

Country consultation for Regional Standards and other NAPPO documents

Country consultation for NAPPO documents follows the same process irrespective of whether the document is 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 new timelines for consultation were approved by the NAPPO EC in July of 2015.

Process steps

1. The NAPPO Executive Director obtains the final draft document from the Expert Group Chair.
2. The NAPPO ED confirms the dates (start and finish) for the sixty (60) or ninety (90) day country consultation period, depending on the type of document.
3. The NAPPO Secretariat reviews and edits (TD or ED), formats (TD or ED), and translates (T/I) the document.
4. The NAPPO ED drafts a letter of congratulation to the EG and distributes the document to the NAPPO Advisory and Management Committee and to the Expert Group Chair members a few weeks before opening the country consultation.
5. The AMC consults with the EG to identify all stakeholders that should be involved in the country consultation.
6. The designated member of the EG from each member country, alongside a member from the AMC for that country are **responsible for the coordination of country consultation comments in their country**.
7. The document is uploaded to the NAPPO website (see example below) with clear indication of the following:
 - Dates for the country consultation
 - Point of contact in each country – for questions and to receive comments.
8. Country consultation includes internal and external consultation and need not be limited to comments from NAPPO member countries. It involves consultation with stakeholders, and may include technical experts, industry and state/provincial representatives, regional organizations, and foreign governments, as appropriate.
9. Industry review should be coordinated through the appropriate IAG representative. **The AMC member for that country ensures that this is coordinated.**
10. Comments will only be accepted when made in the comments table (see below).
11. Comments from within the NAPPO region must be sent to the designated EG member.
12. Stakeholders outside the NAPPO region must send their comments to the NAPPO Executive Director.

<i>Title</i>	<i>NAPPO discussion document on the likelihood of establishment – click here to download in English</i>		
<i>Título</i>	<i>Documento de discusión de la NAPPO sobre la probabilidad de establecimiento – haga clic aquí para obtener el documento en español</i>		
Dates for Country Consultation	April 1 – May 31, 2017 – SIXTY DAYS 1 de abril – 31 de mayo del 2017 – SESENTA DÍAS		
NAPPO country comments			
Country	Canada	United States	Mexico
Expert Group person responsible	Robert Favrin robert.favrin@inspection.gc.ca 613 773 5266	Christina Devorshak Christina.Devorshak@aphis.usda.gov 919-855-7547	Xochitl Aidee Campuzano xochitl.campuzano@senasica.gob.mx 52-55-5905-1000 ext. 54765
AMC member responsible	Dom Pelletier Dominique.Pelletier@inspectin.gc.ca 613-773-7180	Pati Abad Patricia.V.Abad@aphis.usda.gov 301-851-2264	Ana Lilia Montealegre Lara Ana.Montealegre@senasica.gob.mx 52-55-5905-1000 ext. 51341
International Comments	Stephanie Bloem Stephanie.Bloem@NAPPO.org 919-617-4040		

NAPPO Table for Comments *on draft Documents*
Likelihood of establishment

- Use this table for sending comments to the designated country contact.
- Please consult 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 the compilation of comments by the Expert Group and the NAPPO Secretariat.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Country: _____

Use these columns to record your comments					Leave these blank	
1. Document section	2. Comment type	3. Precise location – page and line number	4. Proposed rewording	5. Explanation	6. Accept/Reject ¹	7. If reject why? ¹
General Comments on Document						
Title						
Background and Introduction						
Interpretation of PRA elements with focus on						

Use these columns to record your comments					Leave these blank	
1. Document section	2. Comment type	3. Precise location – page and line number	4. Proposed rewording	5. Explanation	6. Accept/Reject ¹	7. If reject why? ¹
evaluating LoE						
<i>Pest listing</i>						
<i>Type of commodity and intended use</i>						
<i>Elements of likelihood of establishment</i>						
Availability, quantity and distribution of hosts in the PRA area						
Environmental suitability						
Other pest characteristics						
Pest mobility						
Cultural practices and control measures						
Flowchart						
References						

HOW TO USE THE TABLE

Comments will be compiled so that all comments by country on each section or paragraph will appear together.

Please do not add or delete columns and do not change their width.

1. DOCUMENT SECTION

- This column has the titles of sections as they appear in the document, plus a row to add general comments.
- General comments apply to the entire document. Specific comments apply to a particular document section.
- If you have several comments on parts of a same section, one or more row(s) can added 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.

2. COMMENT TYPE

For each comment please indicate if it refers to:

- a technical issue with the content of the standard or document.
- an editorial issue
- a translation issue

Technical issue - These comments cover conceptual problems, scientific errors, technical adjustments, etc. Rewording should be proposed (in column 4) and detailed explanation (in column 5) should be provided to facilitate review by the EG and AMC.

Editorial issue - 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 issue – These comments are restricted to cases where the English version is thought to be correct, but the translation into Spanish seems incorrect or viceversa.

3. PRECISE LOCATION

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

Use these columns to record your comments					Leave these blank	
1. Document section	2. Comment type	3. Precise location – page and line number	4. Proposed rewording	5. Explanation	6. Accept/Reject ¹	7. If reject why? ¹
General Comments on Document	editorial	Page 3 line 43	Seed seed	Incorrect spelling		

4- 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~~.

5- EXPLANATION

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