GEF

PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GEF COUNCIL WORK PROGRAM SUBMISSION

AGENCY'S PROJECT ID: GFL/2328-2716-4771
COUNTRY: Global (List of Countries attached in Annexes)
PROJECT TITLE: "Capacity Building for Effective Participation in Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)" : Add-on for 89 countries
GEF AGENCY: UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):
DURATION: 3 years
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity
GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM: Enabling Activity
GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITY: # 3 CAPACITY BUILDING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE: December 2004
IA FEE: UNDER NEGOTIATION US$

FINANCING PLAN (US$)	
GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT	
Project	8,905,700
PDF A	
PDF B	
PDF C	
Sub-Total GEF	8,905,700
CO-FINANCING 1,053,399*	
GEF Agency	
Others	
Sub-Total Co-financing:	1,053,399
Total Project Financing:	9,959,099
FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES IF ANY:	
LEVERAGED RESOURCES IF ANY:	

*Details provided under the Financial Modality and Cost Effectiveness section

CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS OF THE BUSINESS PLAN:

RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
Date:

Approved on behalf of the *UNEP*. This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for work program inclusion

Ahmed Djoghlaf
IA/ExA Coordinator
Date: October 13, 2004

Christopher Briggs
Project Contact Person
Tel. and email:Tel. +41 22 917 8411
Email: chris.briggs@unep.ch

1. Project Identifiers

Project Number: GFL/2328-2716-4771

Project Title: Add-on Project for "Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)" (to include 89 additional countries)

Duration: 36 months

Implementing Agency: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Executing Agency: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Eligibility: The original project was intended to support 50 countries that were Parties to the Protocol at the time of the first meeting of the Parties (COP7/MOP1). However, at the time of the first MOP, 61 countries had already become Parties.

COP 7 gave guidance to expand the eligibility of the project to include all developing countries and countries with economies in transition that are Parties to the Protocol or who:
- Are Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Provide clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol through a written assurance to the Executive Secretary that the country will become a Party on completion of activities to be funded; and
- Are not beneficiaries of GEF project to support implementation of their National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs).

This leads to a further 89 countries becoming eligible for support.

GEF Focal Areas: Biodiversity/Biosafety

GEF Programming Framework: The project, which is an extension of the original project on "Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)", falls within the activities contained in the GEF Initial Strategy on Biosafety adopted by GEF Council in November 2000. The project also addresses the emerging priorities outlined by the GEF for Phase III under the pillar on "Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety". Biosafety is a crosscutting issue to OPs1-4 and OP13. As an enabling activity, this project is eligible for full

financing. This further request for additional funds for 89 additional countries is an extension of the original project design with the same norms and standards.

2. Summary:

The goal of this project falls under the global aim to support the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The GEF Initial Strategy set out the need for support within the list of its proposed activities "to enable countries to participate in the biosafety clearing-house, once the clearing-house terms of reference are agreed upon by the Parties". The project is proposed as an add-on project to the current UNEP-GEF Project on Development of National Biosafety Frameworks. The objective is complementary to that project's aims, but more specifically will develop core human resources and establish an appropriate national BCH infrastructure so as to enable eligible countries to fully participate and benefit from the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH), as established under Article 20 of the Biosafety Protocol, and assist them to comply with their obligations under the Biosafety Protocol. This targeted intervention will facilitate the ability of the eligible countries to readily access scientific, technical, environmental and legal information on LMOs, and thereby assist with implementation of the Protocol in ensuring an adequate level of protection for biodiversity in the field of safe transfer, handling and use of LMOs. This activity will also complement the other past and existing projects aiming at the implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks.

3. Costs and Financing (Million US $)

This is an Enabling Activity project and is therefore considered fully incremental in the context of GEF funding. The add-on project budget summary for 89 countries is provided in Annex 1. The costs of the project have been calculated from the base of the original project costs for 50 countries and have been adjusted on a pro rata basis for 89 countries. The original budget covered the costs of all activities at the national level to be agreed individually with each country, as well as some costs associated with use of a limited number of experts. All the original costs, as well as the global level activities and support have been calculated back to a country basis and multiplied for 89 additional countries. However, an additional sum of 682,000 US $ has been added to the total for the following reasons:

- A consultation of experts to assist in developing the TORs for a training package was held in May 2004 (Report attached as Annex 6). The meeting participants decided that the training and use of regional experts at country level was the most effective way of supporting countries to set up and use their biosafety clearing-houses. The original intention had been to train, at a sub-regional level, three national experts and a few regional experts. Professional experience has shown that trained regional experts are better able to provide better long-term and tailored service to assist countries to participate in the BCH. Only regional experts will henceforth be used for giving assistance to countries.
- It is, however, necessary to enhance the expertise of existing IT experts and Cartagena Protocol experts from all four regions. All regional experts will go through a rigorous recruitment procedure before qualification and this recruitment and quality control imposes additional costs to the management system. All chosen regional experts will be given intensive and extensive training on the BCH using a curriculum and a pedagogical methodology

2

developed in collaboration with InWEnt and with a training package developed in collaboration with UNITAR. This imposes additional costs above the original design in terms of training trainers and keeping up high standards of service delivery by additional training, more monitoring and annual meetings of experts to maintain and update the quality and content of advice and delivery of training.

- In addition, the Joint Summary from the May 2004 GEF Council, it is cited 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..."

Additional funding of 682,000 US $ is, therefore, requested for holding this proposed consultation of regional experts and scientists and for supporting additional costs of recruitment, training, updating and annual review of regional experts as per the above-mentioned recommendations.

A list of potentially eligible countries is appended as Annex 2, 3 and 4.

With respect to co-financing, all participating countries will be asked to contribute in-kind by assigning staff to work at a country level with the project and the value of this will be monetized. In addition, Canada is contributing US$420,000 to help set up a regional BCH for the 14 Pacific Island Countries to be hosted and managed by the regional organization, SPREP in Samoa. Germany will also be contributing up to US$10,000 to help in developing the curriculum and methodology for the training of the regional experts. This co-financing is at a greater ratio than the original project and shows the great interest in training for the BCH.

GEF:	Project	:	$	8,905,700
	Subtotal GEF	:	$	8,905,700
	Governments in kind Contribution:			
	Participating Country Governments :		$	623,399
	Canada	:	$	420,000
	Germany	:	US$	10,000
	Subtotal Co-financing	:	**US$**	**1,053,399**

Total Project Cost	:	**US$**	**9,959,099**

4. IA Contact: Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, Director Division Global Environment Facility, UNEP/GEF Co-ordination Office, UNEP, Nairobi. Tel: 254-2-624166; Fax: 254-2-624041; Email: Ahmed.Djoghlaf@unep.org

Additional Information on Add-on Project (89 countries) to the UNEP-GEF Project on *Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)*

A. BACKGROUND

1. More than 100 countries signed the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB) while it was open for signing, and as of 15 July 2004, 102 countries have already ratified or acceded. **The Protocol entered into force on 11 September 2003, on the 90th day after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification or accession.** Entry into force of the Protocol means that all Parties to the Protocol must be able to use the Biosafety Clearing-House to fulfill various obligations under the Protocol. In this context, many Parties during the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP) have expressed concern over the urgent need to build national capacities to use and provide information to the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH). A questionnaire was launched by UNEP-GEF in February 2003, in close collaboration with the CBD Secretariat, in order to determine the state of current access and use of the Biosafety Clearing House in each country, and to further understand their urgent needs. The results of this survey indicated a series of needs and specific requests for training and were used in designing a project that could meet their urgent needs.

2. The CBD Secretariat, following the recommendations of the ICCP, has developed the BCH. The pilot phase was first launched in March 2001, and a revised version was made available in February 2003 and the fully operational phase was launched in April 2004. The BCH is comprised of a central portal and a distributed network of external components. The focus of the work at the CBD Secretariat has been on development of the central portal. Now the focus is to develop the national BCH components and the capacities of countries to access and use the BCH.

3. The CBD-COP-6 has also specifically requested the GEF to provide for national capacity-building in biosafety, in particular for enabling effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (Decision VI/17.10b). The Intergovernmental Committee for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (ICCP) has recognized the interconnection between national capacities, effective use of the Biosafety Clearing-House and successful implementation of the Biosafety Protocol, and urged donors to provide financial support and technical assistance to enable developing countries to access and use the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (see recommendations 1/4.1, 2/8 and 3/3).

4. It is therefore imperative that all countries have the necessary capacity to access and use the BCH effectively. With the entry into force of the Protocol on the 11 September 2003, countries are required to enter and manage their own data in the Biosafety Clearing-House. They, therefore, require essential equipment, tools and training, to be able to fulfill these obligations and to take advantage of the benefits provided by the BCH. The 12 demonstration projects on Implementation of National Biosafety Frameworks, presently being run by UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank, already have specific budget provisions on setting up national components of the

BCH and will therefore not be eligible to directly receive funds under this project.

5. It is also intended that this project will synergize with the larger global effort at capacity building in support of implementation of the Protocol. For example, the BCH will assist in making legislative and regulatory frameworks more widely accessible to the world. This is important for learning lessons and information sharing as a number of such frameworks are being developed through the UNEP/GEF global biosafety frameworks project. In addition, infrastructure and expertise gained through this project may be applied to other areas of information-exchange, such as upgrading and maintaining an online biodiversity presence through the Clearing-House Mechanism of the Convention.

6. The overall objective of this project is to assist eligible countries in building and strengthening the national capacity needed to enable access and use of the BCH in order to implement their obligations under the Protocol now that it has entered into force. The overall objective will be achieved through the following specific objectives:

(a) To strengthen capacity in eligible Parties through support for capacity building including training activities for key stakeholders. The training programmes will cover (i) data management; (ii) identification and access to information required for decision-making under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and (iii) access to, and registration of information in the BCH.

(b) To create an enabling environment for Parties to meet the obligations for implementation of the Protocol by providing participating countries with appropriate computer hardware and software, as well as appropriate software for the storage and exchange of data with the BCH through Internet connectivity or other means.

(c) To support further capacity building activities through the development and dissemination of an interactive computer-based training package including the BCH toolkit. This training package will be developed at the global level and used for training as well distributed in participating countries.

B. ELIGIBILITY

7. The original project was intended to support 50 countries that were Parties to the Protocol at the time of the first meeting of the Parties (MOP1) and were not beneficiaries of the GEF demonstration projects for implementation. However, at the time of the first MOP (13 February 2003) 61 countries had become Parties, 11 more than the project had been designed to support (See Annex 1). There is a consequent need to respond to the needs for support for these 11 countries.

