without diluting the knowledge being tested in the question.
- There was a request that question 5 be rewritten with clearer English. Here is a first attempt:

(Reference: see CPB articles 1, 10 and 11). If a Party of import cannot be sure of the effect of an LMO on biological diversity, including possible risks to human health, then that Party:

- must allow the import of the LMO into its country. The Party of import must be absolutely certain about the risks associated with an LMO before it can prohibit its import.
- must prohibit the import of the LMO into its country. The Party of import must be absolutely certain about the risks associated with an LMO before it can allow its import.
- must allow the importer to decide whether the LMO is to be imported or not. A lack of certainty regarding the risks associated with an LMO means that the Party of import is unable to make any decision at all.
- must decide whether to allow or prohibit the import of the LMO using the available information. The Party of import has the right to allow or prohibit the importation of any LMO into its country, even if the scientific information regarding the LMO is incomplete.

Bio-safety Acronyms

Cathy prepared a session to introduce terminology and acronyms most frequently used in the BCH context. She divided participants in two groups, gave them the acronyms and asked to find the matching definition spread around the computer room. The winning group received a prize the next day. The objective of the session was to raise awareness of some of the terminology and acronyms that were introduced during day one. Participants appreciated the session as many of them were not familiar with the terminology.

Workshop navigation meeting

Cathy explained the workshop navigation process and invited participants to gather, to select a reporter and to discuss the events of the first training day. Comments on any aspect of the day's 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 by the intense amount of new material. A number of corrective measures were implemented the next day to address the participant's concerns.

DAY 2 – Tuesday October 9, 2007.

The session began with a recapitulation of the session held the first day. Tony presented a recapitulation of the previous day.

A summary of the navigation meeting was also presented. General impressions were: "great, very good, relieved, satisfied, and happy the day was over." It was agreed that a summary of the previous day would be presented by one of the participants every morning.

Biosafety and the Environment Part 2

Leonard continued explaining several aspects of biotechnology and the environment. The main focus of his presentation was Earth Summit, Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The objective of the module was to highlight both values of biodiversity and biosafety issues surrounding the adoption of LMOs for release into the environment. He talked about what where the biosafety issues, which at the moment represent just concerns and projections. He explained that the purpose of his presentation was to provide awareness about biodiversity to new potential RA advisors without expecting them to become biotechnology experts. The presentation included a section on the origin of genetic resources from the different world regions. The contribution of biodiversity is a global effort. The purpose of the CPB is to conserve all this global biodiversity. He mentioned several multi lateral environmental agreements contributing to conservation of biodiversity. At the end he linked the nature and types of

LMO. He talked about potential risks posed to the environment by LMOs such as persistence, invasiveness, reduction in biodiversity, transfer of introduced gene to other plant species which may in turn become persistent or invasive.

Questions were raised about centres of origin of different crop types. Maria de Lourdes commented that it was very important to understand the interaction between agro ecosystems. Leonard talked about interactions in natural communities not in agro-ecosystems.

UNEP-GEF Biosafety Projects.

Jyoti talked about the BCH project objectives which are primarily to develop core human resources and strengthen national infrastructure. There are 139 countries eligible, and 120 endorsement letters had been received to participate in the BCH project. She demonstrated a slide with the participant countries. There are 16 countries in Latin-American, 48 in Africa, 25 in Asia, 14 in the Pacific, 22 in CEE and 14 countries in the Caribbean. She talked about the training package including background material, 10 training modules, 2 interactive modules, 12 ready reference guides, 8 discussion points, 22 case studies, 8 quiz questions and the Moodle web site.

Introduction to BCH

Stephen 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.

Interactive modules comments and remarks.

- Good guide
- Material is well done, effective, efficient and easygoing.
- Excellent session, good pacing concise and insightful.
- Lesson 5: instruction to drag is displayed too quickly: needs to be shown a bit longer or else could be missed.
- Module 4 (sunflower growing concerning illegal transboundary movement) sentences is awkward and needs to be re-written.
- Question 1 does not say that multiple answers apply.
- Question 14: confusion because declaration does not have a time frame but decision does.
- Lesson 2(see: 3 circles) the blue one only displays opportunities and not the obligations
- The Spanish version only has 19 questions instead of 20.

