



**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/NP/CB/WS/2019/1/2
14 November 2019

ENGLISH ONLY

**REPORT ON THE GLOBAL CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOP ON MONITORING THE
UTILIZATION OF GENETIC RESOURCES UNDER THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL
BONN, 30 SEPTEMBER - 2 OCTOBER 2019**

INTRODUCTION

1. At the third meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, Parties requested the Executive Secretary to continue providing technical assistance for the submission of information on the ABS Clearing-House, including through increasing the understanding of the functioning of the system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources (NP-3/1, para. 21 (c)). Building the national-level capacities to use the ABS Clearing-House was also been identified as a priority in the short-term action plan (2017-2020) on capacity-building to support the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol (decision NP-2/8, annex and decision XIII/23).
2. The Global Capacity-Building Workshop on Monitoring the Utilization of the Genetic Resources under the Protocol was intended to raise awareness and share practical experiences regarding monitoring the utilization of genetic resources, and thereby build capacity.
3. The workshop was financially supported by the Government of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund, the European Union, and the Government of Germany and organized with the collaboration of the ABS Capacity Development Initiative and the United Nations Development Programme, through the UNDP-GEF Global ABS Project.
4. The workshop included both plenary and breakout group sessions and thematic presentations followed by question-and-answer sessions, interactive group exercises and discussions. It was attended by 68 participants, representing 54 different countries.
5. A complete list of documents and presentations for this workshop, including the list of participants is available at: <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/NP-CB-WS-2019-01>.
6. The workshop was conducted in English.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

7. Mr. Matthew Dias, Programme Officer at the CBD Secretariat, welcomed participants, thanked the collaborating partners and donors, and opened the workshop at 9 a.m. on Monday, 30 September 2019. He highlighted the challenges countries were facing related to monitoring the utilization of genetic resources and the reason for the workshop. Mr. Dias also emphasized that the implementation of the Protocol requires cooperation among different entities beyond the national level and the workshop presented was an important opportunity to move the Protocol forward together.
8. Mr. Dias then invited, Mr. Stephan Lütkes, Head of Division for Nature Conservation and Landscape Management Legislation in the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), to deliver an opening statement. In his statement, Mr. Lütkes noted the German Government's long-standing commitment to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. He emphasised the key role the ABS Clearing-House plays in the context of monitoring utilization of genetic resources by helping to ensure transparency and facilitate communication and compliance. Finally, Mr. Lütkes expressed his Government's satisfaction in collaborating with the CBD

Secretariat and the other key partners, including the ABS Capacity Development Initiative and the United Nations Development Programme in the organization of the workshop.

ITEM 2. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND, APPROACH AND EXPECTED OUTPUTS

9. Mr. Matthew Dias presented the methodology, programme, and expected outputs. He explained that the first day would focus on providing participants with a basis and common understanding of the key concepts that play a role in monitoring utilization of genetic resources set out in the provisions of the Protocol. The second day was dedicated to sharing experiences and approaches by countries in the implementation of these concepts and during the third and last day participants would be given time to reflect on what they had learned, discuss solutions, and think about how they would use the new information gathered at the workshop to improve their national ABS systems.

10. Then, the participants went through an “ice breaker” activity where the participants were encouraged to see each other as colleagues or teammates working together towards a common goal.

ITEM 3. OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM FOR MONITORING THE UTILIZATION OF GENETIC RESOURCES UNDER THE NAGOYA PROTOCOL

11. Under this item, Mr. Dias provided an overview of the system outlined in the Nagoya Protocol to monitor the utilization of genetic resources through the ABS Clearing-House. The presentation focused on key concepts and obligations, such as, ABS permits, internationally recognized certificates of compliance, checkpoints, and checkpoint communiqués and information-sharing through the ABS Clearing-House.

12. The presentation highlighted the aspects of international collaboration, communication and cooperation that the Protocol is dependent on for the monitoring system to function effectively at the international level.

13. Mr. Peter Schauerte, of the ABS Capacity Development Initiative, led an interactive role play activity that walked participants step-by-step through a typical, yet hypothetical, ABS case. The session focused on addressing common misconceptions and answering questions at each step in the process from the point of view of the user, authorities in the provider country and authorities in the countries where the users are located.