8. Additionally, as of 15 August 2004, 16 countries have ratified or acceded to the Protocol after the first meeting of the Parties (See Annex 3). These could be considered to be eligible for funding through this project based on COP7/MOP1 guidance that "All developing countries, in particular the least developed and small developing states among them, and countries with economies in transition, including

countries amongst these that are centres of origin and centres of genetic diversity, which are Parties to the Protocol, are eligible for funding by the Global Environment Facility in accordance with its mandate."

9. Finally, based on the recommendations from COP7-MOP/1, an additional 62 countries could be eligible to seek funding from this project (See Annex 4). The COP 7 guidance expanded the eligibility of the project to include all developing countries and countries with economies in transition that are Parties to the Protocol or which:
   - Are Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and
   - Provide clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol through a written assurance to the Executive Secretary that the country will become a Party on completion of activities to be funded.

10. Attached, as Annex 5, is a letter forwarded to the above-mentioned 62 countries by the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Chief Executive Officer/Chairman of the Global Environment Facility informing them of Decision VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. A sample written confirmation to become a Party to the Protocol is also attached to this letter. Upon receiving notification from the SCBD of the written assurance from a country to become a Party, UNEP will proceed with the project in that country.

11. A list of the 89 countries that are considered eligible under these three sets of criteria, as of 15 August 2004, can be found in Annexes 2, 3 and 4.

12. Countries that are beneficiaries of the 12 GEF demonstration projects to support implementation of their National Biosafety Frameworks (NBFs) are not considered eligible for funding through this project.

C. CURRENT STATUS OF THE ORIGINAL 50 COUNTRY PROJECT

13. In November 2003 the GEF Council approved, in principal, the project entitled "Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH) of the Cartagena Protocol". In March 2004, final approval was given to UNEP–GEF by the GEF Secretariat. In anticipation of the approval of the project by the GEF Council at its November 2003 session, the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit in November 2003 recruited a task manager for the project. In addition, an information-technology specialist has started work from mid-June 2004.

14. Between January and February 2004, letters were sent to the 61 countries informing them of their potential eligibility to participate in the new BCH project. As of 1st October 2004, 51 countries had sent letters from their GEF Focal Points indicating their interest in participating in this project.

15. In May 2004, a meeting of international experts was convened to investigate various ways in which the development of the training programme for the BCH could be moved forward in an expeditious and efficient manner. The two-day deliberations by these experts raised a number of important issues in the methodology to be used

by the BCH project in delivering training programmes to assist countries to set up, maintain and use BCHs, whether through the central portal or by setting up their own national BCHs. In accordance with the discussions in the workshop, the design of delivery of the training has been adjusted to reflect the concerns of the participants. The minutes from this meeting are attached as Annex 6.

16. At the above meeting of the experts, it was recognised that the most efficient and expeditious way to deliver high quality, tailored services to participating countries, was to recruit and train a team of regional experts who could directly deliver services to countries to assist them in their choice, selection and set-up of national BCHs. The original intention had only been to train, at a sub-regional level, three national experts and some regional experts. Professional experience has shown that trained regional experts are better able to provide better long-term and tailored service to assist countries to participate in the BCH. Therefore, a set of regional experts will be selected from the four regions in which UNEP is working (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean and Central and Eastern Europe). However, since expertise on the BCH is currently very limited, it is necessary to enhance the expertise of existing IT experts and Cartagena Protocol experts from all four regions.

17. A full open, public advertisement through regional newspapers will be made as well as through circulation to a network of over 5000 contacts for the services of the regional experts throughout the four regions. A shortlisting of suitable candidates will be carried out according to a competency-based analysis. Papers of shortlisted candidates will be submitted to an international peer review process involving experts, scientists and a sample of the participating countries to ensure that they meet the needs of the countries and chosen candidates will be invited to attend training workshops where they will have to pass tests before qualification. This increased recruitment and quality control process imposes additional costs to the management and monitoring system. All chosen regional experts will thus be given intensive and extensive training on the BCH using a curriculum and a pedagogical methodology developed in collaboration with InWEnt and with a training package developed in collaboration with UNITAR.

18. This revised procedure also imposes additional costs above the original design in terms of training the trainers and keeping up high standards of service delivery by additional training, additional monitoring of outputs and holding of annual meetings of experts to maintain and update the quality and content of advice and delivery of training.

19. The selection of the experts will be done transparently, based on terms of reference prepared by the Biosafety Unit and peer reviewed by experts, scientists and a sample of the participating countries to ensure that they meet the needs of the countries.

20.

21. The role of the regional experts will include direct support to countries by:
   - Assisting in making the choice for type and style of national participation in the BCH;

- Delivering training activities including a training workshop, where required, with national counterparts to train up to 20 participants in the use and access of the BCH; and
- Assisting in making the choice of national BCH access operational

22. There will be two types of regional experts selected. A larger number of experts who are skilled in information technology (IT) and other technology-related expertise, and a smaller number of experts with knowledge of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. As indicated, the experts will be selected, after open advertisement and review by a panel formed by CBD Sec, STAP and UNEP-GEF on the basis of established skills sets. The experts will be trained using a training programme developed by the UNEP-GEF Biosafety Clearing-House team in collaboration with other partners. The training programme for the regional experts will be based on adult learning techniques.

23. Finally, during the GEF Council meeting in May 2004, the extension of the project to include countries based on the guidance of COP 7 was discussed. Para 61 of the Joint Summary of the Chairs states 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. The concerns expressed by Council Members about the GEF-financed biosafety projects should also be taken into consideration in developing proposals to expand the project." UNEP-GEF, in collaboration with the GEF Secretariat and the CBD Secretariat, will hold a consultation with experts and scientists later in the year to act as a peer review for the training package that is being developed. This regional consultation will provide an opportunity for international experts and scientists to examine the training materials and tools and provide comments.

Annex 1

Budget for add-on Project for 89 Additional Countries within UNEP-GEF project for "Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)"

UNEP BUDGET LINE/OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE	US$ (TOTAL GEF FUNDING) 50 Countries Project	Budget per Country	Budget for 89 Countries
10 PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT			
1100 Project Personnel			
1101 Project Manager	438,000	8,760	779,640
1199 Subtotal	**438,000**		**779,640**
1300 Administrative Support			
1301 Administrative Assistant	263,000	5,260	468,140
1399 Subtotal	**263,000**		**468,140**
1999 Component Sub-Total	**701,000**		**1,247,780**
20 SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT			
2300 Sub-contracts for commercial purposes			
2301 Subcontract to private firms for development of supporting training materials	500,000	10,000	890,000
2399 Subtotal	**500,000**		**890,000**
2999 Component Sub-Total	**500,000**		**890,000**
30 TRAINING COMPONENT			
3200 Group training			
3201 Training / Orientation Sessions (average 20 participants x 50 countries x $29,000 per country +20 regional experts) plus trainers and programme support	2,047,000	40,940	3,643,660
3202 Consultation of regional experts and scientists and workshops for training regional experts			691,000
3299 Subtotal	**2,047,000**		**4,334,660**
3300 Technical Meetings			
3302 Project Steering Committee			
3399 Subtotal			
3999 Component Sub-Total	**2,047,000**		**4,334,660**
40 EQUIPMENT COMPONENT			
4100 Expendable equipment			
4101 Office supplies	10,000	200	17,800

4199 Subtotal	**10,000**		**17,800**
4200 Non- Expendable equipment			
4201 Computer hardware and software for 50 countries x 25,000 US $ each	1,250,000	25,000	2,225,000
4202 Office equipment / furniture	15,000	300	26,700
4203 Office rental and maintenance			
	45,000	900	80,100
4299 Subtotal	**1,310,000**		**2,331,800**
4999 Component Sub- Total	**1,320,000**		**2,349,600**
50 MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT			
5200 Reporting costs			
5201 Publication of relevant documents and reports			17,800
	10,000	200	
5299 Subtotal	**10,000**		**17,800**
5300 Sundry			
5301 Communication and mailing costs			
	37,000	740	65,860
5399 Subtotal	**37,000**		**65,860**
5999 Component Sub-Total	**47,000**		**83,660**
GRAND TOTAL GEF FINANCING	**4,615,000**	**92,300**	**8,905,700**

Annex 2

List of 61 countries that were Parties to the Cartagena Protocol by the time
of the first meeting of the parties (COP7-MOP1) and are not participating
in the demonstration projects on implementation of their NBFs

1	Antigua and Barbuda *	32	Maldives *
2	Bahamas *	33	Mali *
3	Bangladesh *	34	Marshall Islands *
4	Barbados *	35	Mauritius *
5	Belarus *	36	Mongolia *
6	Belize *	37	Mozambique *
7	Bhutan	38	Nauru
8	Bolivia *	39	Nicaragua *
9	Botswana	40	Nigeria *
10	Brazil *	41	Palau *
11	Burkina Faso *	42	Panama *
12	Cambodia *	43	Moldova, Republic of *
13	Croatia *	44	Romania *
14	Czech Republic *	45	Saint Kitts and Nevis
15	Korea, Democratic People's Republic of *	46	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines *
16	Djibouti *	47	Samoa *
17	Ecuador *	48	Senegal
18	Egypt *	49	Slovakia
19	El Salvador *	50	Slovenia *
20	Ethiopia *	51	South Africa *
21	Fiji	52	Tajikistan *
22	Ghana *	53	Tonga *
23	Grenada *	54	Trinidad and Tobago *
24	Hungary	55	Tunisia *
25	Iran, Islamic Republic of *	56	Turkey
26	Jordan *	57	Ukraine *
27	Latvia *	58	Tanzania, United Republic of *
28	Lesotho *	59	Venezuela
29	Liberia *	60	Viet Nam *
30	Lithuania	61	Niue (Not UN country)
31	Madagascar*		

* The UNEP-GEF Biosafety Team has received endorsement letters from these
countries from the GEF Focal Points as of 1st October 2004.

