**Online Comment System user requirements**

| **Comm. no.**  | **Para. no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Comment**  | **Explanation**  | **Language**  | **Country**  | **Secretariat's Response**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. 2. 3. | *G*  | Substantive | I support the document as it is and I have no comments |    | English  | Mexico, Ghana, Costa Rica, Republic of Congo |  Ok |
| 3b | *G*  | Substantive | I wonder if it is possible to that the OCS system include coordination between SC members within a region and relevant RPPO. I give as example the Near East. If it is possible to allow members of SC (which are not in general contact point of IPPC) to log in the system and to share comments with others representatives. | Note: comment sent via email | English | NEPPO | Ok. This can be done by requesting the Secretariat to create level 1 user accounts for SC members, who may share comments between them (without submitting them to the Secretariat) and send them to the OCS accounts of the RPPO and/or NPPOs in the region for submission; alternatively – better option – SC members that are not contact points (therefore, level 1 users) may request the contact point or the RPPO or NPPO of their region/country to create an account for them as Commenters. |
| 4.  | *G*  | Substantive  | * ﻿We think that this kind of analysis is only effective if the user is working on OCS. To check if the user requirements is a task that depends on working on OCS. For us is difficult to do this analysis without work on OCS and check if each user requirement is ok.
 | ﻿We think that this kind of analysis is only effective if the user is working on OCS. To check if the user requirements is a task that depends on working on OCS. For us is difficult to do this analysis without work on OCS and check if each user requirement is ok. | English  | Brazil  | Noted, we will ask developers to present a template for the Secretariat, which will be available for the members who request it. |
| 5.  | *G*  | Substantive  | Review of the OCS is timely and needed. Jamiaica fully supports this. | A review of the OCS is needed. | English  | Jamaica  |  Ok |
| 6.  | *G*  | Substantive  | For proper establishment of user requirements of the system, it is advisable to classify users and determine or identifiy the requirements under this classification.  Among the types of users can be identified as follows: 1) individual contracting parties (NPPOs); 2) contracting parties regional (e.g. EU); 3) RPPOs; 4) IPPC Secretariat; 5) CPM subsidiary bodies (e.g. CN). | The system design based on user requirements established as suggested, will allow a better adjustment of the system to the needs of each user types   | English  | OIRSA  | Thanks for the note, but as per footnote 5 this will be addressed when the IT experts start developing the system. The Secretariat preferred to use general terms (i.e. “level 1”, “level 2”, “level 3” users) in order to allow the development of different user types to follow under the different categories.  |
| 7.  | *G*  | Technical  | Due to possible implications for the future, it would be advisable to check whether the user requirements for IPPC system are consistent with user requirements for Codex system. | It is very likely that processes for developing Codex standards differ from the processes of IPPC standards. | English  | OIRSA  | The present plan has been developed jointly by the IPPC and Codex Alimentarius secretariats. Some minor user requirements that are specific to Codex are not mentioned here. |
| 8.  | *4*  | Editorial  | **3. Background information**The current version of the OCS has been developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization’s Knowledge and Information Systems (CIOK) division based in Bangkok using a Flash-based platform with a Java back-end. The IPPC Secretariat identified its initial requirements in 2009, and started using the system for its member consultation in June 2011.The Codex Alimentarius Secretariat started testing the same system in 2012; the same year the WTO-SPS Committee recommended that its “Three Sisters” (the IPPC, Codex and OIE secretariats) should collaborate more in their efforts and the OCS was noted as one possible tool for enhancing such collaboration.Originally, the OCS was conceptualised to be ***simple***, with minimal complexity; ***efficient***, therefore reaching its goals with a minimum of time-waste or unnecessary effort from its users; ***user-friendly***, that is, users would be able to use the system in an easy and self-explanatory way based on their needs.Until 2013, the system has proven adequate in meeting user needs, as it provided an online platform for Contact Points to insert, save, share and submit comments, and facilitated the IPPC Secretariat in collecting, compiling and posting comments during its member consultation periods. In fact, in 2012, 62 IPPC members submitted 4,786 comments to the IPPC Secretariat; in 2013, 66 IPPC members submitted 5,717 comments.2It is now being revised due to four main reasons:- restructuring of FAO has created uncertainty regarding FAO’s support for the OCS and partial support has just resumed at this moment ~~of reporting~~the present time- users have started expressing the recurrence of issues that may be better addressed with a comprehensive revision of the system rather than with minor fixes- some programming imperfections make the compilation and management