Presentation of Assignment No. 1

Each participant had an opportunity to deliver the presentation they had prepared and to receive feedback from their peers. Several suggestions were made to improve the

presentations such as timing, gestures, voice modulation. It was explained that all of us are still working to improve our skills.

BCH Surfing the BCH Central Portal and Finding Information

Vida showed the current BCH central portal. She explained the objectives of the Module. Users will learn how to navigate into the BCH Central Portal. She showed the new version of the Central Portal. She explained it was much easier to navigate. She showed the old BCH Central Portal. The link for the new BCH central portal is <http://bchdev.cbd.int>. The password is Bonn2008



Biosafety Clearing-House  **Convention on Biological Diversity**

Home
The BCH
The Protocol
Finding Information
Registering Information
Resources
Help

Welcome to the BCH Central Portal

The Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) is a mechanism set up by the [Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety](#) to facilitate the exchange of information on Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and assist the Parties to better comply with their obligations under the Protocol. Global access to a variety of scientific, technical, environmental, legal and capacity building information is provided in all 6 of the UN languages. BCH account holders can create and manage records in the BCH through the [Management Centre](#).

Latest news

- 2007-03-27 [March release of the Biosafety Clearing-House...](#)
- 2007-03-07 [Costa Rica - "Convención Interinstitucional para el Desarrollo de Capacidad Nacional" sobre el Centro de Intercambio de Información sobre Seguridad de la Biotecnología para Costa Rica...](#)
- 2007-02-28 [Final Report of the second meeting of the BCH-IAC now available...](#)

Latest Additions

- 2007-9-24 [Biosafety Information Resource...](#)
- 2007-9-24 [Biosafety Information Resource...](#)
- 2007-9-24 [Guatemala - Capacity Building Project...](#)
- 2007-9-24 [Panama - National Focal Point...](#)
- 2007-9-23 [Albania - Biosafety Expert...](#)
- 2007-9-23 [Albania - Biosafety Expert...](#)
- 2007-9-21 [France - Law, Regulation or Guideline...](#)

[More additions...](#)

march'07 release

LMO & Gene Registry

Biosafety Clearing-House Convention on Biological Diversity

Home
The BCH
The Protocol
Finding Information
Registering Information
Resources
Help

Finding Information | Home | Finding Information

Finding Information

Welcome to the 'Finding Information' section of the BCH. Here a wide variety of scientific, technical, environmental, legal and capacity building information can be accessed.

National Contacts
Follow this link to search for: (i) National Focal Points, (ii) Competent National Authorities and (iii) National Biosafety Websites and Databases

Laws and Regulations
Follow this link to search for: (i) National Laws, Regulations and (ii) Guidelines and Bilateral, Regional and Multilateral Agreements

Communications from Parties
Follow this link to search for: (i) Decisions on LMOs under Advance Informed Agreement; (ii) Decisions on LMOs for

LMOs
Follow this link to search for: (i) the LMO-UID Registry; (ii) Gene Registry and (iii) Organism Registry

Biosafety Information Resource Centre
Follow this link to access electronic catalogues of biosafety-related publications and information resources including: news services; e-mail listservs; online databases and search engines; reports and case studies; journals and newsletters; and teaching materials (manuals, toolkits and presentations). Its objective is increase the accessibility and utilization of available biosafety information and resources by policymakers, educators, researchers, and the

Case Studies 1 and 22 were presented to participants and later on one of them presented the results.

Assignment No. 2

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. Ms. Lopez complemented and reinforced the concepts and methodological steps for a successful planning. Assignment No. 2 was delivered by region.

Workshop navigation meeting

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

DAY 3 –Wednesday October 10, 2007

The morning began with a recapitulation of the session held the second day by Emma.

Announcements were made such as the participant's list, a restaurant venue for dinner and the change of venue for the session on Friday.

Management Centre : Using the Central Portal/Registering Information

Stephen 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 and four case studies. He explained what is the Management Center. The Management Centre can be accessed by people with authorized logins. He talked about the kind of users that can add and delete information at the Management Centre. He mentioned that there are two types of users, the NFP and the NAU. NFPs cannot be created by a national user. The NFP account is created by the Secretariat of the Convention with a letter sent by a Party to the protocol. The NFP is responsible for publishing the data and is the only user who is responsible for publishing the information. Each country has its unique way to administrate the BCH according to national decisions. Only the NFP can create NAUs. He showed how to create a NAU.