Annex 3

List of 16 countries that have ratified or acceded to the Cartagena Protocol after the first Meeting of the Parties, as of 15th August 2004

1	Algeria
2	Armenia
3	Dominica
4	Estonia
5	Gambia
6	Kiribati
7	Lao People's Democratic Republic
8	Paraguay
9	Peru
10	Rwanda
11	Seychelles
12	Solomon Islands
13	Sri Lanka
14	Syrian Arab Republic
15	Togo
16	Zambia

Annex 4

List of 62 additional countries that are eligible under the COP 7 guidance to the GEF, which are Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and are not yet Parties to the Cartagena Protocol

1	Albania	35	Malawi
2	Angola	36	Malta
3	Argentina	37	Mauritania
4	Azerbaijan	38	Micronesia, Federated States of
5	Benin	39	Morocco
6	Bosnia and Herzegovina	40	Myanmar
7	Burundi	41	Nepal
8	Cape Verde	42	Niger
9	Central African Republic	43	Pakistan
10	Chad	44	Papua New Guinea
11	Chile	45	Philippines
12	Comoros	46	Russian Federation
13	Congo	47	Saint Lucia
14	Cook Islands (Not UN country)	48	Sao Tome and Principe
15	Costa Rica	49	Sierra Leone
16	Côte d'Ivoire	50	Sudan
17	Congo, Democratic Republic of the	51	Suriname
18	Dominican Republic	52	Swaziland
19	Equatorial Guinea	53	Thailand
20	Eritrea	54	Macedonia, The Former Yugoslav Republic of
21	Gabon	55	Turkmenistan
22	Georgia	56	Tuvalu
23	Guatemala	57	Uruguay
24	Guinea	58	Uzbekistan
25	Guinea-Bissau	59	Vanuatu
26	Guyana	60	Yemen
27	Haiti	61	Serbia and Montenegro
28	Honduras	62	Zimbabwe
29	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		

Annex 5

Global
Environmental
Facility

Convention on
Biological
Diversity

September 13, 2004

Dear Madam/Sir:

Re: Requests for Financial Assistance from the GEF in Accordance with
**Paragraph 21(b) of Decision VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties
to the Convention on Biological Diversity**

Reference is made to paragraph 21(b) of decision VII/20 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity which provides the following eligibility criteria for funding by the Global Environment Facility of certain activities related to the Cartagena Protocol:

"All developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing States amongst them, and countries with economies in transition, including countries amongst these that are centres of origin and centres of genetic diversity, which are Parties to the Convention and provide a clear political commitment towards becoming Parties to the Protocol, shall also be eligible for funding by the Global Environment Facility for the development of national biosafety frameworks and the development of national biosafety clearing-houses and other necessary institutional capabilities to enable a non-Party to become a Party. Evidence of such political commitment shall take the form of a written assurance of the Executive Secretary that the country intends to become a Party to the Protocol on completion of the activities to be funded."

In order to facilitate the implementation of this decision, the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Global Environment Facility have agreed that the following process should be followed by Parties to the Convention that are not yet Parties to the Cartagena Protocol and that wish to request funding from the GEF for the activities described in paragraph 21(b) of decision VII/20:

1.   In order for a developing county or a country with an economy in transition that is a Party to the convention but not to the Cartagena Protocol to be eligible for financing from the financial mechanism for activities described in paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20, the Party must confirm in writing its political commitment to become a Party to the Protocol upon completion of the activities to be funded.

2.   Such written confirmation should be in the form of a letter from the Minister responsible for biosafety issues within the Government addressed to the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. A copy of the letter should also be sent to the CEO/Chairman of the GEF.

3.   A copy of the letter submitted to the Executive Secretary should be attached to the project proposal submitted to an Implementing Agency of the GEF for funding.

4.   The project proposal should be endorsed by both the national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the national operational focal point of the Global Environment Facility. If a country has not yet designated a national focal point for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the project proposal should be endorsed by the national focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity.

5.   Countries that have received funding from the Global Environment Facility for activities referred to in paragraph 21 (b) of decision VII/20 will, on an annual basis, inform the Executive Secretary of the Convention of actions being taken towards becoming Parties to the Protocol.

6.   The Executive Secretary will annually compile the national information that he receives and will distribute the compiled information to the Parties to the CBD and to the GEF Council.

A sample written confirmation of political commitment to become a Party to the Protocol is attached to the present letter.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurance of our highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Leonard Good   Hamdallah Zedan
Chief Executive Officer/Chairman   Executive Secretary
Global Environment Facility   Convention on Biological Diversity

Attachment: Sample letter

cc: National Focal Points for the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biodiversity
       GEF Focal Points, Implementing Agencies, STAP and Trustees

SAMPLE LETTER

Date:

Mr Hamdallah Zedan
Exeutive Secretarz
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
393 St. Jacques, Suite 300
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 1N9

Dear Executive Secretary,

Re: Political Commitment to become a Party to
the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

I wish to refer to decision VII/20, adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its seventh meeting, which requires that any developing county or country with an economy in transition that is a Party to the Convention but not yet a Party to the Cartagena Protocol provide written assurance of political commitment to become a Party to the Protocol in order to access funding from the Global Environment Facility for biosafety project activities referred to in paragraph 21(b) of the decision.

In this regard, I have the honour, on behalf of the Government of (country name) to confirm that (country name) intends to become a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety by the time of completion of such activities that are financed by the GEF.

The Government of (country name) will inform annually the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity of the actions it has taken towards becoming a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Such information will be submitted to the Executive Secretary before the end of each calendar year.

Signed by Minister
(Minister responsible for biosafety issues)

cc: Leonard Good, CEO/Chairman, GEF

Annex 6

Workshop on Development of Training Materials
For the UNEP-GEF Project for Capacity-Building for the
Biosafety Clearing House
Geneva, 3-4 May 2004

Workshop Summary

1.   The first Workshop on the *Development of Training Materials for the project on Capacity Building for the Biosafety Clearing House* was held in Bossey, Switzerland on 3-4 May 2004. It was organized in response to the mandate of the project to engage experts and recipient country nationals in the development and implementation of the training component. This report summarizes the proceedings of the workshop in sections IV through VIII, and includes conclusions of the deliberations in Section IX. Six Annexes to this report include the agenda, the list of participants, note on background documentation and summaries of the reports to the plenary from the small-group work.

I. Background

2.   The UNEP-GEF project *Capacity-Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)* received final approval from the GEF in March 2004. A large component of the project is to develop and deliver a training programme that will assist eligible countries to access and use the Biosafety Clearing House in order to meet their obligations under the Cartagena Protocol.

3.   The UNEP-GEF Biosafety team, in May 2004, invited experts who have been involved in various aspects of developing their national Biosafety Clearing Houses, or that have been involved with the negotiations leading up to the various ICCP recommendations and MOP decisions on the BCH or that have been involved in training for the BCH to a workshop to assist in identifying the elements of a training programme. Participants were selected in such a manner as to cover the variety of expertise relevant to the implementation of this project. List of participants attached as Annex B.

4.   The UNEP-GEF BCH project team will need to assist initially 50 countries, as established in the project design. There will also be a potential need to service an additional 90 countries to use and access the BCH, depending on the decision of the GEF Council.

5.   This support includes assisting countries to make decisions from a large range of possibilities to establish national BCH access, from countries choosing to directly use the services provided by the central portal run by the CBD secretariat to those wanting to develop their own national websites and databases that would be interoperable with the central portal.

6.   To assist countries to use and access the BCH, there is a need to develop a training package. This could include:

- Background material,
- Interactive tools and tutorials,
- A BCH toolkit,
- User-friendly computer based training manual,
- Database and website templates, and
- Coursework.
- Workbook etc.

7.   Prior to the workshop, a background note was circulated to all participants (attached as Annex H) as a basis to start the discussion at the workshop. In the note it was proposed that the training be delivered as a five-day course divided into three Sections:

- Introduction and Protocol-related Training (i.e. country obligations vis-à-vis the Protocol, users of the BCH in countries, importance of Roster of experts etc.)
- BCH-Related Training; and
- National BCH and IT-related Training.

II.   Objective of Workshop

8.   The objective of this workshop was to investigate various ways in which the development of the training programme could be moved forward in a expeditious and efficient manner.

9.   Participants were invited to read the project document and the list of documents attached (Annex C) before coming to the workshop and were requested to think of the following questions prior to the start of the workshop:

a)   Can this type of training be developed in a course format and be modular? If so, how should the course be divided between technical aspects relating to the set of computer hardware and software and the aspects relating directly to the obligations of the countries vis-à-vis the Protocol?

b)   What are the different levels of training corresponding to a country's level of IT-related skills, and how should this be handled by this project? Do all the sections of the training package need to be different or only the final section that deals with national BCHs and IT-related training?

c)   What are the main topics relating to the Protocol that need to be addressed in the course?

d)   Is it possible to link-up with Universities and / or Institutions to provide this type of training for longer-term sustainability?

e)   What should be the profile of the participants from countries who attend the regional workshops? Should all three participants from one country attend the same workshop or should participation be divided dependent on the profile of the participant?

III.   Agenda Day One, Morning Session

10.   The Facilitator, Cynthia Brzak, opened the meeting by welcoming all present and requested that each participant introduce themselves and provide a brief description of their background and function in their respective organizations or area of employment.

11.	Cynthia invited participants to express their expectations for the workshop and encouraged participants to set and agree to some basic ground rules. Basic ground rules, such as putting phones on mute and having mutual respect for one another, were established and agreed-upon by the participants. The Agenda for the two days was reviewed and discussed (Attached as Annex A). One participant suggested a discussion on the role of the BCH project and its aims and objectives in order to identify what the participants would be expected to accomplish during the course of this workshop. It was agreed that the workplan for the first day would need to sort out issues and structure and that the second day would add more detail.

12.	Chris Briggs, the Global Programme Manager, presented an overview of the BCH project within the context of the overall UNEP-GEF Biosafety projects. He explained that the Biosafety team helped countries to build a structure, from a very basic level up to the development of a draft national biosafety framework, which included components such as a regulatory regime administrative systems, policy, monitoring and public participation. He elaborated on the 18-24 month duration for developing a draft national biosafety framework (NBF) under the Development project, which would then be followed by an Implementation phase so as to move the NBF from draft to a fully operational system.

13.	Chris Briggs emphasized that the key role for the Biosafety Clearing House project is to assist all countries that may wish to use the BCH. He went on to say that the BCH project will initially cover 50 countries but, depending on the May Council in Washington, this number could increase up to 140 countries. There is a large audience that the BCH project would cater for, in both developing and developed countries. Currently, it appears, that countries that have a draft NBF or are in the process of developing their NBFs and the twelve countries with demonstration implementation projects would like support and advice from the BCH project.

