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Report on the Anglophone African Training Course on Risk Assessment of Living Modified Organisms

**Pretoria South Africa, 8-12 April 2019**

INTRODUCTION

1. At their eighth meeting, in decision [CP-VIII/12](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/mop-08/mop-08-dec-12-en.pdf), the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety requested the Executive Secretary to support, subject to the availability of resources, regional and subregional capacity-building activities on risk assessment of living modified organisms (LMOs).
2. Likewise, in their decision [CP-VIII/3](https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/mop-08/mop-08-dec-03-en.pdf) on capacity-building, Parties also requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate priority capacity-building activities in support of the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol.
3. With support from the [Government of the Republic of Korea](http://eng.me.go.kr/), through the Korea Biosafety Capacity‑Building Initiative, and in collaboration with the [Department of Environmental Affairs of the Government of South Africa,](https://www.environment.gov.za/)the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity organized a training course on risk assessment of living modified organisms for the Anglophone African region, which was held in Pretoria from 8 to 12 April 2019.
4. The objectives of the course were to provide theoretical and practical training for participants on:
5. The risk assessment process (concepts, steps, methodology, key issues to consider);
6. Hands-on training in the evaluation of case studies of living modified organisms for environmental release, identifying protection goals and applying the risk assessment methodology to develop risk scenarios to assess.
7. The training course consisted of plenary sessions and break-out groups. Documents for the course are posted at <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/CP-RARM-CB-2019-01>.
8. In total, 37 participants attended the workshop in representation of 16 countries from the Anglophone African region (see annex I for the full list of participants).

# ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

1. The course was opened by Ms. Wadzanayi Mandivenyi, Chief Director of the Biodiversity Specialist Monitoring and Services, Department of Environmental Affairs of the Government of South Africa, at 9 a.m. on Monday, 8 April 2019. She welcomed the participants to Pretoria and thanked the Secretariat for facilitating training in the field of risk assessment of LMOs.
2. Mr. Shonisani Munzhedzi, Deputy Director-General, Biodiversity and Conservation, Department of Environmental Affairs, also welcomed the participants and the Secretariat to South Africa. He stressed the importance of the Cartagena Protocol and of the actions taken to ensure the safe use of biotechnology, and praised the cross-sectoral cooperation within the national Executive Council for Genetically Modified Organisms. He invited the participants to take advantage of the knowledge that would be shared during the course to reinforce existing capacities in their countries and to trigger further regional cooperation in biosafety.
3. Mr. Julian Jaftha, Chairperson of the Executive Council for Genetically Modified Organisms, noted the role of the Department of Environmental Affairs in providing leadership in the field of science-based risk assessment of LMOs and expressed appreciation for the increasing regional cooperation in that regard.
4. Ms. Paola Scarone of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity welcomed the participants to the course. She expressed gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Korea for its generous financial support and to the Government of South Africa for hosting the meeting.
5. Following the opening remarks, Ms. Scarone introduced the programme of work for the week and invited participants to introduce themselves.

# ITEM 2. OVERVIEW OF BIOSAFETY AND THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

**2.1. History of the Protocol and main provisions**

1. Under this agenda item, a presentation was given to provide an overarching framework for the work on risk assessment that was to be undertaken during the training course, including concepts, history and main provisions of the Cartagena Protocol. The presentation provided information on the history of the Protocol, its importance, its link to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals. The presentation also included a description of some of the articles of the Protocol, in particular Article 15 on risk assessment, Article 16 on risk management, and annex III.

**2.2. Techniques used in modern biotechnology**

1. Following the presentation on the Cartagena Protocol, an overview of the techniques used in modern biotechnology was presented to familiarize the participants with the way in which genetic modifications occur.

# ITEM 3. RISK ASSESSMENT EXPERIENCES IN THE REGION

**3.1. Experience of South Africa with risk assessment and the regulatory system for living modified organisms**

1. Under this agenda item, the South African national biosafety system was detailed, including a description of the main components and operations associated with the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol and, in particular, with risk assessment.

**3.2. Presentations from participants: national experience on risk assessment and the application of the Cartagena Protocol**

1. Participants from the countries represented at the training course offered short presentations about how risk assessment was carried out on their countries, highlighting main challenges and strengths. This session was particularly useful for sharing experiences between the countries, as well as to identify lessons learned from the various approached followed by countries in relation to the implementation of their national biosafety frameworks.