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.

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 you require a BCH training account. When your account is activated you are issued a password that provides access. He explained that the training site does not normally use email addresses as user account names. It was explained that some fields are required when creating NAUs. The roles control what records you control in the database.

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

A presentation on Common Formats and Controlled Vocabularies was made by Fred. He demonstrated some examples and their usage.

IT RAs

IT participants worked on lab work on options 3 and 4 lead by Ernesto.

CPB RA Case Study – Cathy and Vida

Case study No. 20 was developed by CPB trainees. The 7 participants were divided into 2 groups. Participants appreciated the session. The case provoked several questions and discussions.

Workshop navigation meeting

The day ended with the daily navigation meeting.

DAY 4 – Thursday October 11, 2007

Ilyas made a recap of the previous day. Terrance presented the outcome of the navigation meeting the evening before.

Cathy presented the agenda to be cover during the day.

Vida made general presentation on Hermes.

Role Play Hermes. Vida and Stephen presented a role play to introduce Hermes to participants. In role play all features were demonstrated. Participants were split in four groups and asked to prepare a National Web Site using Hermes. A prize was offered to the web site judged as the better by participants.

Vida demonstrated use of the Ajax plug in – examples of usages on existing web page were shown.

Training and Management Material and Tools

Fred Vogel presented a basic outline of MOU and related forms. He explained the kind of information found in 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, etc... Before a mission a FORM 9 is uploaded in the system with TOR and RA choice. Form 9 refers to the 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.

Interviews

Each of the new IT and CPB RAs were interviewed by Ingo, Fred, and Ernesto.

Participants were divided in four groups and given directions to prepare consultation skills role plays. The role plays were well received by participants.

CPB and IT Regional advisors share their experiences with participants. Questions and comments were made at the end of the presentations.

Group picture was taken.

Workshop navigation meeting

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

DAY 5 – Friday October 12, 2007

A summary from the previous day and navigation meeting outcome was presented.

Presentation of the Assignment No.2 Presentation Skills

Each group had the opportunity to deliver the assignment they had prepared and to receive feedback from their peers. Several suggestions were made to improve the presentations such as layout of power point presentations, agenda, contents, material, etc.

First Introduction of BCH Operational Handbook, BCH-MOU

Ingo presented an overview of the Biosafety Project Operational Handbook. The steps in the Biosafety 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. 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.

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. Ingo emphasized that Countries that need assistance from the Biosafety Project must sign the MOU. Ingo then discussed the procedure for closing projects.

Report Writing

The workshop session on report writing was presented by Jyoti.

Peer evaluation

All participants were asked to fill out evaluation forms to appraise the level and quality of participation of their peers from their region. Forms were given to Ernesto for the BCH Team's consideration.

Course Evaluations

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked to fill out evaluation forms. These were collected and evaluated by Vida. A summary of responses is given in Annex 3.

Overall Synthesis, Evaluation and Closure

The workshop concluded with comments from Jyoti. She thanked the participants for their continued hard work, enthusiasm and commitment and for making it a truly pleasant workshop. The workshop ended at 16:30 PM.

Conclusions

The workshop objectives were successfully met but additional practice is required by participants prior to accomplish a mission individually. Specifically, participant's 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 to be encouraged to practice the training modules and material delivered.

Recommendations

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

Lessons Learnt

We again learnt that it is very important to be flexible and adopt the schedule to current situation. During workshop several changes were made to schedule to have more time for discussions and guided tour to the Palais des Nations (a wish expressed by the majority of participants).

Navigation meetings proved to be an efficient method to recognize potential issues and to adopt suggestions if applicable.

Interactive modules were appreciated by participants as effective way to learn, some additional were required.

Case Studies are also good way of learning – they show real life scenarios. Case Study 20 was found to be very efficient in recapitulating the knowledge of a Party's obligations under the Cartagena Protocol and not only as an example of a new Party's obligations.

Other Lessons Learnt & Recommendations

1. Workshop Delivery

In relation to the actual delivery of the training workshop, the following lessons were learnt and recommendations made:

i. Presentations

Many of the presentations that were shown to the trainees contained a huge volume of information, usually in text form. The problem with this is that the presenter often just reads out the slide, while the audience reads ahead of the presenter because they can read faster than the presenter can speak. The result is that the audience and the presenter are out of synchronization. This is a very common problem and leads to the presenter's message being lost.

Solutions to this problem include the increased use of graphics and the limiting of text to only the minimum to support the presenter's message. The use of text and graphics is especially effective as each is processed by different parts of the brain, so reinforcing the message. In addition, graphics are usually much easier to remember than words, so helping retention.

Many good guides exist for writing presentations, eg:

<http://www.guidestar.org/DisplayArticle.do?articleId=1148>

A number of books have also been published on this subject, eg:

Presentation Zen: Simple Ideas on Presentation Design and Delivery

(<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0321525655/103-6148611-3957463?ie=UTF8&tag=garrreynoldsc-20&linkCode=xml2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0321525655>)

and

Why Most PowerPoint Presentations Suck

(http://www.amazon.com/Why-Most-PowerPoint-Presentations-Suck/dp/0615142230/ref=pd_sim_b_shvl_njs_title_3/105-5582264-6710051)

People only remember about 10% of what is said to them, so presentations which are short (limited text) and which use images to reinforce the message, are usually much more effective.

ii. Headphones

The interactive modules would have been more effective if headphones had been available to the participants. While not essential, headphones would have added a non visual element to the teaching, again helping to reinforce the message. In addition, the use of headphones would have shown the future trainers the full capabilities of the interactive modules.

iii. Navigation Meetings

On the first couple of days, the end of day navigation meetings were held in “public”, ie: in view of all the trainees. While this is not a bad teaching tool to show the trainees how navigation meetings should be conducted, a problem arose in that the onlookers interrupted the meeting with their own comments, instead of relying on their spokesperson to put it forward. This delayed the meeting and made for a considerably more frustrating experience.

This was corrected on the last two days when navigation meetings were moved to a separate room in which only the nominated participants took part. For future training, we recommend that navigation meetings always take place in a separate room, closed to the non participating trainees.

iv. Giving and Receiving Feedback Training Session

One of the main aspects of giving feedback is that one should try to remain positive, even if one needs to give suggestions for improvement. This is why feedback generally starts with a positive compliment, before moving on to explain how improvements could be made.

However, based on the course evaluation forms that were filled in by the participants, it would seem that we failed to sufficiently stress the importance of being positive when giving feedback. Some of the comments on the evaluation forms were expressed in quite a negative way, and while this may be justified, if the training session on “Giving and Receiving Feedback” had been really effective, then this situation should not have arisen.

We would therefore recommend that this training session is given greater emphasis in future training courses. Nobody like to be criticized, but suggestions for improvement, when given in a positive way, are usually very welcome. We need to emphasis this. In addition, a little more time could be provided to the participants for completing the evaluation forms. This would give them the opportunity to expand on their comments, and turn short, negative comments, into longer, more positive ones.

v. Daily Roadmap

This was an excellent suggestion made during the first navigation meeting by the trainees. In essence, they experienced difficulty in that they were unable to see the

“big picture” of the day’s training, and they were unable to relate one training session to another. They requested that at the beginning of each day a “roadmap” was presented, giving them an overview of what would be happening during the day, and how that day’s training fitted into the overall training agenda. This overview of the day’s activities provided the participants with a mental framework within which they could associate the different training sessions they were receiving.

We believe that this is actually a really useful summary to give the participants at the start of each day, and significantly increases the quality and retention of the training. We recommend that this is incorporated into future training courses.

Annex 1:
AGENDA

**BCH Train of Trainers Workshop,
Geneva, Switzerland
8-12 October 2007**

AGENDA

DAY 1 – Introduction To CP, And BCH Project Requirements

MORNING

- Workshop Opening.
- Introduction to the workshop, Biosafety Unit Team, Trainers Introduction, Objectives.
- Participants Introduction, Expectations and Concerns
- Introduction to UN system, UNEP, GEF and CBD
- Introduction to Global Biosafety Projects.
- Overview of BCH Project
- Introduction to Biotechnology and biotech issues part 1
- BCH Training Workshop deployment methodology introduction (will be covered more deeply later).
- Working and navigation meetings groups setup; assignment of Group Work on Sample MOUs & Group Work on MOU and analyzing global BCH Projects situation

AFTERNOON

- Introduction to Biotechnology and biotech issues part 2
- First introduction of BCH Operational Manual, MOU, Forms, etc.
- Introduction to Cartagena Protocol
- Interactive Module on Cartagena Protocol

DAY 2– More Biosafety and the BCH CENTRAL PORTAL

MORNING

- Session on Biosafety (LOG)
- Review of Cartagena Protocol, and Q&A, open discussion
- Introduction to BCH
- Interactive Module on Introduction to BCH

AFTERNOON

- Using the Central Portal to find information, hands – on computer labs – examples on finding info.

- Hands-on computer lab on using the BCH Central Portal - finding information. Case studies.
- Group Work on analyzing current example MoUs and BCH Projects situation

DAY 3– Using the CP Management Centre to register Info & National Options

MORNING

- Introduction to BCH CP Management Centre, authorized users demo.
- Hands-on labs on registering information
- Q&A on registering information. Introduction to Common Formats and Controlled Vocabularies. Exercise on registering information requirements (expected data amount, training, infrastructure and human resources requirements)
- The options for information exchange and participation with the Central Portal

AFTERNOON

- Presentations of donor nBCH applications, Pros-Cons / requirements of each application
- Open Discussion, Q&A on applications implementation
- Lab work on options 3 and 4 (IT Ras)
- Group Work on MOUs, focusing on National Options selection, and development requirements for National BCH implementation.
- Group Dinner at typical restaurant

DAY 4- More nBCH practice, National Training Workplans, Project Implementation Workplans and Introduction to Training Materials.

MORNING

- Hands-on working on new SCBD nBCH application.
- Hands-on working on Canadian SCBD-hosted nBCH application
- Task Managers and current RAs presentations of example national training workplans, project implementation work plans and task force meetings schedules from other countries MOUs. Experiences and lessons learned.
- Group Work on MOUs, focusing on training & implementation workplans, and task force meetings requirements and schedule.

AFTERNOON

- Training and Management materials and tools : ANUBIS; Missions workflow and process (administrative requirements)ANUBIS
- INTERACTIVE MODULES AND NETOP

- MOODLE courses and forums
- BCH OFFLINE PORTAL (CD-ROM version)
- Other resources??

DAY 5- Recap of tools, Presentation of Group Work, Discussion, Conclusions

MORNING

- BCH Training Workshop deployment methodology introduction (will be covered more deeply later).
- Group Work on country-level deployment of training and capacity- building existing materials.
- Presentations of MOUs developed by Groups. Detailed description of all forms and documents, work plans, etc.

AFTERNOON

- Discussion about analyzed existing MOUs, lessons learned
- Review of Expectations and Concerns
- Recap of Workshop, BCH Project requirements, main conclusions & Further Work
- Course Evaluation
- Closing of the Workshop

Annex 2

Workshop Objectives

- ◆ Understand, in broad terms, the role of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the BCH;
- ◆ Know the rules and procedures, concerning your own role and the assistance to be delivered to countries;
- ◆ Understand basic training and communication methodological necessities and be able to apply these presentation- and facilitation techniques; Fully understand the concept and functioning of the BCH and be able to efficiently work with the respective partners and tools;
- ◆ Fully understand the type of support and assistance countries might require and request and are able to support them with high quality service; and
- ◆ Review and evaluate the Course and provide suggestions for improvement.
- ◆ That Developing and EIT countries, with the assistance of the regional advisors trained through this training course, will be:
 - ◆ In compliance with obligations relating to the BCH;
 - ◆ Able to access information from the BCH;
 - ◆ Able to post information on the BCH.

Annex 3

Workshop Evaluation Summary

Evaluation forms were given to all participants and all 13 were collected back. The evaluation form has a section which allows the participant to evaluate each training session on the agenda – presentations, case studies, hands-on, etc.... The average grade for topics from agenda was almost 4,5. From the comments it was seen that participants evaluated not only the presenter but also the content, PPTs , the time dedicated to subject and also features of products/options.

Summary of comments:

- To receive some materials to read before Workshop (on Biotechnology)
- Pictures needed in PPT (Biotechnology presentation)
- Diagram of Hierarchy needed (UN structure)
- More time needed for practices (Finding info, Management Centre, Hermes, Ajax, Options for information interchange with Central portal)
- Interactive Modules – very effective tool for learning
- To receive some information earlier (BCH Operational Handbook, BCH-MOU, Forms), instead of only on the last day

The second part of the evaluation was intended to evaluate resource people – 12 participants out of 13 gave all resource people the highest grade 5 , one participant graded all resource people significantly lower.

The overall grade of TOT Workshop was 5, summary of comments:

- Great job for such a short time,
- Information effectively delivered
- Successful attempt to pack 2 week training in one week
- Access was given to vast store of resources and experiences
- Interesting
- Intense
- Informative/educational
- Rewarding
- Way too little time
- Overall very good grounding for Regional Advisors
- Excellent quality
- Resource people very friendly and helpful
- Some topics more interesting than others, but all people were just fantastic

Annex 4

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS Training of Trainers 4 (TOT4) Geneva, Switzerland 8 - 12 OCTOBER 2007

1 CPB	Mr. Anthony Richards (Antigua & Barbuda national) P.O. Box 2389, St. John's Antigua & Barbuda	2 IT	Mr. Mohammad Ilyas (Indonesian) Database/IT Training Specialist Avenida Bispo de Madeiros, Dili East Timor
3 CPB	Mrs. Emma Lucia Rivera (Colombian) Calle 92 No. 21-91 Ap. 202 Bogota, Colombia	4 IT	Mr. Samiuela M. Fonua (Tongan) Tupou Tertiary Institute Nuku'alofa Tonga
5 CPB	Ms. Julian Bourne (Jamaican) 1 West Path, Calabar Mews, Kingston 20 Jamaica West Indies	6 CPB	Mrs. Maria de Lourdes Torres Proaño (Ecuadorian) Database/ BCH Training Specialist Professor, coordinator of Biotechnology Francisco Salazar 360 y Coruña Complejo Vistaleste, Casa 5 Quito, Ecuador
7 IT	Mr. Nidal Khalil (Jordanian/Palestinian) Head of IT Section / Business Support Systems WATANIYA PALESTINE Mobile Telecommunication Company 3 rd Floor, Tri-Fitness Centre Satah Merhaba, Al Bira P.O. Box 4236, Palestine	8 IT	Mrs. Pilar Galindo (Colombian) Ingeniera de Sistemas Responsable técnica del BCH de Colombia Instituto Humboldt Cra 13 No. 28-01, Piso 7 Bogotá, Colombia

9 CPB	Mr. Samuel Sesega (Samoan) Company Director and Consultant PO Box 774 Apia Samoa	10	Mr. Steven Percival (Samoan) Executive Director Tiapapata Art Centre Malololelei North Road Tiapapata PO Box 9591, Apia Samoa
11 CPB	Mr. Terrence Gilliard (Saint Lucian) Water Works Road Castries Saint Lucia	12 CPB	Fred E. A. Phillips (Vincentian) 1202 York Mills Road, Unit 1603 Don Mills, Ontario Canada M3A 1Y2 Or #9 Locust Hall Terrace St. George Barbados
13 CPB	Mr. Ossama Ahmed Ahmed Abdel- Kawy (Egyptian) 11 Latif Street, El-Haram, El-Giza, Egypt		

RESOURCE PERSONS

16	Ms. Ileana Catalina Lopez Regional Advisor (Guatemala) Km. 15.8 Carretera a El Salvador Condominio la Alambra, Casa No. 7 Santa Catarina Pinula Guatemala	17	Ms. Vida Marolt Parabucki Regional Advisor (Slovene) Puhova 14, 1000 Ljubljana Slovenia
18	Mr. Stephen Vitoria (British/Antiguan) 71 Daisy Drive Wanstead Heights St. James Barbados	19	Leonard O'GARRO UNEP-GEF Biosafety U.N. House, P.O. Box 625C, Bridgetown, St. Michael Barbados