14.	Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, the Task Manager for the BCH project, gave a general overview of the Project and explained that since project approval in March 2004, it was now ready to be executed. To initiate the project, there is a need to develop a training package. She highlighted the objectives of the BCH project, which are to develop core human resources and establish an appropriate BCH infrastructure to enable eligible countries to benefit from the BCH. She also emphasized the two major components of the project: training and equipment.

15.	Jyoti Mathur-Filipp also elaborated on the workshop objectives, which were to identify the methodology for the training programme as well as the basic topics that will need to be covered by a training programme for the BCH. The training package would then be used for training of: a) Trainers, b) Regional experts, c) National experts and d) also used for Self-learning. This training package would aim to cover a large audience and provide a high quality product to be used by 50 countries initially, and scaled up to another 90 countries in the longer term, if needed. The aim of the training package would be to teach the audience to understand and set up the BCH and enable them to acquire the necessary skills to train others.

16.	Professor Julian Kinderlerer of the University of Sheffield, emphasized the need to explain to participating countries what information should be contained both in the BCH in Montreal and in any national BCH. He highlighted the importance of utilizing the BCH to the best advantage for each country by training them on how to set up a database and what information to input to that database. He indicated that it would be necessary to define the objectives of the Project and design the training package in such a way that it aims at the advantages that can be gained by countries to use and access the BCH.

17.	Jyoti Mathur-Filipp described the various ways in which countries will be using and accessing the BCH, i.e.: direct entry; through a national BCH which is interoperable

with the system; or through the use of a CD-ROM. She further listed the elements of the proposed training framework as: (a) Cartagena Protocol related topics; (b) BCH portal related topics and (c) National BCH and IT related topics.

18.　　　　In response to a request from Kirsten McLean, Scientific and Technical Officer for the BCH in the Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity, for an overview about how the training package fits into the whole BCH and what aspects will be dealt with through the project, Jyoti Mathur-Filipp highlighted the two components of the project. The first component deals with equipment that helps countries to access the BCH and includes hardware, software and Internet access. The second is a training component to help countries to understand what the BCH is, how to set it up as well as how to train others. She explained that around 20 trainers will be trained and that these will be regional experts who will help countries to access and use the BCH, as well as 3 national experts per country.

19.　　　　Sheila Schuette from Monsanto posed the question of whether there would be separate training for technical staff and trainers? This question was left open for discussion at a later stage.

20.　　　　Further discussion focused on the need for negotiation with countries on what their actual needs are and what they are able to put on the BCH. Countries must be made aware of their obligations with regard to what information must be put on the BCH and they need to be provided with the tools for putting information on their own BCH. It was emphasized that the Project has a limited time and budget and that the 3 people trained at the regional level must have a mix of skills, preferably including IT skills. A system for continuity and replacement must be in place and the use of templates assist the country to continue smoothly. Lessons need to be taken to as wide an audience as possible.

21.　　　　Julian Kinderler stressed that it is not what a country can put *in* the BCH, but rather what they can get *out*, that is important. He emphasized the need to set up queries for countries to get answers to their questions and also the importance for countries to know how to get information out of the system, regardless of whether they are IT specialists or not.

22.　　　　Charles Gbedemah of UNEP-GEF, posed the question of where the BCH is currently and "what we have on the table", emphasizing that it is necessary for all to understand how the BCH will provide the countries with information. Knowing what you have in place before you can start is crucial.

23.　　　　Kirsty, responding to a request from Jyoti-Mathur-Filipp to explain the current status of the BCH, defined the BCH as an information exchange mechanism and explained that before the entry into force of the Protocol the ICCP met regularly to discuss the development of the BCH. Upon entry into force of the Protocol 50 countries were immediately obliged to provide information through the BCH on transboundary movements on issues including Advanced Informed Agreements (AIAs) (e.g. GM corn growing in another country, the bilateral procedure, publishing of the final risk so other governments can see what process was) and; Food, Feed or Processing (e.g. selling GM tomatoes and making a decision about domestic use- authorities must use the BCH so they can find out about public information).

24.　　　　Kirsty Mclean further explained that defining capacity needs is a complex procedure. The BCH is primarily an internet-based tool with non-internet elements. She also explained that in certain countries the cost of accessing the web is high and sometimes Internet connection is unavailable. She also emphasized the differences that exist in terms of IT and capacity in different countries, added to which is the ever-changing nature of the situation. Currently, the BCH is a decentralized system with a central portal hosted in Montreal by the CBD Secretariat, through which governments can input their data by using a

management centre. The two important aspects of the BCH are the provision of information and making use of the information.

25.   Donna Roy of USGS-BRD expressed the need to identify, for marginalized groups and countries, approximate range of data that is expected to be transferred through the BCH in the next few years. A consensus was reached that this would approximately amount to 4MB.

26.   Kirsty Mclean elaborated that the type of information stored in the BCH corresponds to what is specified in the Protocol. Quantity of data will vary on a country-by-country basis and will mostly be dependent on the decisions taken by the countries in question.

27.   Chris Briggs re-stated the aim of the project was to get eligible countries up to a point where they understand the basics of the BCH. There are many different ways of achieving this. At this stage, it is important to discuss the methodology for training and the development of the training package. Equipment needs would be considered at a later stage in the project, but right now it would be important to decide how countries will be able to use and access data.

28.   Erik Blokpoel of Van Olst Solutions pointed out that the discussions seemed to be focused on a solution to a problem, whilst the problem and the background were still not defined.

29.   Inez Slamet Loedin of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences pointed out that mechanisms for different elements of the NBF, including risk assessments etc, already might exist in countries.

30.   Cynthia Brzak took the floor to clarify the expected outcomes of the discussions. She recognized that there seemed to be a need to further discusses the BCH Project and re-state the objectives of the workshop. An exercise was conducted where participants had the opportunity to present their expected outcome for the workshop. The general opinion was that sustainability and further development are important aspects, as well as transparency in the power structure of the information process, information, useful training courses, a clear view of country needs and a clear definition of target groups.

31.   Cynthia Brzak also posed the question of what participants felt a successful outcome of the training programme would be. Following are a list of some of the responses:

- A populated BCH used to make decisions (data and users). A central portal and national by any means;
- A BCH which is used autonomously and widely, as well as being user friendly;
- The provision of basic tutorials;
- The achievement of three levels of requirements: the Protocol, national level and business level. Most importantly, the BCH must meet user/data input level requirements;
- Improved access and improved capacity to disseminate information;
- Monitoring training to keep redefining and delivering right info/right places to people/right time (avoid flooding);
- A growing competence to identify areas where we are still ignorant or areas still lacking and where we need to deliver;
- No (or reduced) duplication of effort (at technical levels)

- National "collection" of information which is widely used and disseminated via internet or non internet methods

32.   Julian Kinderlerer shared his experiences from participating in many regional workshops over the last 10 years and mentioned that in his opinion a one-week regional training workshop may not be successful in accomplishing its goals. He elaborated that if the BCH Project would host regional workshops as a training of trainers course, more than a week would be needed to train individuals in certain aspects of using the BCH especially since these individuals would then have the responsibility to conduct the national level training workshops. He posed the following questions: Is the regional workshop the right approach? What could we do to achieve that end in a better way? Can money be used more effectively? An option he felt that would be beneficial, would be a system that would comprise of peripatetic trainers who would find out what is needed, direct people in a country and return feedback from countries to the project and CBD Sec.

33.   Cynthia Brzak mentioned a process called cascade training, where a small group of people trains a large audience and she also mentioned that the UNHCR had designed such programmes and training for approximately 6000 people, with positive results. The process initially involves self-study and a considerable amount of background materials. She added that the possible knowledge elements of the BCH training package are really needed from participants. She suggested moving away from the discussion on design, and recommended discussing what must be included in the training package.

34.   Giovanni Ferraiolo stated that it was important to consider the limiting factors of the planning process for the Project. A potential 140 countries represents a large amount of people to train. Training only experts might require a lot more resources than are currently available.

35.   Ms. Christine von Weizacker, Spokesperson on Biosafety Issues for the Federation of German Scientists, pointed out that few people around the world would be competent in all three areas of training (i.e. Cartagena Protocol related training, BCH-related training and IT-related training). For experts in each area, a week is fine, but for non-experts, this would not be enough. More people that are knowledgeable in all three are needed, but short-term regional training will allow for networking between the experts.

36.   Stefi Baum of the US State Department stated that workshops, whether at national or regional levels, should allow for practical use of the BCH, and provide resources to countries to enable them to get answers to their questions. The problem, she emphasized, is getting people to access what they have learnt in a real way and training can only be sustainable if a country is motivated to use BCH. This requires analyzing what type of training countries need and to develop a training package accordingly. She added that to date, only two countries are in compliance with the Protocol.

37.   Han De Koeijer, of Developing Countries Partnership RBIN, emphasized that not more than twenty people should be trained at a time by three or four trainers per workshop. He went on to say that those trained would need to be tested before they deliver national-level training and that it would be important to assess the level of what the trainers have learnt.

38.   Kirsty Mclean added that it was important to know who are the target audience for the training framework and to allow for different country/regional experiences in developing the training package. For example, the training package for SIDS could be completely different to the training package for Canada. How you approach one group may be very different to another group and it is necessary to address different needs and respond to

variations in the use of technology and expertise. People should not all be trained in the same way.

39.   Information Architecture and Systems Analyst, Alain le Duc from Canada, said he was skeptical about training someone to design and manage a database in a short period of time. He added that workshops should focus on topics that people will understand and remember and mentioned that a good exercise would be a period of requirements analysis of the database, to give an overall view of the database and its uses.

40.   Further discussion among the participants focused on the need to identify the target audience. The following three target audience were initially proposed:

> 1. Policy level-scientist, regulators, project coordinators, government departments
> 2. Data managers-data collection agencies, agricultural and technology organizations.
> 3. Technical – designers, programmers, dbase developers

41.   Cynthia Brzak invited participants to discuss possible problems. The following were listed:

- Information must be in the BCH in order to be shared. At present, majority of it is not;
- Alternative ways to send information besides the internet and in more languages than only English;
- How to identify how information is generated within a country and different political/scientific systems;
- How to target who gets training: division of competencies and responsibilities;
- How to address lack of confidence in sharing information due to quality;
- How to accommodate BCH under the Biosafety information (the central portal is not friendly enough);
- How to address national needs vs. just the Protocol requirements;
- How to convert national information into BCH format;

42.   Participants further discussed the idea of developing a modular training package that would include manuals and/or workbooks with detailed documentation. This would allow individuals to read the relevant chapter of the book and complete the exercises. It was suggested that a CD-ROM be developed to enable a more in-depth understanding of the subject matter than the contents in the current BCH toolkit that is available through the BCH central portal. Modules are potentially the best-case scenario as the project staff would be able to identify assess country needs and include additional aspects/topics if needed. Modules can be modified as the Project is implemented and therefore can be flexible.

43.   Chris Briggs pointed out that in looking at 140 countries it would be necessary to have a number of regional or international experts giving courses at a national level, which would make the national level workshops more satisfactory and efficient. The idea was now to train a group of about 20-60 experts who understand clearly the topics that are required for training. At a national level, countries would be provided with the modules, different tools and the workbook.

44.   In response to a question from the participants "Will regional experts ever meet face to face?" Chris Briggs responded that all regional experts would meet and learn from each other, train and exchange experiences.

45.	At the national level, one of the difficulties and obstacles is that people think their failure is due to personal shortcomings and try to hide it. If they can identify that this is a general problem they face rather than a specific one, there is a much better chance of people identifying their shortcomings and areas of learning. A two-way information exchange could therefore be very useful and would give training at national level some additional qualities.

IV.   Day One, Focus Groups

46.	The afternoon session began with a discussion on the target audience and the components of a training framework. After much discussion, the participants agreed upon the following list of potential target audience and the main training components.

47.	Target Audiences were identified as:
- Group 1: Data Entry Operators and collection managers;
- Group 2: IT Specialists;
- Group 3: National Project Coordinators and BCH FPs; and
- Group 4: Competent National Authority and decision makers.

48.	The training framework was identified as having the following four components:
- Obligations of the BCH (or the obligations of each Party relating to the BCH);
- Search/Entry (BCH central portal);
- NBCH and IT related; and
- Knowledge building and networking.

49.	Annex D provides more information on the decision-making process used to arrive at the above conclusion.

50.	Participants were then divided into four groups of between 5 to 6 individuals and each group was assigned one target audience to address. Each group was requested to determine, for the assigned target audience, the different training needs based on the training framework agreed upon. Annex G was distributed to each group to enable them to focus their discussions.

51.	The day ended with each group still in the breakout sessions, with instructions to return to plenary the next morning before continuing in the small groups.

52.	At the request of the participants and following the discussions in the early part of the workshop, Chris Briggs and Jyoti Mathur-Filipp presented the revised design methodology for the project. In the morning and in previous communications, concerns had been raised about how to carry out training effectively for so many countries by training of trainers in a one-week workshop and the limitations of using national trainers, as well the difficulties of the CBD Secretariat attending a large number of regional workshops for national participants. This could potentially require up to 25 man weeks of Secretariat staff. In response, Chris Briggs suggested an alternative to choose a number of experienced and knowledgeable people from each of the four regions and to train them extensively to deliver assistance to countries to assist in their participation in the BCH. This would initially include 20 experts for 50 countries but would be expanded as the number of countries rose.

53.	There was positive support for this suggestion from the people present, and it was agreed by all the participants at this session to support this change of project design. The matter was raised in the plenary the next day and support was again found for this change on the delivery of the training. It was felt that the change was positive and would lead to a

more efficient delivery of training at the country level.

<div align="center">

V.   **Agenda Day Two**

</div>

54.   The participants met in plenary on the morning of the second day, which was started by Cynthia Brzak asking each group a different question on the proceedings of the previous day. Group 1 was asked, *"What they felt had gone well?"* during the course of yesterday. Some of the answers from Group 1 included the fact that participants felt that there had been full participation, robust discussions and fresh ideas raised and that there had been good small group dynamics.

55.   Group 2 was asked, *"What could have gone better?"* One participant felt he had not been sure of the purpose and process of making lists regarding the target audience, another expressed that there had been a difficulty in the definition of terms. Further opinions included that all ideas had not always been listened to and thus, not all ideas had been heard and that participants would have liked to choose the small group they entered.

56.   Group 3 was asked, *"What they would like to happen on day 2?"* Participants mentioned that they would like to speak in a more concrete manner, continue small group work and identify the people and the background that needed to be listened to. They felt it was necessary to find an approach that could fit the countries' needs.

57.   Group 4 was asked *"what they felt was important on day 2 for working in small groups?"* They felt that it has to be realized that not everything can be equally important and that people must prepare themselves before coming to a national workshop, as not everything will be learned solely from these workshops. Problems at the national level need to be taken into consideration and there should be awareness about the fact that one cannot have all the answers immediately.

VI.   Day Two, Focus Groups continued

58.   At the end of the morning session, participants were requested to re-convene in the groups from the previous day and continue to discuss and refine the results of the previous days work. However, they were also requested to, individually, list on one sheet of paper *"what information and/or training modules need to be included for your training audience"*. Annex F is a list of all the individual responses categorized by groups. Group 1 declined to participate in this exercise.

VII.   Day   Two,   Afternoon   Session

59.   In the afternoon, each group was requested to present to the plenary a summary of their discussions. Each group presentation was followed by a discussion period.

60.   The first group to present back was the one that worked on a *Training framework for decision makers and competent authorities*. The summary of their presentation is attached and is part of Annex E.

61.   The discussion focused on the fact that needs do differ for each country and that a training programme should be able to accommodate different approaches. There is a need to develop a structured module that can be used at different levels and to work out what would happen in the worst-case scenario if a country does not want a module, and what are the particular problems in learning, use and access of bch? Why is the BCH not being used properly is also a key question. Is there a need to develop plans for a transition period and

what are the requirements. It was also discussed that a modular way of designing a training package would be able to include many different ways of presenting things, which may not only be in written form. Further, modules can effectively be stand-alone and can be used as a starting point to customize the training for each country to suit their needs.

62.　　　　Participants also discussed the relationship with BCH obligations and the use of BCH for decisions relating to imports, labeling, food feed and processing, the advanced informed agreement etc. How does one make the decision maker aware of the processes being put in place? Should a milestone be set for each country in the MOU? should the country be asked to develop a project plan on how to develop and use the BCH? And should this be part of the MOU? What are the plans for continuity and sustainability in each country, which they must produce?

63.　　　　Participants also cautioned on the need to include a process through which training modules could be updated and modified depending on any new information requirements from the MOP. It was also noted that the writers of the modules may not necessarily also required to be the trainers.

64.　　　　Group 2 was requested to focus on **Project Coordinators and the BCH Focal Points**. The summary of their presentation is attached and is part of Annex E.

65.　　　　The discussion following the presentation by Group 2 focused on the need to recognize the equal importance of training the BCH Focal Point and the national project coordinator and most importantly for the sake of continuity. There is a need to develop training for a coordination committee, i.e. the people who provide the information to the BCH FP. There is a need to explain the validation of the information process in detail. Countries are not confident about putting up their data and therefore the BCH FPs are not providing data through the BCH.

66.　　　　Group 3 was requested to focus on **Data Entry Operators**. There was some confusion as to the definition of this target audience and clarification was sought from the plenary. The summary of their presentation is attached and is part of Annex E.

67.　　　　The discussion, which followed, emphasized the need to further discuss language. The languages of the training package and the requirement by some countries to use their local language for the national BCH. Further it was emphasized that training on controlled vocabulary is extremely essential and important for this category of audience as well as the use of common formats. It was discussed that this category of audience will only be inputting data and it was not envisioned that they would be using the search functionality. There was also a discussion on using a methodology to test the knowledge of the people trained and that it might be useful to develop such a methodology into the modules and perhaps distributed on a CD-ROM.

68.　　　　Group 4 was the last group to present and they focused on IT Specialists. The summary of their presentation is attached and is part of Annex E.

69.　　　　The discussions following the presentation reflected the need for using a phased approach with this audience type. The module for this target audience will have to be designed by IT professional.

70.　　　　The participants decided that there was a need to train IT people specifically on the BCH and not to train people in the specifics of IT. Participants were cognizant of the fact that there are many countries where IT skills are not adequate to set-up, maintain and use the BCH. However it was agreed that there was no point in raising false expectations by giving

IT-training.

71.   The training programme should adopt a two-phased approach: initially encourage countries to input their data and use the central portal to access data while setting up their nBCH, if so decided by a country. It was also discussed that most governments find it difficult to hold on to IT experts, as they are liable to get higher salaries in the private sector. Most countries are aware that they would like to have some sort of national BCH and already some countries are outsourcing the development of this to private firms. It was suggested that if a country is going to outsource the development of the national BCH it might be useful to produce training material that could guide the development of a good product. It was emphasized that there was no need to train the private sector. However, it is up to a country to decide how it will outsource its BCH and probably the regional experts may be able to advice on the options and maybe the number of IT man-hours required for each option. It might be useful to develop terms of reference for countries to use as a blueprint when outsourcing to a private company.

72.   It was further discussed that outsourcing development also requires the maintenance to be outsourced unless it is hosted with a company that will maintain the site. It was raised that, in particular for this target audience, it was extremely useful and necessary to network.

73.   Chris Briggs thanking the participants for their insights and input and their invaluable contribution to the development of the training programme for the BCH closed the workshop.

74.   Following the meeting of experts to develop a training package for the Biosafety Clearing House, a smaller meeting was convened with 8 participants to discuss technical proposals that are being offered to developing countries through the BCH project to be distributed as options for helping them with National Biosafety Clearing Houses. Representatives from three countries, Switzerland, Canada and USA, made presentations on their proposals at this two-day meeting, which was then followed by the group analyzing and categorizing the three proposals using similar criteria across the three proposals. Results from this workshop will be made available separately.

VIII. Conclusion

75.   The two-day deliberations by experts raised a number of important issues in the methodology to be used by the BCH project in delivering training programmes to assist countries to set-up, maintain and use BCHs, whether through the central portal or by setting up their own national BCHs.

76.   The original design of the project involved training three participants from each participating country at a number of regional workshops to deliver training at a national level and set up the BCH. However, the opinion of these training experts and BCH experts was that this would not necessarily lead to an effective or efficient methodology for delivery of training. Training such national experts in a week would not be sufficient to meet these aims and could raise unreasonable expectations. In addition, the focus of capacity building in the project was considered by the workshop participants to be less focussed on formal classroom training for many elements of the BCH and towards meeting the very specific country needs in different ways by means of expert external advice. This led the meeting to conclude that a better design of training delivery would involve the greater use of regional experts to provide advice, support and training where needed. Therefore the project team would provide for intensive and extensive training of a number of regional experts who will then deliver training, advice and assistance to countries during the project life and afterwards.