14. In the next activity, Mr. Dias encouraged participants to explore practical challenges related to monitoring utilization by discussing eight scenarios. Each scenario addressed a particular issue, such as: designating checkpoints, handling confidential information, a change in the intended use, dealing with non-Parties or incomplete national ABS systems, associated traditional knowledge, and a case of misappropriation. Participants were organized into small groups in order to discuss each scenario and share with their group how they would resolve each case given their own particular national circumstances and ABS systems.

ITEM 4. COUNTRY EXPERIENCES ON MONITORING THE UTILIZATION OF GENETIC RESOURCES

15. This item was facilitated by the representatives of the CBD Secretariat. The discussion on the item provided the opportunity to reflect as a group on the country presentations provided by participants prior to the workshop. Participants had been asked to complete a template and answer specific questions related to national implementation on the following topics: the ABS Clearing-House, permits and certificates, monitoring utilization, and compliance. The Secretariat received presentations from 45 of the 54 countries represented at the workshop. These country presentations served to prepare participants for the discussion and were also useful as a benchmark to measure how much was learned during the workshop.

16. The CBD Secretariat presented a selection of sets of information provided by participants that were considered would show the different approaches that countries had taken in implementation. The presentation and the format of the session helped to provoke discussions and gave a large number of participants an opportunity to participate and share their experiences. Discussions helped shed light on

many of the common misunderstandings and challenges, as well as, highlighting accomplishments and successes related to the key topics.

17. Interspersed throughout the main presentation, were longer interventions by a number of participants describing the approaches taken by their countries, as well as, presentations from experts. In particular, participants from Costa Rica, Peru, Brazil, Kenya, and India shared information and experiences on setting up their national online permitting systems.

18. During a discussion on mechanisms to monitor genetic resources, technical expert Mr. Mithilesh Digambar and team leader Ms. Aeshita Mukherjee of Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) presented a demo of their work developing a suite of ABS monitoring tools for India that use datamining and advance analytic techniques to unify and scour a number of scattered data sources, including, taxonomic data, patents and scientific literature, in order to efficiently generate reports, statistics and alerts related to how genetic resources are being used internationally.

19. Paul Oldham, of One World Analytics, presented the potential for machine learning to contribute to monitoring. The technology was described as having the ability to quickly process huge amounts of data related to the use of genetic resources found in patent databases, academic and scientific journals, taxonomic occurrence records, and other relevant sources from across the internet. Mr. Oldham went on to emphasize that monitoring utilization of genetic resources goes beyond ensuring compliance, it also helps recognize and understand the Nagoya Protocol's contribution and the value of genetic resources in innovation and research, as well as its potential to advance the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

ITEM 5. MOVING FORWARD: DEVELOPING ROAD MAPS FOR ENHANCING NATIONAL SYSTEMS TO MONITOR THE UTILIZATION OF GENETIC RESOURCES

20. Under this item, participants were invited to reflect on actions that they could take to improve their national ABS systems. A number of groups were formed around key workshop topics, namely: the ABS Clearing-House, online permitting and permit management systems, alternative monitoring mechanisms, negotiating mutually agreed terms, operationalizing checkpoints and addressing compliance. The groups were facilitated by experts and participants with experience on these topics. Participants were encouraged to shuttle between groups, support each other, and explore solutions to practical and specific issues.

ITEM 6. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

21. Under this item, participants reflected on what they learned in relation to their national circumstances and shared their plans to improve their national systems.

22. A summary of the main outcomes and key messages from the workshop are presented in annex I to this report.

23. Participants were invited to evaluate the workshop by providing their comments through an online survey. Twenty-six participants completed the survey. The results of the survey found that overall participants were very satisfied with the workshop, rating the quality of the material, the quality of the organization, and the quality of the presentations and training, all very high. They also indicated that the workshop was extremely useful, applicable, and relevant to their work. Many responses highlighted that more training and discussion on this topic is needed. The results of the evaluation are provided in annex II of this report.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

24. The workshop was officially closed at 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 2 October 2019 by Thomas Greiber, from the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN). He thanked the participants, the organizers and the funders for all their contribution to the success of the workshop.

*Annex I***OUTCOMES AND KEY MESSAGES**

1. The following is a summary of outcomes and key messages from the discussions held at the Global Capacity-building Workshop on Monitoring the Utilization of the Genetic Resources under the Nagoya Protocol.

A. General challenges

2. There are a number of common underlying challenges that were raised by participants during the course of the workshop that hinder the national implementation of the Protocol and, in particular, the implementation of Articles 6, 14, 15, 17 of the Protocol. These articles work together to set up the system to monitor utilization of genetic resources through the ABS Clearing-House. Challenges include:

(a) Many countries are in the early stages of establishing ABS measures and appropriate institutional arrangements;

(b) Many countries lack the necessary capacity and financial resources to make the Protocol operational;

(c) Many countries lack awareness of the importance of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge and related ABS issues. This is true among CBD Parties and users of genetic resources (such as the business and scientific communities);

(d) Many countries lack understanding of the Protocol's system for monitoring utilization through the ABS Clearing-House;

(e) Many countries lack experience and training on developing ABS contracts and solid mutually agreed terms.

B. The ABS Clearing-House

3. As a key tool for implementation of the Protocol, making information available on the ABS Clearing-House is crucially important to support and facilitate legal access, monitoring utilization and compliance. It was noted that information in the ABS Clearing-House is not yet complete and sometimes is not being kept up-to-date and/or information is not clear and understandable. There were a number of general challenges related to sharing information through the ABS Clearing-House, which included:

(a) Lack of internal communication and coordination and fragmentation of information across various country institutions;

(b) Lack of institutional capacity caused by frequent changes in staff and lack of confidence in transferring knowledge to colleagues;

(c) Providing translations of the information in multiple United Nations languages. Although this can be challenging, translated information can also be very helpful to promote understanding and reach a wider audience.

4. There were a number of participants that had questions on the number of publishing authorities allowed per country in the ABS Clearing-House. The modalities of operation for the ABS Clearing-House allow for one publishing authority per country. The publishing authority can be changed online as frequently as needed.

5. Countries may also designate one or more national authorized users (NAUs). The function of NAUs is to assist the publishing authority in the preparation of draft national records. National authorized users can create and manage draft records for their country and send them as requests to the publishing authority for publication. For example, it may be useful to designate a checkpoint as an NAU in order to enable them to submit checkpoint communiqués to the publishing authority for approval and publication on the ABS Clearing-House.

6. Many countries were confused about the obligations related to the ABS Clearing-House and the development of a national ABS clearing-house or website. Many countries are under the impression that the Protocol obliges Parties to share their national information through a national website or clearing-house. Developing or setting up a national website or clearing-house for ABS is not an obligation under the Protocol and Parties are only obligated to make information available on the ABS Clearing-House, as per Article 14 of the Protocol.

7. Establishing a national or regional website or clearing-house may be useful in certain cases; however, countries should take care not to duplicate the role, function or data of the ABS Clearing-House. The ABS Clearing-House has been designed to be interoperable with other systems and using its interoperability mechanisms should be considered in order to avoid costs related to developing and maintaining redundant systems.

Confidentiality

8. A number of concerns related to confidentiality and the ABS Clearing-House were also brought up during the workshop. It was made clear that the ABS Clearing-House does not host confidential information, and, therefore, publishing authorities should take care to ensure that national records, in particular certificates and checkpoint communiqués, do not contain any confidential information. In the ABS Clearing-House, the mandatory fields in the submission forms allow the possibility to avoid entering confidential information either by using a checkbox indicating that the information for the field is confidential or by using a free text field giving the submitter the flexibility to provide information that is not confidential.

9. When information in an internationally recognized certificate of compliance is confidential, it is particularly important that the certificate can be traced back to the original permit. Linking this information can be done by providing a permit identifier in the certificate and/or by saving the certificate's unique identifier with the original permit. In this way, when the information is provided in a checkpoint communiqué on utilization that makes reference to a certificate, the certificate can be traced back to the original permit details, which may include confidential information, including information on prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms.

10. Countries can also stipulate conditions related to confidentiality in mutually agreed terms.

11. In order to assist in monitoring the utilization of genetic resources, particularly when user information is confidential, provider countries can also play a proactive role in alerting the user's country bilaterally when a user under their jurisdiction has been granted access to the provider country's genetic resources.

12. User countries can also assist by sharing information bilaterally in cases when it is not possible to share information, particularly the information gathered from users by checkpoints through the ABS Clearing-House, due to confidentiality or other reasons, as appropriate.

C. Permits and certificates

13. For countries that require prior informed consent (PIC) to be granted before issuing a permit, or equivalent, this information should be made available on the ABS Clearing-House, as it is a crucial element of the Protocol system to facilitate monitoring utilization. When information on a national permit or equivalent is entered into the ABS Clearing-House and published, it becomes available as an internationally recognized certificate of compliance (certificate or IRCC). The certificate provides evidence that the user has accessed a genetic resource legally and in accordance with prior informed consent and that mutually agreed terms have been established, as required by the domestic ABS legislation or regulatory requirements of the provider country.

14. From the workshop discussions, it became clear that there are a wide variety of elements that may constitute an ABS permit, or equivalent, and of procedures to obtain them.

15. As the processes and procedures for access vary widely from country to country, making this information clear and available on the ABS Clearing-House can be extremely useful. ABS procedures,

including step-by-step guidance on how to apply for access and how to obtain a permit, can help potential users understand the process involved and comply with ABS rules.

16. ABS procedures can also help to advertise a country as “ready for business” as well as help to reduce the burden on the ABS national focal points by answering common questions and providing clear guidance to potential users.

17. During the workshop, some countries had questions on what exactly can be considered a permit in the context of ABS and when permits should be published in the ABS Clearing-House as internationally recognized certificates of compliance.

18. For example, some countries were unsure if research or non-commercial permits could be considered ABS permits and made available as certificates on the ABS Clearing-House. Some concerns stemmed from research or non-commercial permits in some countries being handled differently and by different entities within the country. However, facilitators clarified that information on both non-commercial (research) and commercial permits can be made available as certificates on the ABS Clearing-House.

19. In addition, some countries have been publishing certificates on the ABS Clearing-House for permits granted to users under their own jurisdiction. Some participants questioned the value of issuing international certificates of compliance on the ABS Clearing-House when the permits are granted to national users.

20. It was uncovered that a number of countries have ABS permit information but have not published it on the ABS Clearing-House for the reasons mentioned in the above paragraphs. Other participants mentioned that challenges related to capacity and the time needed to make the information available prevented them from publishing the information.

21. Countries were invited to contact the Secretariat for assistance if they had any questions or issues regarding making information, in particular permits, available on the ABS Clearing-House.

22. Some participants clarified that their countries have not been granting permits while they are in the process of establishing their ABS measures and appropriate institutional arrangements. Others have issued permits without the legal backing from an established ABS regime and were reluctant to publish information on these permits as certificates on the ABS Clearing-House.

23. A few participants shared their experiences in developing ministerial resolutions or other interim measures, which helped minimize delays and accelerate the operationalization of their systems to answer requests and formally grant permits.

24. Some participants indicated that there is a need to increase understanding of how systems are dealing with traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources, including when it has been accessed without accessing the associated genetic resource.

25. It was also noted that the Protocol encourages non-Parties to participate in the ABS Clearing-House (Article 24). However, the non-Parties represented mentioned that their countries had decided not to publish certificates on the ABS Clearing-House until they had ratified the Protocol.

Permit management systems

26. During the discussions on permits and procedures, it became clear that using electronic databases and information technology systems for permitting and managing permits would be highly desirable.

27. Online permitting systems that assist and guide potential users through the process could be an efficient and practical way to deal with access requests.

28. As it can take many years before monetary or non-monetary benefits are shared, it can be extremely useful if permits and their related information are stored and organized in a searchable electronic database system. This allows provider country authorities to make information available, to facilitate monitoring.

29. Many participants mentioned that their countries plan to develop, or were in the process of developing, an online permitting system or electronic permit management system.

30. A number of countries have already developed such systems and shared valuable experience during the workshop in this regard. Although these systems are developed to meet a country's unique set of requirements, some universal lessons learned were identified. Firstly, having a very clear idea of external and internal national ABS procedures, as well as the elements that constitute a permit, or its equivalent, are helpful first steps towards developing an online permitting or permit management system. Furthermore, some countries warned that, in some cases, the most time-consuming part of this process is persuading all the various institutions involved to agree on the internal procedures and requirements of the system.

31. It also became clear through the discussions that some of the countries that have set up electronic permit management systems have not yet connected them to the ABS Clearing-House. It is important to connect these systems using the interoperability mechanisms available in order to automate the publication of certificates and facilitate the monitoring of utilization.

D. Monitoring utilization and compliance

32. Throughout the entire workshop, it was emphasized that strong communication and cooperation between countries is an essential component of the utilization monitoring system set up under the Protocol. Many participants, from both user and provider countries, expressed openness and motivation to work closely to improve communication, clarify expectations and collaborate in effective monitoring utilization of genetic resources.

33. Many participants highlighted that in-person meetings and sharing experiences helped to build relationships and trust and also strengthened informal communication channels between authorities in different countries.

1. Checkpoints

34. Many participants shared challenges related to setting up their checkpoints. It became clear that checkpoints, in the context of Article 17 of the Nagoya Protocol, have been widely misunderstood. When establishing checkpoints, many countries erroneously believe that their national checkpoints are responsible for monitoring the use of their genetic resources in other countries. Although these mechanisms may be useful, they are not checkpoints in the context of Article 17 of the Nagoya Protocol.

35. It was expressed by some participants that their countries currently lack the resources and capacities to establish checkpoints. They stated that further capacity-building and capacity-building material, providing models, examples, guidance, and low-cost options to efficiently operationalize effective checkpoints, would be helpful.

36. The workshop helped to clarify that checkpoints, in the context of the Protocol, are supposed to gather information related to the utilization of foreign genetic resources. All Parties are required to establish one or more effective checkpoints along the value chain from research to commercialization in order to gather information from users of genetic resources, particularly foreign genetic resources. The information gathered at these checkpoints is to be made available on the ABS Clearing-House and to provider countries, as appropriate, in order to assist in ensuring that users are in compliance with the ABS requirements of the country providing the genetic resource.

37. It was mentioned that a number of countries have published information on the authorities that manage checkpoints and enforce user compliance in the ABS Clearing-House. These authorities include competent national authorities and checkpoints. This use of competent national authorities may contribute to some confusion since, under the Protocol, the defining responsibility of a competent national authority is to grant access and issue permits or their equivalents. Also, it was noted that the checkpoints in these cases could also be more clearly defined since they do not specify the particular point in the value chain where information is being gathered from the user.

38. Providing clearly defined checkpoints in the ABS Clearing-House can assist users of genetic resources to understand their obligations in providing information. Clear checkpoints can also reassure provider countries by providing sure information on when and from where to expect information to be gathered on the utilization of their genetic resources. Likewise, it can help improve and standardize the organization of this information in the ABS Clearing-House for display and reporting purposes.

2. *Checkpoint communiqué*

39. During the workshop, it became apparent that some countries lack a clear understanding of the role that the checkpoint communiqué plays in monitoring the utilization of genetic resources. The role of the checkpoint communiqué was clarified: it is a transparent way for checkpoints to provide information gathered from users and alert the provider countries about utilization of their genetic resources that happens outside the provider countries' jurisdiction.

40. It was noted that some countries had been publishing checkpoint communiqués on the use of their own genetic resources as reported by national checkpoints. Some participants questioned the value of publishing checkpoint communiqués when the user's country and the provider country are the same.

41. It was also noted that very few of the checkpoint communiqués currently published on the ABS Clearing-House have been linked to a certificate. Even when there is no certificate provided, many communiqués try to provide information that may be helpful in locating the original permit. However, in some of these instances, the provider country found the information in the communiqués unhelpful and confusing.

42. The workshop helped to emphasize that it is important for provider countries to communicate and follow up with user countries regarding any checkpoint communiqué that is confusing or that raises doubts or concerns about non-compliance, particularly when a certificate is not identified.

43. Some participants shared their experiences regarding checkpoint communiqués. Participants explained how a checkpoint communiqué initiated a review process to address the information in the communiqué, in order to determine if access was legally obtained and the utilization taking place was in line with the agreement made by the provider country. The countries involved highlighted the cooperative approach that was taken and the back-and-forth follow-up that was needed to address checkpoint communiqués.

44. Participants identified that delayed or ineffective follow-up communication between provider and user countries could likely disrupt or diminish the effectiveness of the monitoring. Therefore, it may be important that each communiqué be summarily addressed in an organized manner, particularly by the provider country. It is equally important that both countries be kept appropriately informed of any follow-up or necessary actions up to the conclusion of the process.

45. It was highlighted that, when the checkpoint communiqué is published, an alert is sent by email from the ABS Clearing-House to the provider country's competent national authority and ABS national focal point. Using interoperability mechanisms, the ABS Clearing-House can be set up to additionally alert an electronic monitoring system which can help ensure that this information is well organized, traceable, and promptly addressed. For example, when a checkpoint communiqué is published, the ABS Clearing-House could alert a national monitoring system and create a task or reminder for the provider to review the information from the communiqué and permit, take any actions necessary, and reply to the user country in order to ensure that each checkpoint communiqué has been summarily dealt with in an organized manner.

3. *Compliance*

46. During the workshop, it became clear that many countries had not addressed the aspects of the Protocol relating to compliance with domestic legislation of other countries in their national legal frameworks. It was noted that, when developing ABS legal frameworks, considering compliance aspects early may be helpful and save time in the establishment of a fully functional and complete national system.

47. Nonetheless, many countries had made progress in operationalizing their compliance measures, particularly those that do not require PIC. Participants from these countries shared their experience, lessons learned and practical questions on how to improve ABS systems to make them more effective. It was suggested that more guidance and experience-sharing related to the different approaches to promoting compliance, raising awareness, and identifying users, could be useful.

48. Several times during the workshop and discussions related to compliance, it was stressed that building and maintaining strong communication and cooperation between provider and user countries can be useful to facilitate and promote ABS and user compliance.

49. For example, some participants noted the challenges they faced identifying national users accessing foreign genetic resources. Many participants from countries actively implementing compliance measures invited and encouraged provider countries to communicate this information to them. In particular, they were interested in information regarding doubts or concerns related to users and utilization happening in their jurisdiction and indicated that such information was useful to enhance risk-based compliance and trigger compliance checks on users.

50. Participants also discussed how their countries deal with situations of non-compliance. On this topic, it was highlighted that, when a user has been found to be non-compliant, it also presents an opportunity. Efforts to bring these users back into compliance by taking remedial or retroactive actions before turning to penalties, sanctions or other more severe enforcement mechanisms, can save the benefits from being lost and improve relationships with users.

51. Participants also discussed the challenges related to the enforcement of mutually agreed terms at the international level. In these cases, it was highlighted that the user country may not play a very active or significant role in the enforcement of private international contracts. For this reason, it is important to develop solid contracts that include clauses related to regular reporting and alternative methods of settling disputes or that dictate the specific rules and procedures that will be applicable to the interpretation and resolution of the contract or agreement under the mutually agreed terms.

52. Finally, it was mentioned that effective monitoring utilization is not only useful for ensuring compliance, it also helps us recognize and understand the Nagoya Protocol's contribution and the value of genetic resources in innovation and research and its potential to advance the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

*Annex II***Results of the workshop evaluation**

(1) My knowledge and skills on the following topics improved as a result of this workshop:

| Question: | Rating (0-5) | Responses |
|--|--------------|-----------|
| The overall system for monitoring the utilization of genetic resources under the Nagoya Protocol | 4.23 | 26 |
| How the monitoring of the utilization of genetic resources happens in practice and differs from country to country | 4.42 | 26 |
| Concrete actions that are needed to enhance my country's national system to monitor the utilization of genetic resources | 4.20 | 25 |

(2) How relevant was the subject matter to your job responsibilities?

| Options: | Responses: |
|---------------------|------------|
| Very relevant | 24 |
| Relevant | 2 |
| Moderately relevant | 0 |
| Slightly relevant | 0 |
| Not relevant | 0 |

(3) To what extent are you likely to apply the knowledge and skills you acquired to your work?

| Options: | Responses: |
|-------------------|------------|
| Very likely | 23 |
| Likely | 3 |
| Moderately Likely | 0 |
| Not likely | 0 |
| Not relevant | 0 |

(4) Satisfaction with the workshop

| Question: | Rating (0-5) | Responses |
|---|--------------|-----------|
| Rate your overall satisfaction with the workshop | 4.73 | 26 |
| Session 1: Introduction to the workshop and methodology | 4.58 | 26 |
| Session 2. Introduction to the system for monitoring utilization under the Nagoya Protocol | 4.54 | 26 |
| Session 3. Practical example of an ABS case | 4.38 | 26 |
| Session 4. Activity with different scenarios on how the monitoring system can work in a variety of national circumstances | 4.19 | 26 |
| Session 5. Country experiences: Permits and IRCCs | 4.31 | 26 |
| Session 6. Country experiences: Monitoring the utilization of genetic resources, checkpoints and the checkpoint communiqué certificates of compliance | 4.31 | 26 |
| Session 7. Country experiences: Other systems to monitor the utilization of genetic resources | 4.23 | 26 |
| Sessions 8 and 9. Country analysis and road map | 4.27 | 26 |

(5) What was the least useful element and/or session of the workshop?