of comments uneasydifficult for the Secretariat and this causes delays in the workflow- technology is changed and there is a need to make the OCS compatible with portable devices and a variety of browsers.In fact, as the system further developed, its technology became outdated and users identified some issues, which mainly consisted in ***compatibility*** with several browsers and devices (i.e. not full compatibility with IE 10 or above and IE 6 or below, system not running on portable devices); lack of ***intuitiveness*** (several users reported not being able to understand the system at first sight, also due to its many functions, frequent changes and difficulty in reaching all users for personalized training); degrading ***performance*** (to date, the system is very slow in loading); sharp drop in ***user-friendliness*** (many users have difficulties in logging in and locating the documents and commenting on long documents is not convenient and time consuming; Secretariats hasve many difficulties in compiling comments).Therefore, the current system has grown inadequate to satisfy user needs, as new necessary features were added through time but they have overburdened its users and generated additional technical issues.These reasons are the basis for reviewing users’ needs and requirements with the specific purpose of reiterating the need for a simpler and lighter, efficient and user-friendly system to **facilitate** the participation of relevant stakeholders to the Standard Setting Process. Even if that was the original idea, the increase in the OCS complexity has resulted in a more inefficient system that is now too fixed to be flexible and does not allow to work efficiently.Background information and training material for the current OCS are available at [www.ippc.int/ocs](http://www.ippc.int/ocs). | It is not clear if we are talking about the IPPC Secretariat or other Secretariats as well.   | English  | United States of America  | This is a plan made by the IPPC and Codex Alimentarius secretariats jointly and therefore it refers to both, but the present consultation on the document was made for IPPC members only. |
| 9.  | *6*  | Editorial  | **4.1 General requirements for users**In collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat, the main OCS users have set a series of general requirements to address the current challenges as described below.3 | edit   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 10.  | *7*  | Editorial  | The OCS should be **fully compatible** with portableportal devices and all main browsers used by FAO. It should support the **six FAO official languages** (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and it should be **integrated with the main Secretariats’ portals** (i.e. the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for IPPC and the Codex portal for Codex Alimentarius). The integration shall possibly allow for single sign-on Authentication. It should also be ***customizable***, allowing secretariats to brand the system as their own and do minor adjustments to suit their needs. Minor differences between the systems will be allowed, with regard to content, graphics, user databases, and option to turning certain features on and off. **Users will be grouped in different categories** and may have more than one role. | Typing error   | English  | OIRSA  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 11.  | *7*  | Editorial  | The OCS should be **fully compatible** with portal devices and all main browsers used by FAO. It should support the **six FAO official languages** (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and it should be **integrated with the main Secretariats’ portals** (i.e. the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for IPPC and the Codex portal for Codex Alimentarius). The integration shall possibly allow for single sign-on Authentication. It should also be ***customizable***, allowing secretariats to brand the system as their own and do minor adjustments to suit their needs. Minor differences between the systems will be allowed, with regard to content, graphics, user databases, and option to turning certain features on and off. **Users will be grouped in different categories** and may have more than one role. | edits   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 12.  | *7*  | Editorial  | The OCS should be **fully compatible** with portal devices and all main browsers used by FAO. It should support the **six FAO official languages** (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and it should be **integrated with the main Secretariats’ portals** (i.e. the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for IPPC and the Codex portal for Codex Alimentarius). The integration shall possibly allow for single sign-on Authentication. It should also be ***customizable***, allowing secretariats to brand the system as their own and do minor adjustments to suit their needs. Minor differences between the systems will be allowed, with regard to content, graphics, user databases, and option to turning certain features on and off. **Users will be grouped in different categories** and may have more than one role. | nous sommes favorable avec cette disposition   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 13.  | *7*  | Technical  | The OCS should be **fully compatible** with portal devices and all main browsers used by FAO. It should support the **six FAO official languages** (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and it should be **integrated with the main Secretariats’ portals** (i.e. the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for IPPC and the Codex portal for Codex Alimentarius). The integration shall possibly allow for single sign-on Authentication. It should also be ***customizable***, allowing secretariats to brand the system as their own and do minor adjustments to suit their needs. Minor differences between the systems will be allowed, with regard to content, graphics, user databases, and option to turning certain features on and off. **Users will be grouped in different categories** and may have more than one role. | Should be desirable determine the scope of this compatibility in terms of smartphones and other devices with small screen, in order to avoiding efforts on not appropriate processes for these devices.   | English  | OIRSA  |  Ok |
| 14.  | *8*  | Editorial  | Many OCS users find the system very complex and not user friendly. They deem the homepage is not really useful, and they would prefer to have direct access to the drafts. In the new system, **users should have directly access theto drafts open for commenting**, which should always be up-to-date. In addition, **each document should be visible on one page** through a scroll-down bar, just like a word document. | edits   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 15.  | *8*  | Substantive  | Many OCS users find the system very complex and not user friendly. They deem the homepage not really useful, and they would prefer to have direct access to the drafts. In the new system, **users should directly access the drafts open for commenting**, which should always be up-to-date. In addition, **each document should be visible on one page** through a scroll-down bar, just like a word document.  | nous sommes favorables à cette proposition pour une meilleure utilisation et exploitation   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 16.  | *10*  | Editorial  | **Four types of comments** will be allowed as core/basic comments on each paragraph into which the document is automatically split into: Substantive, Technical, Editorial, Translation4. The Secretariat can open documents just for some types of comments and may also chose to not to open some paragraphs for comments. | edits   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 17.  | *10*  | Substantive  | **Four types of comments** will be allowed as core/basic comments on each paragraph into which the document is automatically split into: Substantive, Technical, Editorial, Translation4. Secretariat can open documents just for some types of comments and may also chose to not open some paragraphs for comments. | The scope of this plan aim to provides an outline of users requirement for the OCS used by IPPC and CODEX secretariate, So it should be take into account an accordance on types of comments between IPPC and CODEX. The CODEX procedral manual define only 2 types of comment for standards and related text as below; 1.Amendment (may be comparable to editorial or substantive) 2.Revision (may be comparable to technical). | English  | Thailand  | This was noted. The Codex Secretariat, however, is inclined to use the same comments categorization as the IPPC, and also considering the efforts needed to build two different systems, the OCS will be built to envisage four different types of comments (with the possibility to rename them).  |
| 18.  | *10*  | Substantive  | **Four types of comments** will be allowed as core/basic comments on each paragraph into which the document is automatically split into: Substantive, Technical, Editorial, Translation4. Secretariat can open documents just for some types of comments and may also chose to not open some paragraphs for comments. | nous préferons que les quatre types de commentaires soient sur la même ligne que le paragraphe à examiner pour des considérations pratiques. | English  | Algeria  | The documents’ visualization will be addressed with the IT developers and may depend on the technology involved. However, the format for the commenting page will certainly be user-friendly.  |
| 19.  | *11*  | Substantive  | The OCS will not be an archiving system. Documents should be **visible to users only during their commenting periods**, and they will not be visibleafter their commenting periods are over; however, they should be available on the Secretariat portals. | il serait intéressant d'avoir la possibilité de télécharger les commentaires sous format PDF, Excel ou Word avant leur suppression à la fin du délai d'observation. | English  | Algeria  | Comments from all users are compiled and posted on the IPP, while it is still possible for users to retrieve their own comments, even after the commenting period is over (for a one-year period). |
| 20.  | *12*  | Substantive  | Subject to further funding, level 1 users will also be able to **retrieve internal comments** from all users in the group (those saved as drafts, saved and sent, ready for submission and submitted) and to compile them for a period of one year after the commenting period is over (users would be notified of this deadline).  RPPO's users level 1 should be able to create user accounts for standard review groups and sharing comments between group members and with other users or gropups and these comments should be remain available until the end of the comment period.  | This is desirable to reach broad agreement on the required improvements to the draft ISPM in consultation.   | English  | OIRSA  | Text not included. In this case, commenters should be added or sharing rules apply. RPPO contact points can either add users as their reviewers or share their comments with NPPO contact points in the region. |