UNEP-GEF BCH PROJECT

20	Jyoti Mathur-Filipp BCH Task Manager UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit 11 – 13 chemin des Anémones 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva Switzerland	21	Mr. Ingo Piegeler BCH Task Manager for Africa UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit Geneva, Switzerland
22	Mr. Frédéric Vogel BCH IT Specialist UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit Geneva, Switzerland	23	Mr. Prakash Bista BCH Task Manager for Asia and CEE UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit Geneva, Switzerland
24	Mr Ernesto Ocampo Biosafety Clearing House Project Regional Specialist UNEP - GEF Biosafety Unit	25	Ms Sharon Oseku Consultant UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit Geneva, Switzerland
26	Ms. Pascale Unger Administrative Assistant UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit Geneva, Switzerland		

ANNEX 5

Participant's Expectations and Concerns
TOT 4 Geneva October 8-12, 2007



Name	Expectations	Concerns
Osama Abdel-Kawy	Share experiences and learn from each other.	Will there be enough time.
Emma Rivera	To give complete information to the BCH.	To teach and learn about CPB concepts
Pilar Galindo	Enhance knowledge about CPB and BCH	To use in an effective way the BCH.
Ilyas M	Able to provide services to participating countries.	Commitment and political support from the participating countries.
Maria De Lourdes Torres	Learn and be able to be ready to be an RA in s proper way.	To obtain and process all the information.
Sam Sesega	Improve knowledge of BCH and of ways of training users of BCH.	Managing and absorbing a lot of information over 5 days of training.
Nida Khalil	Share information and develop my skills.	To be able to accept the missions at all times.
Sam Fonua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be an effective RA. To learn more about other Regional experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the main targets of the project? To meet the expectations of the project. Categorize countries into groups based on set criteria. Regional attitudes to development projects.
Terrance Gillard	To become a CPB RA in 5 days	Acquire effective teaching and communication techniques Re: Project.
Anthony R	To be a trained Regional advisor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lost luggage Master BCH delivery.
Fred Vogel	New RAs ready to serve /help countries.	Lack of time.
Julian Bourne	To be selected as CPB RA trainer(effective trainer)	Effectively train countries in the region on biosafety protocol and frame work.
Fred Philips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase practical 	To assimilate all

Name	Expectations		Concerns	
	<p>understanding of the CPB, BCH and their application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be selected as an RA. 		information in time.	
Ernesto Ocampo	Get more BCH RAs		Information overload.	
Steven Percival	To be able to write information on regional BCH portal.		To be able to both film workshop highlights for a meaningful documentary and also participate.	
Jyoti Mathur-Filip	Easy learning.		Time to fully understand.	
Ingo Piegeler	Increase our presence in the regions throughout the world.		Timing in terms of BCH project implementation.	
Pascale Unger	To give all the help needed for the workshop.		Workshop is going well.	
Sharon Oseku	Gain better understanding on how the RAs are trained to be successful in their regions.		None.	
Stephen Vittoria	Participants should get a good understanding of CPB.		Participants do not get a good understanding of the CPB.	
Leonard O`Garro	Give all my best to you.		None.	
Vida Marolt	Sharing knowledge.		Not enough time.	

ANNEX 6

- Terms of Reference -

<p>I. Scope of Work</p> <p>The UNEP-GEF BCH project is organizing the 4th Training of Trainers workshop. 10 to 15 potential new Regional Advisors have been identified and invited to participate in this workshop. The aim of the workshop is to build capacities of participants to enable them to provide support and advice to countries.</p> <p>At the end of the workshop, the candidates should be able to provide assistance by helping countries in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making the choice for type and style of national participation in the BCH;• Delivering training activities with national counterparts to train participants in the use and access of the BCH;• Setting-up and making the chosen method of national BCH access operational;• Developing a sustainability strategy, and;• Training National Focal Points. <p>In consultation with the BCH Team, the consultants (3 Regional Advisors) will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Prepare the Agenda of the 1 week Workshop2. Identify the necessary resources (human and software/hardware)3. Prepare the lessons that will cover the topics mentioned above4. Train the participants5. Evaluate the skills of the participants and report back to the UNEP GEF BCH Team (the final interviews and evaluations will be done together with members of the UNEP GEF BCH Team).
<p>II. Duration, Timing & Venue</p> <p>5 working days, from 8-12 October 2007 in Geneva (exact location to be fixed by UNEP GEF Biosafety Team in September).</p>
<p>III. Required Outputs</p> <p>The workshop should enable a new group of trained regional advisors to be ready to accompany confirmed RAs on a first national mission. A common mission report is required at the end of the workshop.</p>