# ITEM 4. NATIONAL BIOSAFETY FRAMEWORKS[[1]](#footnote-1)

**4.1. Competent national authorities, practices and principles**

1. An overview of the structure and role of national biosafety frameworks, including definition of national competent authorities, and examples of biosafety frameworks from various countries was covered under this session. The rationale behind this session was to provide participants with a better understanding of the main role of national competent authorities using examples of the various approaches that have been followed by different countries.

**4.2. Expert advice and the role of risk assessors**

1. The role of the regulators and scientific advisory bodies was presented, including such issues as the responsibilities of risk assessors, the roster of biosafety experts and public participation. The presentation supported the better understanding of the risk assessor’s function and the difference between “expert advice” and “decision-making”.

# ITEM 5. OVERVIEW OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT

**5.1. Risk assessment methodology**

1. This session covered an overview of the risk assessment methodology, including issues as national protection goals, assessment endpoints, practices and principles and definition of terms such as adverse effects, exposure and risk characterization. Participants benefited from a detailed description of the various steps considered when undertaking risk assessment.

**5.2. Overarching issues (quality and relevance of information, uncertainty)**

1. A presentation on quality and relevance of information and identification and consideration of uncertainty gave the participants the opportunity to better understand how to deal with these overarching issues of the risk assessment process. Also discussed were such topics as the quality and sources of information as well as where to look for additional information, and how to indicate uncertainty on a risk assessment report.

**5.3. The planning phase (context and scope, assessment endpoints, choice of comparators, risk hypothesis)**

1. This topic included establishing the context and scope, selecting relevant assessment endpoints or representative species, establishing the baseline for risk assessment, how to choose suitable comparators and how to develop risks hypothesis. Participants were guided through the various steps that led them to the formulation of risk hypothesis that would eventually be tested during the following steps of the risk assessment.

**5.4. Conducting the risk assessment (identification of novel characteristics, evaluation of livelihood and consequences, estimation of the overall risk, acceptability of risk)**

1. Information key for conducting the risk assessment was offered under this item. Some of the issues included were: (a) identification of the novel characteristics of the LMOs, (b) how to evaluate the likelihood or occurrence of adverse effects and the possible consequences, and (c) the overall estimation of the risk. Such concepts as gene flow, allergenicity and receiving environment were part of this topic.

**5.5. Preparing a risk assessment report and recommendation**

1. This topic provided important information to participants on aspects to consider when drafting risk assessment reports. It was highlighted that a report presented in a well-structured form would facilitate the deliberations of decision makers. The presentation included information on the background and scope of the risk assessment, characterization and estimation of risk, as well as description of risk management and monitoring strategies.

# ITEM 6. CASE STUDIES

**6.1. Presentation of case study 1**

1. A case study on insect-resistant, herbicide-tolerant maize was presented during the plenary session. The participants were divided into groups, each of which were guided by a resource person on how that particular case study could be assessed on the basis of the concepts and methodologies presented on preceding days. The intention of this exercise was to give the participants the opportunity to see how the concepts are applied. At the end of the session, each group reported back to plenary, presenting their assessment, which led to a group discussion.

**6.2. Presentation of case studies 2**

1. An additional case study on engineered mosquitoes containing a gene drive was presented in plenary, and the participants were then divided into groups to undertake an assessment of the information presented on the case studies. Participants were requested to identify protection goals, formulate a hypothesis, identify the assessment end-point, and apply the risk assessment methodology. Each group was guided by one of the resource team members. At the end of the session, each group reported back to plenary, presenting their assessment, which led to a group discussion.

# ITEM 7. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION AND BIOSAFETY CLEARING HOUSE

**7.1. Biosafety resource mobilization**

1. A presentation was made on how to access funding from the Global Environment Facility for projects on biosafety. The presentation included a brief explanation of what the Global Environment Facility is, how it works and how counties could use their STAR resources towards, among other things, the development of biosafety projects.

**7.2. Biosafety Clearing-House**

1. During this session, information was presented on how to use the Biosafety Clearing-House portal. The presentation covered such issues as the roster of experts, where to find information and what can be found in the Biosafety Clearing-House, national and reference records, among others.

# ITEM 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COURSE

**8.1. Evaluation of the workshop**

1. Finally, participants undertook an evaluation of the workshop. The results are summarized in annex II below.

**8.2. Closure of the workshop**

1. During the closure ceremony, representatives of the Department of Environmental Affairs and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity thanked the participants, the Government of the Republic of Korea, other donors and partners for the opportunity to host this activity. The workshop closed at 11 a.m. on Friday, 12 April 2019.

*Annex I*

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**PARTIES**

**Botswana**

1. Mr. Charles Mazereku

Agricultural Researcher

Department of Agricultural Resources

Ministry of Agriculture

Gaborone, Botswana

Email: [cmazereku@gov.bw](mailto:cmazereku@gov.bw); [cmazereku@yahoo.com](mailto:cmazereku@yahoo.com)

**Egypt**

2. Ms. Nahla Mohamed Naguib

Technical Officer, Biosafety Project

Ministry of Environment

Cairo, Egypt

Email: nahla.nagib85@gmail.com; drfoudamos@gmail.com

**Eritrea**

3. Mr. Efrem Kiflemariam Okbaghiorghis

Biodiversity Coordinator

Department of Environment

Ministry of Land, Water and Environment

Asmara, Eritrea

Email: efremko.okbaghiorghis@gmail.com, efi432@yahoo.com

**Eswatini**

4. Mr. Bongani Zipho Nkhabindze

Biosafety Registrar / BCH National Focal Point

Department of Policy, Planning and Research

Eswatini Environment Authority, Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs

Mbabane, Eswatini

Email: [bongani@sea.org.sz](mailto:bongani@sea.org.sz); [bonganizipho@yahoo.com](mailto:bonganizipho@yahoo.com)

**Ethiopia**

5. Mr. Assefa Gudina Muleta

Director

Bio-safety and Invasive Alien Species Regulation Directorate

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

Email: [bile.kela1@gmail.com](mailto:bile.kela1@gmail.com)

**Ghana**

6. Mr. Godwin Amenorpe

Research Center Manager

Nuclear Agriculture Research Center

Ghana Atomic Energy Commission

Accra, Ghana

Email: [gamenorpe@gmail.com](mailto:gamenorpe@gmail.com)

**Kenya**

7. Mr. Martin Bundi Mwebia

Principal Biosafety Officer

National Biosafety Authority

Nairobi, Kenya

Email: [mbundi@biosafetykenya.go.ke](mailto:mbundi@biosafetykenya.go.ke)

**Malawi**

8. Ms. Lilian Chimphepo

Principal Environmental Officer

Cartagena Protocol National Focal Point

Environmental Affairs Department

Lilongwe, Malawi

Email: [lilianchimphepo@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:lilianchimphepo@yahoo.co.uk); [chimphe@gmail.com](mailto:chimphe@gmail.com)

**Mozambique**

9. Ms. Ivone Muocha

Adviser, National Biosafety Authority

Center for Research and Technology Transfer for Community Development

Ministry of Science and Technology, Higher Education and Professional Technician

Maputo, Mozambique

Email: [ivone.muocha@mctestp.gov.mz](mailto:ivone.muocha@mctestp.gov.mz); [muochaivone@gmail.com](mailto:muochaivone@gmail.com)

**Namibia**

10. Ms. Hilde Amputu

Biotechnology Scientist

National Commission on Research Science and Technology

Windhoek, Namibia

Email: [hamputu@ncrst.na](mailto:hamputu@ncrst.na)

**Nigeria**

11. Mr. Agha Ukpai Agha

Chief Scientific Officer

National Biosafety Management of Agency

Abuja, Nigeria

Email: [Ukpaison@yahoo.com](mailto:Ukpaison@yahoo.com)

**South Africa**

12. Ms. Wadzanayi Patience Mandivenyi

Chief Director

Biodiversity Monitoring and Specialist Services

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: wmandivenyi@environment.gov.za

13. Mr. Julian Jaftha

Chief Director, Plant Production and Health

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [julianj@daff.gov.za](mailto:julianj@daff.gov.za);

14. Ms. Ntakadzeni Tshidada

Deputy Director, Biosafety and AIS B&C

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [NTshidada@environment.gov.za](mailto:NTshidada@environment.gov.za)

15. Ms. Maneshree Jugmohan-Naidu

Director, Biotechnology

Department of Science and Technology

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [maneshree.jugmohan-naidu@dst.gov.za](mailto:maneshree.jugmohan-naidu@dst.gov.za)

16. Mr. Barney Stephen Kgope

Director: Biodiversity Risk Management

Biodiversity Planning and Management

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [Bkgope@environment.gov.za](mailto:Bkgope@environment.gov.za)

17. Ms. Nompumelelo Lucritia Mkhonza

Registrar, Genetically Modified Organisms Act, 1997

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [nompumeleloM@daff.gov.za](mailto:nompumeleloM@daff.gov.za);

18. Ms. Bathobile Mahlangu

Office of the Registrar: GMO Act

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [bathobilem@daff.gov.za](mailto:bathobilem@daff.gov.za)

19. Ms. Parmella Makhongwana

Assistant Director

Department of Trade and Industry

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [pmakhongwana@thedti.gov.za](mailto:pmakhongwana@thedti.gov.za)

20. Mr. Keith Khombomani Chuma

Intern

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [kchuma@environment.gov.za](mailto:kchuma@environment.gov.za)

21. Ms. Matshidiso Hlalele

Intern: Biosafety and AIS

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [mhlalele@environment.gov.za](mailto:mhlalele@environment.gov.za)

22. Ms. Zinzi Mboweni

Production Scientist

Department of Water and Sanitation

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [mboweniz@dws.gov.za](mailto:mboweniz@dws.gov.za)

23. Ms. Thato Mogapi

Assistant Director, Biosafety and AIS

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [tmogapi@environment.gov.za](mailto:tmogapi@environment.gov.za)

24. Mr. Sello Mokhothu

Biosafety Officer

Office of the Registrar, GMO Act

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [sellomok@daff.gov.za](mailto:sellomok@daff.gov.za)

25. Ms. Refilwe Ngoepe

Office of the Registrar: GMO Act

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [refilwen@daff.gov.za](mailto:refilwen@daff.gov.za)

26. Ms. Mary-Jane Thaela-Chimuka

Senior Researcher

Agricultural Research Council

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [thaelamj@arc.agric.za](mailto:thaelamj@arc.agric.za)

27. Ms. Phindile Dlamini

Intern: UNCCD and Wetlands Implementation

Department of Environmental Affairs

Pretoria, South Africa

Email: [phdlamini@environment.gov.za](mailto:phdlamini@environment.gov.za)

**Sudan**

28. Ms. Nada Babiker Hamza Babike

Professor

National Research Center

Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources

Khartoum, Sudan

Email: [nada.hamza@gmail.com](mailto:nada.hamza@gmail.com)

**Uganda**

29. Mr. Issa Katwesige

Senior Forest Officer

Forest Sector Support Department

Ministry of Water and Environment

Kampala, Uganda

Email: [issakatwesige@gmail.com](mailto:issakatwesige@gmail.com); [issa.katwesige@mwe.go.ug](mailto:issa.katwesige@mwe.go.ug)

**Zambia**

30. Mr. Patrick Chiza Chikoti

Research Scientist, Plant Pathology and Biotechnology Research unit

Zambia Agriculture Research Institute Ministry of Agriculture

Lusaka, Zambia

Email: [chizachikoti@hotmail.com](mailto:chizachikoti@hotmail.com)

31. Mr. Christopher Simuntala

Biosafety Clearing-House National Focal Point National Biosafety Authority

Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education

Lusaka, Zambia

Email: [csimuntalaw@gmail.com](mailto:csimuntalaw@gmail.com)

**Zimbabwe**

32. Mr. Willmore Chingwena

Biosafety Officer

National Biotechnology Authority

Harare, Zimbabwe

Email: [willchy@gmail.com](mailto:willchy@gmail.com)

**Local Organizations**

**AfricaBio**

33. Mr. Bongani Maseko

General Manager

AfricaBio

Centurion, South Africa

Email: [bongani@africabio.com](mailto:bongani@africabio.com)

**African Centre for Biodiversity**

34. Ms. Linzi Lewis

Research and Advocacy Officer

African Centre for Biodiversity

13 The Braids Road

Emmarentia, 2195

Johannesburg, South Africa

Email: [linzi@acbio.org.za](mailto:linzi@acbio.org.za)

**BASF**

35. Ms. Kelebohile Lekoape

Registration Manager: Seeds and Traits

BASF South Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Isando, South Africa

Email: [kelebohile.lekoape@basf.com](mailto:kelebohile.lekoape@basf.com)

**North-West University**

36. Ms. Nadine Schutte

Student/Intern

North-West University

Potchefstroom, South Africa

Email: [nadineschutte2@gmail.com](mailto:nadineschutte2@gmail.com)

**South African National Biodiversity Institute**

37. Mr. Tlou Samuel Masehela

Scientist

Bio-synthetics: GMO

South African National Biodiversity Institute

Claremont, South Africa

Email: [t.masehela@sanbi.org.za](mailto:t.masehela@sanbi.org.za)

**Resource team**

38. Ms. Wendy Craig

Scientific Coordinator

Biosafety Unit

International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB)

Trieste, Italy

Email:[Wendy.Craig@icgeb.org](mailto:Wendy.Craig@icgeb.org); [craig@icgeb.org](mailto:craig@icgeb.org)

39. Ms. Debora Cornelia Maria Glandorf

Scientific Expert on Risk Assessment

GMO Office, Dept. of Gene Technology and Biological Safety

National Institute of Public Health and Environment

Bilthoven, Netherlands

Email: [boet.glandorf@rivm.nl](mailto:boet.glandorf@rivm.nl);

[Jo-Ann.Partowihono@minienm.nl](mailto:Jo-Ann.Partowihono@minienm.nl)

40. Ms. Jana Collatz

Researcher Agroecology and Environment

Federal Department of Economy, Education and Research

Swiss Federal Research Station for Agroecology and Agriculture

Zurich, Switzerland

Email: [jana.collatz@agroscope.admin.ch](mailto:jana.collatz@agroscope.admin.ch)

**Secretariat of the convention on biological diversity**

41. Mr. Austein McLoughlin

Associate Programme Management Officer, Biosafety

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Montreal, Canada

Email: [austein.mcLoughlin@cbd.int](mailto:austein.mcLoughlin@cbd.int)

42. Ms. Paola Scarone

Programme Assistant

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Montreal, Canada

Email: [paola.scarone@cbd.int](mailto:paola.scarone@cbd.int)

*Annex II*

# EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

Participants were invited to evaluate the course by completing the questionnaire below. Participants were instructed to select the answer that best reflected their assessment of the course.

A total of 31 participants completed the questionnaire. The number of respondents for each option is shown below. Overall, the participants found the training course useful and well organized. They found the risk assessment methodology presented to be effective and the structure of the workshop conducive for learning. The case studies, particularly the mosquito containing an engineered gene drive, were well‑received due to the quality and the technical challenge presented.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Overall assessment** | | | |
|  | **Number of Yes** | **Number of No** | **Percentage of Yes** |
| (1) During the workshop, were you able to acquire knowledge related to: | | | |
| *The Cartagena Protocol and its approach towards risk assessment* | 31 | 0 | 100% |
| *The steps to undertake risk assessment of LMOs* | 31 | 0 | 100% |
| *Practical experience in assessing case studies* | 30 | 1 | 97% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **The workshop exceeded my expectations** | **The workshop met my expectations** | **The workshop partly met my expectations** | **The workshop did not meet my expectations** | **Percentage exceeded** | **Percentage met** |
| (2) To what extent were your expectations regarding the workshop met? | 6 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 68 |
|  | **Very relevant** | **Somewhat relevant** | **Not relevant** | **Percentage relevant** | **Percentage somewhat relevant** |  |
| (3) How relevant was the subject matter of the course to your job activities? | 27 | 4 | 0 | 87 | 13 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B. Content and facilitation of the workshop** | | | | | | | |
|  | **Average rating** | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Adequate** | **Poor** | **Very Poor** | **Not Applicable** |
| The objectives of the workshop were clear | 4.4 | 13 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Quality of the training material | 4.2 | 12 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Quality of presentations | 4.3 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Organization of the sessions | 4.3 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Balance and relevance of topics | 4.1 | 10 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Overall assessment of the facilitators | 4.2 | 13 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Overall clarity of the workshop | 4.2 | 7 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Usefulness of each topic |  | | | | | | |
| Biosafety and the Cartagena Protocol | 4.3 | 10 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Risk assessment experiences in the region | 4.0 | 8 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Overview of the risk assessment methodology | 4.3 | 14 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Case studies | 4.4 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resource mobilization and the Biosafety Clearing-House | 4.1 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Conclusions and recommendations | 4.1 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*Note*: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Adequate = 3, Poor = 2, and Very Poor = 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C. Logistics** | | | | | | | |
|  | **Average rating** | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Adequate** | **Poor** | **Very Poor** | **Not applicable** |
| Time for distributing the invitations, agenda, and relevant materials | 4.3 | 16 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Sufficient time for discussion and participation | 4.1 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delivery time of travel arrangements and expenses | 4.3 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Duration of the workshop | 3.9 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Quality of the venue and facilities | 4.6 | 19 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Planning and overall organization | 4.4 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

*Note*: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Adequate = 3, Poor = 2, and Very Poor = 1

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Presentations for items 4, 5, and 6 were provided by a team of three resource persons: Ms. Wendy Craig, Ms. Jana Collatz and Ms. Debora Glandorf. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)