| 21.  | *13*  | Editorial  | After login, users will be able to access a link on **notifications**, both OCS-related and related to the Secretariat portal. This should have a user friendly format, similar to social networks. Users should be able to delete one or more (all) notifications with the click of a button. Notifications on the opening and closing of commenting periods as well as reminders should also be automatically sent via email, as these are vital, the Secretariat will not deactivate this function. It should also be possible to switch on and off anthe option to receive all notifications via email or notification digest (i.e. sharing of comments, submission of comments, comments sent by lower groups, etc). | edit   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 22.  | *13*  | Substantive  | After login, users will be able to access a link on **notifications**, both OCS-related and related to the Secretariat portal. This should have a user friendly format, similar to social networks. Users should be able to delete one or more (all) notifications with the click of a button. Notifications on the opening and closing of commenting periods as well as reminders should also be automatically sent via email, as these are vital, the Secretariat will not deactivate this function. It should also be possible to switch on and off an option to receive all notifications via email or notification digest (i.e. sharing of comments, submission of comments, comments sent by lower groups, etc). | En plus de ce qui est indiqué, il serait intéressant de disposer d'une boite de réception pour les utilisateurs au niveau même de l'OCS afin de recevoir directement les notifications | English  | Algeria  | Ok. The proposal was already implicit in the text, but it was made explicit. |
| 23.  | *14*  | Substantive  | Users will be able to **search** for other users in the same group or for all users (for Secretariat and for level 1 users wishing to add their Assistant / Commenters). They will also be able to search for documents currently open for commenting, and for internal comments on documents whose commenting period is over. | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 24.  | *14*  | Technical  | Users will be able to **search** for other users in the same group or for all users (for Secretariat and for level 1 users wishing to add their Assistant / Commenters). They will also be able to search for documents currently open for commenting, and for internal comments on documents whose commenting period is over. | There may be conflict with the provisions of paragraph 11: "The OCS will not be an archiving system. Documents should be visible to users only during their commenting periods" | English  | OIRSA  | The text was not revised, as we said that, due to specific requests, IPPC members would still like to keep their own comments in the system – and for technical reasons this will be done for a one-year period (see following paragraphs). |
| 25.  | *15*  | Substantive  | The system should allow users to **export data** in the most common formats (i.e. Microsoft Office Word or Excel, PDF, etc.) and printer friendly. The **Statistics** page will allow Secretariat and level 1 users to check how many and which types of comments have been submitted by which users on which documents in which timeframe. Therefore, statistics are based on the document (title and type), dates, comment type and status, user submitting the comment and Region of the user. This also allows Secretariat to track access to the OCS by its users. | Export data output in any formats should be set as a same pattern and need to be printer friendly.   | English  | Thailand  |  Ok, suggestion incorporated. |
| 26.  | *15*  | Substantive  | The system should allow users to **export data** in the most common formats (i.e. Microsoft Office or Excel, PDF, etc.). The **Statistics** page will allow Secretariat and level 1 users to check how many and which types of comments have been submitted by which users on which documents in which timeframe. Therefore, statistics are based on the document (title and type), dates, comment type and status, user submitting the comment and Region of the user. This also allows Secretariat to track access to the OCS by its users.  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 27.  | *15*  | Technical  | The system should allow users to **export data** in the most common formats (i.e. Microsoft Office or Excel, PDF, etc.). Exports can be ease edited (e.g. making format changes) in target programs and document parts can be selectable by the users as required. The **Statistics** page will allow Secretariat and level 1 users to check how many and which types of comments have been submitted by which users on which documents in which timeframe. Therefore, statistics are based on the document (title and type), dates, comment type and status, user submitting the comment and Region of the user. This also allows Secretariat to track access to the OCS by its users. | Currently, exports of the system, are difficult to handle in the target programs.   | English  | OIRSA  |  Ok, suggestion incorporated. |
| 28.  | *17*  | