



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/BS/MB/WS/2016/2/2
20 December 2016

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE GLOBAL WORKSHOP ON INTEGRATED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY CHISINAU, REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA, 31 OCTOBER- 4 NOVEMBER 2016

INTRODUCTION

1. The Global Workshop on integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity was held in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova, from 31 October to 4 November 2016. The workshop was one of the activities envisaged in the project on “Capacity-building to promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level”. The project, funded by the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, is aimed at strengthening capacity in nine pilot countries to develop and test practical actions to promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention. Within the pilot countries, the project seeks, among other things, to facilitate the integration of biosafety into national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) and other sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes, and strengthen national intersectoral coordination mechanisms. The project is also intended to develop training materials in the form of an e-learning module and toolkit on mainstreaming biosafety to be made publicly available for use at the national level.
2. The workshop was attended by 18 participants from the following nine countries that participated in the pilot project: Belarus; Burkina Faso; China; Ecuador; Mexico; Republic of Moldova; Malaysia; Malawi; and Uganda.
3. The Secretariat and resource persons from the University of Strathclyde served as facilitators for the workshop. The list of participants is presented in annex I.
4. The objectives of the workshop were as follows:
 - (a) To enable focal points of the Cartagena Protocol and the Convention, as well as project coordinators, to present the results of the desk study that show the status of and experience with integrated implementation at the national level;
 - (b) To present the draft e-learning module and associated toolkit on integrated implementation developed within the framework of the project, in order to receive feedback from participants towards their finalization;

(c) To allow participants to share lessons learned at the national level while preparing the desk study and suggest recommendations with a view to providing case studies for and further input into the toolkit;

(d) To assist the Parties represented to work towards the development of a draft action plan/strategy for mainstreaming at the national level.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

5. The workshop was opened by Mr. Charles Gbedemah, on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Mr. Gbedemah thanked the Government of Japan for its generous financial contribution towards the capacity-building project and the workshop. He also thanked the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova, through the State Secretary of Environment, for hosting the workshop and, in particular, Ms. Angela Lozan, Ms. Ala Rotaru, Ms. Lilia Eladii and Ms. Marcela Vatamaniuc for their collaboration in organizing the workshop. He reminded participants that a number of decisions had been adopted at the meetings of the Parties to the Convention and its Protocols in Pyeongchang with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness in the implementation of the treaties. In that regard, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol requested that the issue of integration be prioritized, particularly as Parties were reviewing their NBSAPs under the Convention. Finally, he stated that he expected the workshop to contribute to efforts for strengthening national capacities and fostering cooperation to advance the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol through effective integration.

6. Ms. Inga Podoroghin, State Secretary of Environment of the Republic of Moldova, welcomed participants to the workshop. She noted the many challenges currently facing biodiversity conservation and informed participants that, in 2015, the Republic of Moldova had adopted a biodiversity strategy, including an action plan covering the period until the year 2020, which addresses biosafety, given that the risk of unlawful entry of living modified organisms into the Republic of Moldova was quite high. She explained that a draft law had been developed to align the country with the directives of the European Union on the matter. She pointed out that it also followed the precautionary principle, taking into account the protection of human health and the environment, including its socio-economic impacts. She noted that the draft had been submitted to Parliament and was undergoing public debates. Finally, she wished participants a pleasant stay in the Republic of Moldova and invited them to a welcome dinner that evening.

7. Participants were then invited to introduce themselves.

ITEM 2. OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

8. Mr. Peter Deupmann of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity introduced the objectives for the workshop and provided an overview of the programme and expected outcomes. The workshop programme is presented in annex II.

ITEM 3. PROJECT STATUS OVERVIEW

9. Under this item, Mr. Deupmann presented an overview of the activities undertaken within the project on “Capacity-building to promote integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level”. They included the activities already undertaken by the nine pilot countries at the national level, the preliminary synthesis and analysis of the individual country reports identifying the main capacity needs and skill gaps and formulating recommendations which would be presented later during the workshop, the development of training materials and the global workshop itself, which was intended to provide a platform for the pilot countries to share experiences and assist with providing input into the training materials. Finally, participants were reminded of the upcoming deadlines under the project for submitting the final national projects and financial reports.

ITEM 4. MAINSTREAMING BIOSAFETY

10. Under this item, Mr. Deupmann provided a general introduction to mainstreaming and described the rationale, tools and suggested best practices to facilitate mainstreaming. Participants were provided with a brief overview of the key requirements under the Protocol. They were reminded that the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity were the common objectives of the Protocol and the Convention. Mr. Deupmann also highlighted certain substantive provisions in the Convention and several Aichi Targets that were relevant for biosafety. He reminded participants that the commonalities in objectives among the instruments had triggered several calls by the respective governing bodies for integrated implementation of the Convention and the Protocol and described how that could lead to efficiency savings and better opportunities to access the financial resources needed for biosafety.

11. The presentation then took participants through the possible process for mainstreaming biosafety at the national level, which usually consisted of at least three steps. Firstly, priority areas and objectives for mainstreaming needed to be agreed within the various national policy objectives. Next, stakeholders and partners needed to be engaged, and then entry points needed to be identified in policy instruments, laws and institutions that provided an avenue for integrating biosafety concerns. Mr. Deupmann also explained how filtering criteria could be used to reduce the number of potential entry points to achieve the required objective and priorities. Finally, possible tools and approaches for mainstreaming were described and the way in which countries could develop a biosafety mainstreaming strategy to guide the integration process was explained.

ITEM 5. FINDINGS OF MAINSTREAMING AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL (PRESENTATIONS BY PARTICIPANTS)

12. Under this item, representatives of each participating country made presentations summarizing their desk study and describing the extent to which and the ways in which mainstreaming had been addressed in laws, policies and institutional frameworks in their countries. Presentations focused, in particular, on: (a) processes and practical steps taken to facilitate mainstreaming; (b) major challenges encountered and lessons learned to address them; (c) national capacity needs and gaps related to mainstreaming; and (d) recommendations to further improve mainstreaming at the national level. The presentations were shared with participants through USB keys.

ITEM 6. SYNTHESIS OF THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL DESK STUDIES

13. Under this agenda item, a representative of Strathclyde University presented a synthesis of the preliminary findings of the national desk studies. General observations were shared, including examples of the most commonly identified sectoral and cross-sectoral laws and policies and cross-sectoral institutions that could serve as entry points for mainstreaming biosafety. Participants were then informed what additional information would be needed from the countries in order to finalize the training materials. A request for specific additional information had been sent to the countries participating in the pilot project prior to the workshop, and, though many had provided that information, it was noted that further examples to highlight practical cases would be useful and could be shared during the workshop. Finally, the presentation described the major challenges to mainstreaming identified in the desk studies, the interrelationship among them and the common recommendations suggested.

ITEM 7. LESSONS LEARNED, CAPACITY NEEDS, SKILLS GAPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MAINSTREAMING (GROUP DISCUSSIONS)

14. Participants were divided into three groups to discuss, in further detail, the lessons learned, capacity needs, skill gaps and recommendations on mainstreaming at the national level. They focused, one group each, on policy instruments, legal instruments and institutional frameworks. The groups then shared their findings with all workshop participants. Any findings and suggestions that had not been covered by the synthesis of the national desk studies were noted as possible additional factors to be considered in the capacity-building materials under development.

ITEM 8. E-LEARNING MODULE AND TOOLKIT ON MAINSTREAMING

15. Under this item, a representative of Strathclyde University presented a first draft of the e-learning module and toolkit being developed within the framework of the project aimed at promoting integrated implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the Convention on Biological Diversity at the national level. Considering that the e-learning module may be consulted by persons that may not be familiar with the concept of modern biotechnology and biosafety, the module first provided a general introduction in that regard, including the main features of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The module further explained the concept of mainstreaming and its significance by recognizing how mainstreaming of biosafety into NBSAPs, sectoral and cross-sectoral legislation, policies and institutional frameworks was an important part of Parties' overall national strategies to improve effective and resource-efficient implementation of the Protocol. The representative of Strathclyde University explained that the module would show how mainstreaming biosafety recognized and enforced synergies between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol and more broadly contributed towards meeting the Sustainable Development Goals. The module would next discuss the practical aspects to mainstreaming, including the suggestion to formulate a national "vision", secure stakeholder involvement and raise public awareness, the need to identify and prioritize which laws, policies and/or institutions could serve as entry points, the tools for mainstreaming that could complement entry points and might not necessarily be found in legislation, policy or institutions, and the capacity-building that might be necessary to carry out the process. Finally, participants were informed that the e-learning module would conclude with a test to allow individuals to evaluate their understanding of the concepts introduced and explained. It would then be followed with an invitation to consult the toolkit, intended to provide a more practical "how to" guide for biosafety mainstreaming.

16. The representative of Strathclyde University also presented an outline of the toolkit. It was suggested that the toolkit would identify concrete practical examples to illustrate its components. It would also include more detailed case studies, based on the material provided by the participating countries in their national desk studies, prepared under the project. Participants were then divided into three groups to discuss the different aspects of the draft toolkit and to suggest examples drawn from national experiences. One group discussed how to put in place the prerequisites for successful mainstreaming. They could include awareness raising, capacity-building and public participation. Another group discussed how to select, prioritize and use entry points. The third group discussed how to select and apply tools.

17. Participants were informed that the module and toolkit would be further revised on the basis of the group discussions and other input received from participants on possible examples of mainstreaming at the national level.

ITEM 9. DEVELOPMENT OF DRAFT NATIONAL ACTION PLANS ON MAINSTREAMING (GROUP EXERCISE)

18. Under this agenda item, participants from each project country worked with national colleagues or alone to develop a draft national action plan on mainstreaming. It was recommended that the draft action plan take into account the findings and recommendations of the country desk studies, as well as the discussions on integrated implementation, discussed earlier in the week. Participants then presented their draft plans to the wider group. Several specific examples were given and common approaches were noted for input into the further development of the toolkit on mainstreaming.

ITEM 10. EVALUATION OF THE E-LEARNING MODULE AND TOOLKIT ON MAINSTREAMING (GROUP DISCUSSION)

19. The updated version of the draft e-learning module and toolkit was circulated and presented on the last day of the meeting. Participants raised concerns about the relevance of certain country examples used to highlight different areas of the toolkit and were reassured that information provided in their desk studies and during the workshop that would be used in the toolkit or e-learning module would first be shared with them before its publication to allow a final input to be provided. Participants were also invited

to provide comments or further examples to assist towards the finalization of the toolkit. Some participants made technical and procedural suggestions about the further development of the toolkit.

ITEM 11. MAINSTREAMING AND SCOPE FOR REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL COLLABORATION

20. Under this item, Mr. Deupmann made a presentation on the scope for regional and subregional collaboration on mainstreaming. Given that the desk studies did not seem to address the issue, participants discussed the importance of regional and subregional collaboration and how they could serve as “champions” in their own regions and share their experience on mainstreaming with other countries, also through informal mechanisms and existing intergovernmental institutions.

21. Mr. Deupmann also briefed participants on the ongoing activities related to mainstreaming on the NBSAP platform (available at: <http://nbsapforum.net/>) and a presentation he had made at a webinar held on the NBSAP forum the previous week on integrating biosafety into NBSAPs and other conservation planning tools. He informed the participants that the webinar recording of his presentation was now available on the forum site.

ITEM 12. FURTHER GLOBAL AND NATIONAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND HIGH-LEVEL OUTCOMES

22. Under this item, Mr. Deupmann provided an overview of the further project activities to be carried out at the global and national levels and more detail on the format of the expected outputs. He reminded participants of the applicable deadlines for the submission of the final national project and financial reports. He also informed participants that the Secretariat and Strathclyde University would finalize the synthesis report, as well as the e-learning module and toolkit and that they may need to contact them further for clarification or to request specific input. It was also mentioned that the e-learning module and the toolkit will be made available on the Secretariat’s E-learning platform (currently available at: <https://scbd.unssc.org>).

23. Mr. Deupmann reminded participants that the theme of the concurrent meetings in Cancun, Mexico, in 2016 was on mainstreaming and that a side-event on the project would be taking place on the margins of the eighth meeting of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, with the involvement of workshop participants.

ITEM 13. OTHER MATTERS

24. Under this item, the representatives of Mexico showed workshop participants a short film introducing the upcoming concurrent meetings of the Convention and its Protocols in Cancun, Mexico.

25. Representatives of the CBD Secretariat requested participants to complete and submit a workshop evaluation form. The results of the evaluation are summarized in annex III.

ITEM 14. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

26. The workshop concluded on Friday, 4 November 2016, at 12:00 p.m.

Annex I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Belarus

1. Ms. Galina Mozgova
Head of National Co-ordination
Biosafety Centre
Institute of Genetics and Cytology
National Academy of Sciences of
Belarus
27 Akademicheskaya Street
Minsk 220072
Belarus
Tel.: +375172840297
Fax: +375172841917
Email: g.mozgova@yandex.ru,
g.mozgova@igc.by

Burkina Faso

2. Ms. Chantal Yvette Zoungrana Kaboré
Directrice Générale de l'Agence
Nationale de Biosécurité
Directrice du laboratoire d'Etude et de
Recherche des Ressources Naturelles et
des Sciences de l'Environnement
(LERNSE)
Ministère de la Recherche Scientifique
et de l'Innovation
03 BP 7047
Ouagadougou
Burkina Faso
Tel.: + 226 70723271; +226 25378854
Email: cykabore@yahoo.fr

China

3. Mr. Jing Xu
Assistant Professor
Chinese Research Academy of
Environmental Sciences
No.8 Anwai Dayangfang, Chaoyang,
Beijing 100012
China
Tel.: +86 10 8491 5215
Fax: +86 10 8491 0906
Email: xujing263@163.com
xujing.2001@yahoo.com.cn
4. Ms. Liu Yan
Director and Associate Professor

Nanjing Institute of Environmental
Sciences
Ministry of Environmental Protection
Beijing
China
Tel.: +86 25 852 87 065
Fax: +86 25 854 11 611
Email: liuyan@nies.org

Ecuador

5. Mr. Segundo Ángel Onofa Guayasamin
Focal Point, Protocolo de Cartagena
Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad
Ministerio del Ambiente
Madrid y Andalucía, Ministerio del
Ambiente, Piso 4
Quito
Ecuador
Tel.: +5932 3987600 Ext 1422
Fax: +5932 3987600 Ext 1422
Email: segundo.onofa@ambiente.gob.ec
onofaguayasamin@gmail.com
aonofa@ambiente.gob.ec
6. Mr. Wilson Rojas
Coordinador
Unidad de Recursos Genéticos
Ministerio del Ambiente
Av. Madrid y Andalucía
Quito Pichincha
Ecuador
Tel.: +593 2 3987600 ext. 1422
Fax: +593 2 3987600
Email: alfonso.rojas@ambiente.gob.ec
rojas.wilson@lycos.com

Malawi

7. Ms. Martha Mphatso Kalembe
Environmental Officer
Environmental Affairs Department
Private Bag 394
Lilongwe 3
Malawi
Tel.: +265 1771111
Fax: +265 175 1685
Email: mphakalembe@yahoo.com
mphakalembe@gmail.com

Malaysia

8. Mr. Megat Sany Bin Megat Ahmad Supian
Undersecretary
Biodiversity and Forestry Management Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 2, Wisma Sumber Asli, No. 25, Persiaran, Perdana, Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
Email: dr.megat@nre.gov.my
9. Mr. Letchumanan Ramatha
Director General
Department of Biosafety
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Level 1, Podium 2, Wisma Samber Asli, No. 25, Persiaran Perdana
Precinct 4
Putrajaya 62574
Malaysia
Tel.: +603 8886 1579
Fax: +603 8890 4935
Email: letchu@nre.gov.my
biosafety@nre.gov.my

Mexico

10. Ms. Paola Mosig Reidl
Coordinadora de Asuntos Internacionales
Dirección General de Cooperación Internacional e Implementación
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad
Liga Periférico - Insurgentes Sur, 4903
Col. Parques del Pedregal
México D.F. 14010
Mexico
Tel.: +52 55 5004 5025
Email: pmosig@conabio.gob.mx
uca@semarnat.gob.mx
11. Ms. Sol Ortiz García
Executive Secretary
Comisión Intersecretarial de Bioseguridad de los Organismos Genéticamente Modificados
San Borja 938, Del Valle, Benito Juárez

México D.F. 03100
Mexico
Tel.: +52 55 55757880
Email: sortiz@conacyt.mx

Republic of Moldova

12. Ms. Lilia Eladii
Advisory Officer
Natural Resources and Biodiversity Department
Ministry of Environment
9, Cosmonautilo Str.
Chisinau MD-2005
Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +37322204535
Fax: +37322226858
Email: eladii@mediu.gov.md
liliaeladii@yahoo.com
13. Ms. Angela Lozan
Head of the Biosafety Office
Ministry of Environment
Str. Mitropolit Doseftei 156A, 305
Chisinau MD-2004
Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +373 22 802090
Fax: +373 22 802090
Email: angelalozan@yahoo.com
14. Ms. Ala Rotaru
Head
Natural Resources and Biodiversity Division
Ministry of Environment
9, Cosmonautilo Str.
Chisinau MD-2005
Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +373 22 204 522
Fax: +373 22 226 858
+373 22 242 0 22
Email: rotaru@mediu.gov.md
rotala@mail.md
15. Ms. Marcela Vatamaniuc
Consultant, Biosafety Office
Ministry of Environment
9, Cosmonautilo Str.
Chisinau MD-2005
Republic of Moldova
Tel.: +37369272192
Email: vatamaniucm@gmail.com
16. Ms. Ana Birsan

Moldova State University
E-mail: birsanana@mail.ru
anabirsan@yahoo.com

Uganda

17. Mr. David Livingstone Hafashimana
Director of Research
National Agricultural Research
Organization
Bulindi Zonal Agricultural Research
And Development Institute, 18
KM Hoima - Masindi Road
P.O. Box 101
Hoima
Uganda
Tel.: +256- 465443276
Email: davidhaf2000@yahoo.com;
bulindizardi@yahoo.com

18. Mr. Sabino Meri Francis Ogwal
Natural Resources Management
Specialist (Biodiversity and Rangelands)
National Environment Management
Authority
NEMA House, 2nd Floor, Plot 17/19/21
Jinja Road
Kampala P.O. Box 22255
Uganda
Tel.: +256 414 251 064 / 5 / 8
Fax: +256 414 257 521
Email: fogwal@nemaug.org
sabinofrancis@gmail.com

University of Strathclyde

19. Ms. Elisa Morgera
Professor of Global Environmental Law
Strathclyde Law School
University of Strathclyde
16 Richmond Street
Glasgow G1 1XQ
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Email: elisa.morgera@strath.ac.uk
20. Ms. Miranda Geelhoed
University of Strathclyde
16 Richmond Street
Glasgow G1 1XQ
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Email: miranda.geelhoed@strath.ac.uk

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

21. Peter Deupmann
Legal Officer
Biosafety and Biosecurity Unit
Scientific and Policy Support
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 764 6365
Email: peter.deupmann@cbd.int

22. Mr. Charles Gbedemah
Head of Division
Scientific and Policy Support
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +1 514 287 7032
Email: charles.gbedemah@cbd.int
23. Ms. Paola Scarone
Programme Assistant
Biosafety and Biosecurity Unit
Scientific and Policy Support
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
413, Saint-Jacques Street W., Suite 800
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel.: +514 287-8702
Email: paola.scarone@cbd.int

WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Date and time	Agenda item
Monday, 31 October 2016	
9 – 9.30 a.m.	1. Opening of the workshop (Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova and Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD))
9.30 – 10.30 a.m.	2. Overview and objectives of the workshop (SCBD)
10.30 – 10.45 a.m.	Coffee/tea break
10.45 – 11.30 a.m.	3. Project status overview (SCBD)
11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	4. Mainstreaming biosafety (SCBD)
12.30 – 1.30 p.m.	Lunch break
1.30 – 3 p.m.	5. Findings of mainstreaming at the national level (<i>presentations by participants</i>)
3 – 3.30 p.m.	Coffee/tea break
3.30 – 5 p.m.	5. Findings of mainstreaming at the national level (<i>presentations by participants</i>) (<i>continued</i>)
Tuesday, 1 November 2016	
9 – 10.30 a.m.	5. Findings of mainstreaming at the national level (<i>presentations by participants</i>) (<i>continued</i>)
	6. Synthesis of the findings of the national desk studies (Strathclyde Centre for Environmental Law and Governance)
10.30 – 10.45 a.m.	Coffee/tea break
10.45 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	7. Lessons learned, capacity needs, skills gaps and recommendations on mainstreaming (<i>group discussions</i>) (moderated by SCBD and Strathclyde)
12.30 – 1.30 p.m.	Lunch
1.30 – 3 p.m.	7. Lessons learned, capacity needs, skills gaps and recommendations on mainstreaming (<i>group discussions</i>) (<i>continued</i>)
3 – 3.30 p.m.	Coffee/tea break
3.30 – 4.30 p.m.	7. Lessons learned, capacity needs, skills gaps and recommendations on mainstreaming (<i>reporting back and conclusions</i>)
4.30 – 5 p.m.	8. E-learning module on mainstreaming (<i>demonstration</i>) (Strathclyde)
Wednesday, 2 November 2016	
9 – 10.30 a.m.	8. Toolkit on mainstreaming (<i>demonstration</i>) (Strathclyde)
10.30 – 10.45 a.m.	Coffee/tea break
10.45 – 1.00 p.m.	8. Toolkit on mainstreaming (<i>group discussions</i>) (moderated by SCBD and Strathclyde)
1.00 – 2.00 p.m.	Lunch
2.00 – 3 p.m.	8. Toolkit on mainstreaming (<i>group discussions</i>) (<i>continued</i>)
3 – 3.30 p.m.	Coffee/tea break
3.30 – 5 p.m.	8. Toolkit on mainstreaming (<i>reporting back</i>)
Thursday, 3 November 2016	
9 – 10.30 a.m.	9. Development of draft national action plans on mainstreaming (<i>Group exercise</i>)
10.30 – 10.45 a.m.	Coffee/tea break
10.45 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	9. Development of draft national action plans on mainstreaming (<i>Group exercise</i>)(<i>continued</i>)
12.30 – 1.30 p.m.	Lunch
1.30 – 3 p.m.	9. Development of draft national action plans on mainstreaming (<i>reporting back and conclusions</i>)
3 – 3.30 p.m.	Coffee/tea break

Date and time	Agenda item
	10. Evaluation of the e-learning module and toolkit on mainstreaming (<i>group discussion</i>)
3.30 – 5 p.m.	11. Mainstreaming and scope for regional and subregional collaboration
Friday, 4 November 2016	
9 – 10.30 a.m.	12. Further global and national project activities and high-level outcomes (SCBD)
10.30 – 10.45 a.m.	Coffee/tea break
10.45 – 11.15 a.m.	12. Further global and national project activities and high-level outcomes (Strathclyde)
11.15 – 11.45 a.m.	13. Other matters
11.45 a.m. – 12.00 p.m.	14. Closure of the workshop

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

1. At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to complete a workshop evaluation form. They were asked to rate, on a scale of 1 to 6, the extent to which the workshop had improved their understanding of the issues covered at the workshop. Participants were also invited to provide an overall assessment of the workshop in terms of how well it was organized and conducted and the extent to which it had met their expectations. The results of the evaluation are summarized in the table below.

Table. Summary of the Workshop Evaluation

A. Assessment of the workshop content:	Level of Satisfaction
1. The decisions by the COP-MOP and the COP calling for integrated implementation of the two instruments and the relevant Aichi Targets.	88%
2. The rationale, approaches and key points to consider in mainstreaming biosafety into relevant sectoral and cross-sectoral policies, plans and programmes, including NBSAPs.	90%
3. The establishment of priority areas and objectives, engagement of stakeholders and partners, and the identification of entry points for mainstreaming.	86%
4. The development of a biosafety mainstreaming strategy/national action plan to guide the integration process.	84%
5. The importance of and scope for regional and subregional collaboration on mainstreaming, including the NBSAP forum and follow-up activities of the pilot project.	82%
B. Overall workshop assessment:	
1. Has the workshop met your expectations?	86%
2. How useful has the workshop been for you as an individual?	91%
3. How well organized was the workshop?	95%
4. How did you find the balance between presentations and the discussions?	79%
5. Overall, how useful were the thematic presentations?	86%
6. How useful were the country presentations?	88%
7. How useful were the group discussions on lessons learned, capacity needs, skill gaps and recommendations on mainstreaming at the national level?	94%
8. How useful were the capacity-building materials presented (e-learning module and toolkit)?	84%
9. How useful were the small group discussions to provide further input into the toolkit?	91%
10. How useful was the exercise to develop a draft national action plan on mainstreaming?	83%
11. Overall, how would you rate the success of the workshop?	88%
2. In the written comments, participants considered the following to have been the most helpful parts of the workshop:	
(a) Country presentations on experiences and lessons learnt;	
(b) Exercises for developing a national action plan and follow-up discussions;	
(c) Understanding the concept of “mainstreaming” in the right context (devoting time to reflect on the issue of mainstreaming);	

- (d) Presentations of the e-learning module and toolkit outline and associated group discussions;
- (e) Understanding/clarifying possible entry points for mainstreaming;
- (f) Recommendations for mainstreaming biosafety at the national level;
- (g) Learning about Biosafety issues to better integrate with the Convention issues.

One participant thought that the overall efficient organization of the workshop warranted mention and another participant also thanked the host organizers for their kind assistance in obtaining visas.

3. Two participants considered the following to be the least helpful aspects of the workshop:

- (a) Perhaps too much detail on the country specific action plans that were shared following the exercises to develop a national action plan on mainstreaming;
- (b) Steps of implementation of mainstreaming.

Otherwise, participants did not feel that any part of the workshop was not helpful.

4. The participants made the following suggestions for improving future workshops:

- (a) Having the resource persons from Strathclyde University, instead of workshop participants, lead the small group discussions and subsequent write-up for sharing with the other participants;
- (b) More time dedicated for coaching individuals and overall moving at a slower pace;
- (c) Time allocation could be improved for presentations by country representatives;
- (d) Include the participation of other sectors (agriculture, health, trade etc.) to see how they view biosafety mainstreaming;
- (e) More clarity on the tools to be produced (e-learning module and toolkit);
- (f) More examples about good practices.

5. Finally, a few participants stated that more such workshops would be useful, including at the regional level, and also focusing on a narrower approach to include specific examples of mainstreaming biosafety into specific sectors.