77.   A major focus for the future will be to find a number of appropriate regional IT experts and regional experts familiar with the Cartagena Protocol, agree their nominations with CBD Secretariat and then train them to be appropriate BCH experts.

78.   The deliberations at the workshop also focused on the need to develop specific training material targeted at certain audiences, which were identified and agreed upon by the participants. It was felt that the training programme should be developed in a modular fashion so that it would enable training to be targeted at different levels of capacity in terms of both IT and understanding the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH). This would also allow for the training to be able to be customized to fit specific country needs. Different modules can be put together to develop a training programme that would suit the specific needs of each participating country.

79.   Further, it was also felt that there was a need to develop a refresher/primer course for the different levels of audience understanding. This should include a module that would allow people to test their understanding of the BCH.

80.   The meeting also concluded that there was a need to create a knowledge management and networking module that would enable experiences to be captured and ensure that experiences were shared among people working on the BCH.

Annex A
Workshop on Development of Training Materials
For the BCH Capacity-Building Project
Geneva, 3-4 May 2004

Session Name Duration	Time	Facilitators	Content – Process	Expected output So what? What next?
Welcome	9:00 – 9:30	Cynthia	Thank you for coming Introductions	Ground rules
Opening Overview	9:30 – 10:00	Chris and Jyoti	Introduce project and workshop objectives	<u>Project Objectives</u> • to develop core human resources; and • establish an appropriate national BCH infrastructure to enable eligible countries to fully participate in, and benefit from the Biosafety Clearing House <u>Workshop Objectives</u> • to identify the topics that need to be covered in a BCH training that would include (a) training of trainers (b) regional experts (c) national experts (d) self-learning; • develop a high-quality training package that can be used by 190 countries, if needed
Clarifying Expectations	10:00 - 10:30	Cynthia	Participants' expected outcomes	Understand where we need to end up
Coffee Break	10:30 – 11:00			

Session Name / Duration	Time	Facilitators	Content – Process	Expected output / So what? / What next?
Overview of Training Framework	11:00 – 12:00	Jyoti and Cynthia	Review paras 8-10 of Background Note covering main elements of training package	Clarify three main components as starting point: • Cartagena Protocol-related Training • BCH central portal related Training • National BCH and IT-related Training Purpose of Training Package: • Initially to be used to train 50 countries • Will be scaled up to include another 90 countries • Audience must be able to understand, learn and set-up their BCH AND • Be able to train others.
Exercise	12:00 – 12:15	Cynthia	Participants write down modules which need to be included in training package	Check for understanding
Lunch	12:15 – 13:30			
Refining Training Framework	13:30 – 15:30	Cynthia	Plenary discussion on – • Target Audience • What are main elements • What are different levels for whom • How to handle different levels	Broadly develop different sections of the eventual training package
Coffee Break	15:30 – 16:00			

30

Session Name Duration	Time	Facilitators	Content – Process	Expected output So what? What next?
Defining Terms of Reference	16:00 – 17:30	Jyoti *Small working groups (3 or more)*	Groups are formed corresponding to each training section of the Framework	Each group develops a section within package with defines: ● Learning hours ● Topics covered ● Materials (for workshops & self-study)
Wrap Up	17:30 – 18:00	Cynthia *Plenary or small group*	What went well? What could have gone better? How do you see tomorrow?	
Aperitifs	19:00			
Dinner	20:00			

31

Tuesday, 4 May 2004 – MORNING and AFTERNOON

Session Name Duration	Time	Facilitators	Content – Process	Expected output So what? What next?	Supporting materials/handouts	Outstan… issue
Review of Day 1	9:00 – 9:30	Cynthia	Feedback on what went well, what to improve	Overview of day ahead		
continue **Defining Terms of Reference**	9:30 - 12:00	*Continue group work (in same groups from Day 1)*	Groups continue development of a section within package with defines: • Learning hours • Topics covered • Materials (for workshops & self study)	Further define ideas & materials to train regional experts & trainers who together give national workshops		
Coffee Break	Each group to take coffee and continue					
Lunch	12:00 – 13:30					
Refining Terms of Reference	13:30 – 15:30	Cynthia	Small groups report to plenary	Plenary inputs to refine TOR and training package		*Someone to t. session notes retrieve group flipcharts*
Coffee Break	15:30 – 16:00					*Chris, Jyoti, C review progre how to wrap u*
Refining Training Framework	15:30 – 17:30	Cynthia	Plenary revisits the Training Framework after small group work and before next phase	Global check of sections, approach, methodology and training process	Note input from group on flipchart	*Someone to session notes retrieve flip ct. input*
Wrap Up Next Steps	17:30 – 18:00	Chris and Jyoti				

Annex B

List of Participants

1   Mr. Marc Auer
Bundesministerium fuer Umwelt, Naturschutz
und Reaktorsicherheit
Federal Ministry for the Environment,
Division/Referat N II 4,
Biotechnologie/Genetechnik

2   Ms. Steffi Baum
Science Policy Adviser
US State Department

3   Mr. Erik Blokpoel
Founder and Co-Director
Van Olst Web Solutions

4   Ms. Cynthia Brzak
Training Assistant
UNHCR Staff Development
Section

5   Mr. Jose Luis Gerhartz Muro
SIDSNet Information Officer for the
Caribbean
Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas

6   Ms. Perla Godoy
Technical Coordinator in Biosafety
Biotechnology Office.
Secretariat of Agriculture, Livestock,
Fisheries and Foods

7   Mr. Matthias Guldenpfennig
Project Leader
Gruner AG Basel Ingenieure und Planer

8   Prof. Julian Kinderlerer
Professor of Biotechnology Law
Sheffield Institute of Biotechnology
Law and Ethics
University of Sheffield

9   Mr. Han De Koeijer
Assistant, Developing Countries
Partnership

10   Mr. Alain Le Duc
Information Architecture and Systems
Analyst

11   Ms. Julijana Lebez-Lozej
Counsellor to the Minister
Ministry of Environment, Spatial
Planning and Energy

12   Ms. Inez Slamet Loedin
Head of Molecular Biology Division
RC Biotechnology - Indonesian Institute of
Sciences (LIPI)

13   Ms. Kirsty Galloway McLean
Scientific and Technical Officer/BCH
Secretariat to the Convention on Biological
Diversity

14   Ms. Nichole McNeely
NBII Technical Project Coordinator
NBII Program Office
US Geological Survey

15   Mr. Alex Owusu-Biney
National Project Coordinator
UNEP-GEF Project on "Development
of National Biosafety Framework"
Ghana Atomic Energy Commission

16   Ms. Darja Stanic Racman
Researcher/NPC Slovenia
National Institute of Biology

17   Ms. Donna Roy
IT/GIS Project Manager
USGS - BRD

18   Ms. Sheila Schuette
Director
Regulatory Affairs, Monsanto Company

19   Ms. Christiane Speiss
Associate Programme Officer
UNITAR

20   Mr. Albert Spielmann
Scientific Adviser
Swiss Agency for Environment,
Forests and Landscape

21 Ms. Christine von Weizsacker
    Spokesperson on Biosafety Issues
    Federation of German Scientists

UNEP-GEF

22 Mr. Jean-Louis Balladier
    Fund Manager
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

23 Mr. Christopher Briggs
    Global Programme Manager
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

24 Mr. Koffi Dantsey
    Assistant Regional Coordinator, Africa
    UNEP-GEF Coordination Division

25 Ms. Liina Eek
    Assistant Regional Coordinator
    Central and Eastern Europe
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

26 Mr. Giovanni Ferraiolo
    Regional Coordinator, Latin America
    and Caribbean
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

27 Mr. Charles Gbedemah
    Regional Coordinator, Africa
    UNEP-GEF Coordination Division

28 Mr. Faulalo Keneti
    Assistant Regional Coordinator, Pacific

29 Jyoti Mathur-Filipp
    BCH Task Manager
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

30 Mr. Nizar Mohamed
    Regional Coordinator, Asia Pacific
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

31 Ms. Nelly Opiyo
    Programme Assistant
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

32 Mr. Ingo Piegeler
    Training Manager
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

33 Ms. Alessandra Sensi-Nori
    Programme Officer
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

34 Ms. Mallory Smuts
    Information Officer
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

35 Mr. Frédéric Vogel
    BCH IT Specialist
    UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit

Annex C
List of Documents Relating to the Biosafety Clearing House

1. The Biosafety Clearing-House of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety: A Guide to the BCH (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/publications/bch-brochure-en.pdf)

.2. Guidelines for National Participation in the Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/notifications/2003/ntf-2003-105-bch-en.pdf)

3. <u>Decisions adopted by the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</u> (Pages 35-40)

   4. Report of the African regional meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House and the Clearing-house Mechanism (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/bch/bchafr-01/official/bchafr-01-02-en.pdf)

   5. Report of the Latin America and the Caribbean meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/bch/bchlac-01/official/bchlac-01-02-en.pdf)

   6. Report of the Central and Eastern Europe regional meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/bch/bchcee-01/official/bchcee-01-02-en.pdf)

   7. Report of the Asia and The Pacific regional meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House (http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/bch/bchap-01/official/bchap-01-02-en.pdf)

   8. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/5/ADD3:</u> Synthesis of capacity-building needs identified by the regions for implementation of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

<u>Other Relevant Documents</u>

   1. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/5:</u> Information-sharing: Progress report on the development and implementation of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

   2. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/5/ADD1:</u> Summary of the independent review of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

   3. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/5/ADD2:</u> Third note by the bureau of the ICCP on technical issues associated with the development of the pilot phase, and preparation for the implementation phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

   4. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/INF/8:</u> Information-sharing (Article 20): Report of the Central and Eastern Europe regional meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House

   5. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/INF/9:</u> Information-sharing (Article 20): Report of the Asia and the Pacific regional meeting on the Biosafety Clearing-House

   6. <u>UNEP/CBD/ICCP/3/INF/10:</u> Information-sharing (Article 20): Independent review of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

7. UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/9: Information-sharing: Progress report on the development and implementation of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

8. UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/9/ADD1: Information-sharing: Technical review of the implementation of the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

9. UNEP/CBD/ICCP/2/15: Report of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety on the work of its second meeting

10. UNEP/CBD/ICCP/1/3: Information-Sharing (Art. 20, Art. 19): Outcome of the Meeting of Technical Experts on the Biosafety Clearing-House

11. UNEP/CBD/ICCP/1/3/ADD1: Information Sharing (Art. 20, Art. 19): Outcome of the Meeting of Technical Experts on the BCH - Addendum: Estimate of resources for the pilot phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House

12. First Liaison Group Meeting of Technical Experts on the Biosafety Clearing-House, Montreal, 19 to 20 March 2001

13. Second meeting of the Liaison Group of Technical Experts on the Biosafety Clearing House, Nairobi, 27-28 September 2001.

