**Country consultation for Regional Standards and other NAPPO documents**

Country consultation for NAPPO documents follows the same process irrespective of the type of document - a Regional Standard, a Science and Technology or a Discussion Document. The only difference is that for documents OTHER than Regional Standards, the period of country consultation is sixty (60) rather than ninety (90) days. These timelines were approved by the NAPPO Executive Committee in July of 2015.

**Country Consultation steps**

1. The NAPPO Executive Director (ED) obtains the final draft document from the Expert Group Chair.
2. The NAPPO Secretariat, in consultation with the NAPPO Advisory and Management Committee (AMC), confirms the dates (start and finish) for the sixty (60) or ninety (90) day consultation period, depending on the type of document(s).
3. The NAPPO Secretariat reviews (Technical Director (TD) or ED), formats (TD or ED), and translates (Translator/Interpreter) the document(s) and places them in the Country Consultation folder under the appropriate year.
4. The AMC determines which EG member will be responsible for collecting comments in their country.
5. The designated member of the EG, alongside a member from the AMC for that country work together and are **responsible for the coordination of country consultation comments in their country**.
6. The AMC consults with the EG to identify all stakeholders that should be involved in the country consultation.
7. The NAPPO ED drafts a letter of congratulation/information to the EG and distributes the document to the NAPPO AMC and to the Expert Group at least one week before opening the country consultation.
8. The materials are uploaded to the NAPPO website and include the following:
	1. Document
	2. Instructions and example
	3. Table for comments
	4. Table with points of contact in each country
		1. Comments from within the NAPPO region must be sent to the designated EG member.
		2. Stakeholders outside the NAPPO region must send their comments to the NAPPO Executive Director.
9. Comments may be received from technical experts, industry and state/provincial representatives, regional organizations, and foreign governments, as appropriate.
10. Industry review should be coordinated through the appropriate Industry Advisory Group (IAG) representative. **The AMC member for that country ensures that this is coordinated.**
11. Comments will only be accepted when made in the comments table.

**NAPPO Table for Comments for Country Consultation**

* Use the table below for recording and providing comments to the designated country contact.
* Consult the table of country contacts on the NAPPO website to ensure you know who that person is as well as their email and phone number.
* Persons outside the NAPPO region should send their comments to the NAPPO Executive Director.
* Instructions on how to use the table are found below.
* The table format facilitates compilation of comments by the Expert Group and the NAPPO Secretariat.

Name: ----------------------------------------------

Title: ------------------------------------------------

Country: -------------------------------------------

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Record your comments in this section* | *Leave these blank* |
| 1. *Document section*
 | 1. *Comment type*
 | 1. *Precise location – page and line number*
 | 1. *Proposed rewording*
 | *5. Explanation* | *6. Accept/reject* | *7. If reject, why?* |
| General comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Title  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Background and Introduction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**HOW TO USE THE TABLE**

* Please do not add or delete columns and do not change their width.
1. **DOCUMENT SECTION**
* This column has a row for general comments and includes the titles of sections as they appear in the document. They will be different for each document.
	+ General comments apply to the entire document.
	+ Specific comments apply to a specific section – for example the Title.
* If you have more than one comment on parts of the same document section, add one or more row(s) to the table. The title of the section should be repeated in the new rows.
* If changes are proposed to the titles of document sections, they should be made in the column proposed rewording.
* If there are no comments for one document section the entire row should be deleted.
1. **COMMENT TYPE**

For each comment please indicate if it refers to:

* **Technical issues -** These comments cover conceptual problems, scientific errors, technical adjustments, etc. Rewording should be proposed (in column 4) and a detailed explanation (in column 5) should be provided to facilitate review by the EG and AMC.
* **Editorial issues -** Wording could be improved to clarify or simplify the text. However, the meaning must not change.

Examples:

* a term in the text is thought to better fit in the definitions section of the standard
* a sentence needs to be consistent with wording used elsewhere in the text
* a more appropriate synonym could be used
* the language could be simplified.
* **Translation issues –** These comments are specific to cases where the version in one language is thought to be correct, but the translation seems incorrect.
1. **PRECISE LOCATION**

To facilitate the compilation of comments, **please use the page number and line number** to identify where your comment belongs.

Example:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Record your comments in this section* | *Leave these blank* |
| 1. *Document section*
 | 1. *Comment type*
 | 1. *Precise location – page and line number*
 | 1. *Proposed rewording*
 | *5. Explanation* | *6. Accept/reject* | *7. If reject, why?* |
| General comments | editorial | Page 3, line 43 | Seed ~~sead~~ | Incorrect spelling |  |  |

1. **PROPOSED REWORDING**

Rewording should be proposed for changes to the text. For example, added text can be underlined and deleted text can be ~~struck-through~~ (see above).

1. **EXPLANATION**

This field should include the justification for the comment. Please provide enough detail to assist the EG and AMC in understanding the comment and proposed rewording.