| |
|---|
| Responses: |
| Presentation on ABS Initiative and Global ABS Project |
| Good |
| All the sessions were very useful |
| everything was useful |

| |
|---|
| None |
| N/a |
| None |
| Some country experiences were too long to hear without bringing adequate ideas or lessons to others |
| Every session was found to be informative and useful. |
| All of it was good |
| It was really useful. |
| The discussion tables at the end were good for allowing people to concentrate on a topic of interest but the time was too short to have a proper rotation. I am not sure how this could work better in practice but it seemed like people were interested in getting into details and were thus reluctant to move on. |
| It was all useful and relevant |
| None |
| I was already familiar with content on checkpoints, which ended up being a key part of the workshop. However I appreciate that while not useful for me personally, it was useful for the broader workshop attendees. |
| For me all was useful. |
| None |
| As far as I am concerned all elements and sessions were useful. it was one of the most important and useful workshop I have participated. it was a real opportunity for me to enhanced my capacities and better comprehension of Nagoya Protocol genetic resources utilisation monitoring |
| no |
| none |
| Nothing because it was very interactive |
| n.a. |
| Nothing comes to my mind. |
| Other systems to monitor the utilization of genetic resources, because some of them are not applicable in Belarus |
| Understanding checkpoints and checkpoints communiqués |
| none |

(6) Comments or suggestions to improve the content and facilitation of the workshop?

| |
|---|
| Responses: |
| Need more time for discussion. |
| Good |
| We had too much to share with each other but the time was limited, I wish the workshop was planned for the whole week |
| more time to present |
| Group sessions should be allocated enough time and also advised to focus on three main issues. Manage the full rotation to all groups. |
| Need more training and times, can participate only few subject but not all |
| More examples of ABS case should be interesting |
| If CBD Secretariat could come up with certain guideline especially on ABSCH mechanism and compliance to standardise the process and to achieve common goal |
| The methodology of avoiding death by endless power point by choosing specific questions and countries should be used again. |
| The 2 day session about country experiences session became very exhausting. |
| I thought that the scenarios were very good but there were too many choices and not enough time to discuss them satisfactorily. I would possibly reduce the number of options or give each table a different scenario to discuss and present to the plenary. I liked the soccer analogy - I think this will stay with people for a long time. I also liked the summaries of the information sent in by the participants and the short presentations. It was interactive and I |

| |
|---|
| think this worked really well. |
| Allow more time for discussions |
| Just a note to say the workshop was extremely useful and I feel one of the most beneficial aspects was simply meeting representatives from other countries to talk about each other's challenges and stages in person. It would be great if this workshop could be hosted on a fairly regular basis (perhaps every couple of years?). One suggestion would be to have a group activity where countries currently developing their legislation can rotate around to speak to countries with more developed legislation. The small group activities seemed more useful to some countries that didn't appear to be as comfortable speaking about their issues to the wider group. |
| Sincèrement, je suis entièrement satisfait du contenu de l'atelier. La méthode était pragmatique et participative. Je pense que les organisateurs de l'atelier ont fait jeu et le ballon est dans notre camp. Ce qui a manqué c'était l'insuffisance du temps, l'absence de la traduction de l'anglais en français. Aussi l'Afrique de l'Ouest et francophone était peu représentée. Je suggère l'organisation d'un pareil atelier par l'Union Africaine pour tous les pays africains surtout ceux qui n'étaient pas là à Bonn en Allemagne. Sincerely, I am completely satisfied with the content of the workshop. The method was pragmatic and participatory. I think the organizers of the workshop have made play and the ball is in our camp. What was lacking was the lack of time, the lack of translation from English into French. Also West Africa and Francophone countries was poorly represented. I suggest the organization of such a workshop by SCBD or AFRICAN UNION for all African countries especially those who were not there in Bonn in Germany. |
| There was no enough information about traditional knowledge associated to genetic resources, It is necessary to analyze deeper this issue. |
| I suggest more time for discussions and sharing information It will be good to repeat this kind of workshop in order to help us to improve our existing system of monitoring or to set up a better system |
| perhaps duration increased by 2 days |
| In the future it should be interesting that all participants can present their work or the activities taking place in each country. |
| I liked very much the football game and the teamwork. |
| Maybe keep more time for the different "topic meetings" on the last day. Hopefully there will be another workshop soon that deals with sovereignty and chain of values. |
| Add more screens and mobile microphone to every table |
| Addressing questions and concerns by participants |
| more time should be given to group work |