14. Meeting of Technical Experts on the Biosafety Clearing-House (11-13 September 2000, Montreal, Canada)

15. First Note from the Bureau on technical issues associated with the implementation of the Pilot Phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (30 March 2001).

16. Second Note from the Bureau on technical issues associated with the implementation of the Pilot Phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (10 October 2001)

17. Third Note from the Bureau on technical issues associated with the development of the Pilot Phase of the Biosafety Clearing-House (26 April 2002).

TRAINING PACKAGE

1-Database design and management
2-search BCH for info.
3-Access use of BCH info
4-ID of relevant BCH info for decision makers
5-Registration of info on BCH
6-Use of non-internet media as provided by CBD Sec
7-Networking
8-Knowledge building

TRAINING FRAMEWORK

1. CP related
2. BCH central portal related
3. NBCH and IT related
4. Knowledge building and networking

AUDIENCE 1

Those who search, access and use BCH. These consist of:

- Policy makers and decision makers who both form a part of legislators/judiciary
- Regulators
- Competent national authorities
- Scientists and risk assessors
- Project coordinators
- Customs/control
- BCH Focal Points
- Public and business

AUDIENCE 2
Data entry

- BCH Focal Point-data validation and entry
- Data collection agencies
- Competent national authorities
- Collection managers

Skills in department of subject matter

"Geeks"

TARGET GROUP FOR FIRST PHASE OF TRAINING

1. Data entry operators
2. BCH FP (validates data)-diff agencies input data

3. Competent National Authority (s)/((decision maker –depending on system (politician))-responsible for government responsibility, giving permission (food, feed etc)-data suppliers in the end
4. NPC
5. IT specialist

(decision makers trained at a different level)

	Search and Access	Data Entry	IT
CP Types of Information	H	M	L
BCH Central portal	M	H	M
NBCH/IT	L	M	H

ANNEX E
Summary of Reports from the Break-out Groups

Group 1
Training framework for decision makers, competent authorities

1. **Before training is instigated the following needs to be in place/provided:**

    a. Administrative infrastructure

    b. Link to the development project (provide a worksheet to identify that which is already in place)

    c. Identification of responsible people for the BCH (input, extraction) including those receiving information from the CBD secretariat

    d. Basic inventories resulting from the development project, including the surveys which form the basis of information some of which will be on a national database eventually, some on the BCH.

2. **"Carrots & Sticks"**

    Explanation of obligations and needs for and from the BCH including

    a. What are the benefits to <u>you</u> of the BCH (including roster of experts, summaries of risk assessments, comparative information on similar or identical products placed on the BCH by different countries, and laws regulations and guidelines) **The BCH should be seen as a tool for decision making.**

    b. What are the pitfalls if you are not using the BCH

    c. "Refresher" on BCH obligations and choices (including national systems if and when appropriate)

    d. What can be done now – even countries that have made no decisions that need to be placed on the BCH have obligations. Decisions could be that if a product has been agreed in a number of countries they may be admitted without further analysis, or analysis is first needed....

    e. Training information on decisions on how to implement the BCH provisions in a particular country – what are the options; how to interact with the BCH

    f. Examples of different countries experience of using the BCH effectively including examples of National BCH systems and where appropriate, examples of summary risk assessments that have been placed on the BCH by different countries to indicate differences because of different environments etc.

3. **Modules tailored towards needs, to be used flexibly (in presentation style) and where appropriate**
    Provision of training information structured in modules on the uses to which the BCH could be put, and the input necessary for different uses of LMOs

including Import and Export under the AIA and the FFP procedures. These will address each issue individually (with overlap) that can be used by countries as appropriate. Appropriateness includes timing.

Knowledge Management is needed, including setting milestones that need to be accomplished before proceeding to a next stage of implementing the use and input to the BCH.

Group 2
Project Coordinators and BCH Focal Points

We recognized that there will be different needs for BCH FP and Project RC on data entry and knowledge.

We realized even though the needs may be different, two people need to receive the same training in case one of two leaves.

What will be priorities for each person compared to four points of training framework:

1=CP related
2=BCH central portal related
3=NBCH and IT related
4=Knowledge building and networking

BCH Focal Point: 1<2<3>4
National Project Coordinator: 1>(2<3)<4

- For both the Focal Point and Regional Coordinator it was assumed that they were already aware of the Protocol and BCH.
- Focal Point needs to address the issue of knowledge management
- National Project Coordinator may need more training on BCH and CP
- Networking is the highest priority for the National Project Coordinator

Searching BCH portal-BCH same priority as enterting data
FP-knowledge management and
NPC-may need more training on BCH and CP
Networking-highest priority for NPC

2<2<<3>4 FP
1>(2<3)<4

1. Obligation of BCH

A)   Need to have background on BCH obligations and explanations (updated according to MOP discussion) is circulated 1 month prior to training in form of CD (in case of no internet etc)

B)**Training** (would take half a day if people prepared)

a)   On the assumption that all had a look at the CD before coming to the training, there will be a discussion on point A and clarifications leading to understanding of the background.
b)   Collection of points not understood from background material

c)   Training on information/data management on: regulations, risk assessment, AIA, LMOs and FFPs and roster of experts that they should be aware of.

2.   BCH central portal (one day or 2 half days)

Assumption: Toolkit on CD so that all can have a look before coming to the training. For countries with internet connection, it is assumed that they will go through internet but could use CD.

        A) Background information (toolkit and data) is sent to countries 1 month prior to training for exercises
        B) Hands on training module:

        *search and retrieval
        *advanced search

Success criteria: The knowledge gained to be able to train others
*practical tests will be held at the end of the training period.

3.   Presentation of four options

*Background information: on the four options and obligations to enter data on the BCH

*Plan for the future: (moving from one assessment criteria to another)

*Data entry: Options 1, 2 and 3 of the framework should be trained on a modular basis and for 4, only standard formats.

(search, data entry and validation training only for the BCH Focal Point)

An important aspect of the training would consist of hands on exercises

4. One day module on how to start/create a network in the country and keep it running

- E.g. In-country mechanisms to submit information on decisions/risk assessment
- Informing people on new decisions/risk assessment procedures from neighbouring countries
- Internet discussion group for participating countries

*Regional meeting for NPC to exchange experience after X years

*Additional training might be on negotiation and reporting

A half day open to be discuss points 2/3, depending on experience of trainer

Many existing materials which could be used.

CB training only for 2 people (BCH and FP)

a) On the assumption that all had a look at the CD before coming to the training, discussion on points of clarification, on BCH and CP. Interesting to collect some points that were not understood from CD ROM (2 Hours)

Group 3
Data entry operators

	Obligations of BCH	Search/access	Data entry	Knowledge management	Network
	Overview	Comprehensive	Indepth	Cross-cut-1-3	
Purpose content	*General overview of CP in context *what types of information can go on BCH *National equivalents to international information *Terminology *Responsibilities of individuals/institutions (CAN, FP, secretariat)				*Increase awareness of networking
Method	*Lecture *CDRom *Written reference Material	*Lecture *Active participation	*Exam *interactive CD-rom *lecture/doing *support (person) *comprehensive reference material ("user guide")		
Available now (2)	All available	All available	Basis available, needs tailoring, no exam available, help secretariat/us project		Not sure
%of course	10%	25%	60%	2.5%	2.5%

Group 4
IT Specialists

IT SKILLS	BCH	NBCH
RDMBS familiarity		x
XML familiarity		x
Web serving familiarity		x
Hardware and peripheral knowledge (CD, floppy, FTP)	x	x
Integration and PC support (know who to call and what they can fix)	x	x
System administration familiarity and access		x
Programming familiarity		x
Web familiarity		x
Requirements analysis		x

Assumptions

We are not training core IT skills. There is a list of minimum skills that the chosen IT person must have.

These are skills that Regional trainers must have or have the capability to get. At national level, technical people must be familiar with. Trainers will provide post-workshop helpdesk/support

1. Central portal (direct)-mail, email, fax, phone
2. NBCH-create with HTML/XML (push). This would be a simple database. Using toolkit-mail, email
3. NBCH-create XML/SOAP interface (push)
4. Web-crawling of XML/HTML files

Tools/training

Obligated types of info	Refine CBD toolkit: -Definitions -update per module 1 according to XML specifications
Data search and retrieval	Demonstrate BCH search concepts. XML

	to search engines.
Data entry BCH and NBCH	
Knowledge and networking	CP exposure by ICCP or COP/MOP 1 negotiations from the region.

- Methodology and concepts of BCH and CP, role of IT, importance of data.

- Data entry into the portal and searching. Emphasis on first, intermediate and emergency method.

- Gathering information requirements in complex environment with regulators, scientists, policy etc. Include justifications across options.

- NBCH-what, when, how, why and who:
- audience
- stakeholders
- anticipated resources: fluctuations of costs, people etc.

- Everything that countries can use – Templates compatible with what is working already-link in in appropriate way. Choice of country. Criteria for what you get-country chooses.

- Concrete workshop training and examples from countries provided. Solutions when feasible.

Individual Responses for "What Information and/or Training Modules Need to be included for your Training Audience" Exercise

Group 2

- Training courses, modules and/or information to fulfil the BCH requirements
- Basic information on the CP. Information on the obligations of BCH
- Training on how to search, access and retrieve data and information off the BCH Central Portal
- Training on how to enter data under the National BCH Portal, make them familiar with application and possibilities to insert data, write articles, attach documents and its publications on the website (National Portal)
- Give the target audience a brief introduction and overview over main aspects of knowledge management
- Inform them on important actors/stakeholders and data suppliers in the field of biosafety
- Role of BCH
- Operation of Central Portal – types of information on BCH
- Possible structures for national BCH components
- Information management
- Basic information on metadata and controlled vocabularies
- Basic information on CP related to BCH
- Advance information on search/access of Central Portal information
- Definition of BCH terms
- Resources for assistance
  - Glossaries
  - Websites
  - Users' guides
- Preparation track (what do the participants need to do before the training)
- General understanding of BCH
- A good understanding of why the training and the content/purpose of the training course by the participants
- Good home review material
- Decent follow-up track

Group 3

IT Training

- Basic introduction about database problems, no code but: difference between data and metadata
- Problems of the *tendency working* using not only a sheet of paper for storage of information

Christine

- The information and training modules that the NGO-community after careful analysis handed in to – hopefully – be taken on board (Beth Burrows and Li Lim Lin will - upon requests – make these still valid comments available again).
- Go for iterative processes of joint and mutual learning instead of hierarchical once and for all solutions, structures modules

- Allow for intermediate solutions like national legislations sent in by diskette or even in print to the BCH whilst building up IT expertise in the region or the country. You will lose 90% of the trainees to other job offers at the beginning. Intermediate solutions are crucial for such unstable structures depending on career decisions of a few young men.

Fred

Module 1 – A general introduction to CP
- Clearly define what has been asked to the countries
- Quich

Module 2 – Examples of tools and success stories

- US, Canada, Switzerland, UNEP???
- Pros and cons of each tool. They do not have to choose during the training but so the IT people can brief their colleagues. NO DECISION NEEDED?

Module 3 – BCH DB Model description

- Develop a multiple case scenario to adapt the content of the IT training module to the country's needs and level of "capacities"

Before training

- Provide extensive documentation on principles and technologies (BCH toolkit+)
- Gather sufficient requirements on information processes from participating countries to understand what is needed in terms of application development. Only once this is done, a proper set of training module can be developed.

Training material

- Too premature. Must first determine what the technical training will be on.
- Maybe IT people can receive training on gathering requirements ???

Group 4

- Information relating to the obligations of different target groups
- Understanding the process – how the information is generated and to whom it is intended
- Training module for IT specialists including the optimal technology used for the country
- Information on how to search and retrieve different information from the BCH Central Portal and the NBCH

BCH Focal Point and Project Coordinators

- Background materials on CP and BCH
- Obligations of BCH: deep explanation on the obligations

- Use of the Central Portal for search and information retrieval. Manual of the CH use. Although the FP and PC won't be the main users they are intended to know very well the portal.
- Use of other tools for implementation of national or regional CH. This topic can be very important for certain regions and/or countries with unreliable telecommunications.

Data Entry

- Depending on the reality in each country, this section can be focused differently. In certain cases, the use of the Central Portal will be the most important way, while in some others, the use of non-web-based tools should be emphasized.

Networking

- This point is particularly important for project coordinators
- The use of existing networks could be importance for certain regions like SIDS.

Introduction	-	Obligations of BCH
Training Module 1	-	CP search and retrieval of information
Training Module 2	-	Data entry
Training Module 3	-	Networking and knowledge management

- Need to provide participants, at least one month in advance, with background information, to make sure that they tried to use the toolkit as available on the biodiv website under the BCH pilot phase
- Not everything can be covered at the workshop. So participants are expected to come up with problems they feel, requests for clarifications, etc. at workshops
- Information on overview of CP-related obligations
- Information on BCH, required summaries of national data
- Pros and cons + cost elements of the options of data entry (4 options)
- CPB vs. expected national obligations

Training Modules

- "Hands-on" bases training modules
- Modules packaged for all inclusive training or module per target group
- Use of the current tutorial/modules on the BCH as baseline training material
- FAQ material on the BCH as a background material
- Periodic review for pre-training material inputs and post-training input to enrich process
- Early delivery of background training materials
- Data entry module
- Background module on CP with few questions as to check that everybody read it before coming to training
- Central Portal module as background paper/tryout before
- Data entry module with tests (background or in-training)
- Information on how some countries that have already developed their framework has done this.
- Information on NBCH/tools that are already in use
- Follow-up training
- Further clarification of each point of BCH obligations and background
- Data entry manuals

- Template of the web
- Risk assessment template (final version)
- Search and retrieval data manual

Annex G

Training Framework

1. Obligations of the BCH
2. Central Portal – search and retrieval of types of information
3. Data entry with or without nBCH and tools
4. Knowledge management and networking of people and resources

Workshop on Development of Training Materials
For the BCH Capacity-Building Project
Geneva, 3-4 May 2004

Background Note and Agenda

I.   Background

81.   The UNEP-GEF project *Capacity-Building for Effective Participation in the
Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)* received final approval from the GEF in March 2004.
A large component of the project is to develop a training package that could include:
     a) Background material,
     b) Interactive tools and tutorials,
     c) A BCH toolkit,
     d) User-friendly computer based training manual,
     e) Database and website templates, and
     f) Coursework.

82.   The training package is envisaged to have a dual purpose:
     • it will be used in the regional training workshops which are intended
     to build the capacity of three participants from each country in the use and
     access of the BCH as well as to set up their own national BCH's depending
     on their strategies for long-term use of the BCH; and
     • it will also be disseminated as a complete course to countries which
     may be adapted for the national-level workshops on the BCH.

83.   An interactive software programme (a step-by-step guide) will also be
developed as part of the package to assist countries when they start inputting their
data.

84.   It is intended that this workshop should build upon the work already carried
out by the Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity in identifying capacity
needs for the BCH, and also the work it has done with the Belgian government in
carrying several training workshops. It is important to harness the lessons and
practices from this past experience and build these into the future training course.

II.   Objective of Workshop

85.   The purpose of this workshop is to investigate the various possible ways in
which the development of the training course for this UNEP-GEF project can be moved
forward in the most expeditious and efficient manner.

86.   Participants are invited to read through the attached list (Annex A) of CBD
documents and to come prepared to answer the following basic questions:
     • Can this type of training be developed in a course format and be
       modular? And if so, how should the course be divided between
       technical aspects relating to the set of computer hardware and
       software and the aspects relating directly to the obligations of the
       countries vis-à-vis the Protocol?

50

- What are the different levels of training corresponding to a country's level of IT-related skills, and how should this be handled by this project? Do all the Sections of the training package require to be different or only the last Section that deals with national BCHs and IT-related training?
- What are the main topics relating to the Protocol that need to be addressed in the course?
- Is it possible to link-up with Universities and / or Institutions to provide this type of training for longer-term sustainability?
- What should be the profile of the participants from countries who attend the regional workshops? Should all three participants from one country attend the same workshop or should participation be divided dependent on the profile of the participant?

III.   Participation

87.   Participants at this workshop have been invited based on their involvement in various aspects of developing either their national Biosafety Clearing Houses, or have been involved with the negotiations leading up to the various ICCP recommendations and MOP decisions on the BCH or have been involved in training for the BCH. Participants have been selected in such a manner as to cover the variety of expertise relevant to the implementation of this project. List of participants attached.

IV.   Outcome

88.   The outcome of the workshop will be in the form of detailed terms of reference on how to proceed with the development of the different components of the training course. It is hoped that this workshop will provide the developers of the different modules and the tools with enough information and guidance to actually develop the package over the next three months for delivery to eligible countries by mid-September. A Training of Trainers workshop is scheduled for August 2004 and will be considered part of the preparation for delivering the workshops over the next eighteen months.

V.   Proposed Training Structure

89.   This workshop will help synthesize the structure and form of the curriculum for the BCH training package.   This will include the expected outcomes of the training package, the objectives, the pedagogical methodology, experiential learning vs. lectures, length of training courses, assessments to measure learning etc.

90.   The following is ONLY a proposal. It is proposed that the training be delivered as a full-five day course. The course itself may be divided into three Sections:
- Introduction and Protocol-related Training (i.e. country obligations vis-à-vis the Protocol, users of the BCH in countries, importance of Roster of experts etc.)
- BCH-Related Training; and
- National BCH and IT-related Training.

91.   Each section could contain between two or three modules each; and examples from Day One, Section One could be used and built-upon all through the other two sections to illustrate and capture the important ideas from the previous section(s).

92.   For sustainability, it is proposed that the courses be conducted in conjunction with research or academic institutions at a regional level. This may enable the courses to be continued beyond the eighteen month period if the institutions we partner with may choose to give refresher courses. It is envisaged that since there will be a high-turnover due to attrition and changes in the BCH Focal Points and trainers at a country-level, such arrangement with existing institutions may ensure continuity and this may help make the training more sustainable and able to continue beyond the life of this project.

93.   It might also be useful to discuss, at this workshop, if it is possible to put into place some methods of cost recovery for the above-mentioned strategy.

94.   Following is a proposal only; the participants may wish to change this structure after discussing the intended participants at the regional workshops.

95.   A 5-Day course with an afternoon on third day off: 3 sections of 2-3 modules.
Each module of 4 hours will include a half hour coffee break. The structure could be:

<u>Day 1</u>
Morning: Section I: Introduction and Protocol-related Training
              Module 1: Introduction to the Protocol
Afternoon: Section I: Introduction and Protocol-related Training
              Module II: Protocol-related training
<u>Day 2</u>
Morning: Section II: BCH-Related Training
              Module I: Introduction to the BCH
Afternoon: Section II: BCH-Related Training
              Module II: central-BCH portal
<u>Day 3</u>
Morning: Section II: BCH-Related Training
              Module III: BCH
Afternoon: Afternoon Off

<u>Day 4</u>
Morning: Section III: National BCH and IT-related Training
              Module I:
Afternoon: Section II: National BCH and IT-related Training
              Module II:

<u>Day 5</u>
Morning: Section III: National BCH and IT-related Training
              Module III:
Afternoon: Evaluation and Wrap-up

96.   We may also wish to discuss if there is a value to give some sort of certification to the participants for attending the workshop and if so, what criteria should be used for the certification process. This will be essential if the strategy in paragraph 12 is followed.

<u>VI.   Approach</u>

97.   Since this workshop is being designed to develop future training materials participants will be encouraged to propose creative ideas and solutions to potential gaps and barriers, a rigorous structured organization of the discussion is discouraged. Rather, a skeleton tentative agenda is proposed below, which is designed to encourage a full examination of all possible alternatives to develop a rigorous terms of reference for the training course.

98.   The broad categories for our discussions are proposed to include:
- Participation in regional workshops
- Users of the Training Package
- Components of the training package
- Timelines for development of training project
- Measures to ensure sustainability
- Possible barriers to implementation and sustainability and how best to preemptively handle these problems
- Mechanisms for monitoring success and adjustment of workshops based on evaluation of results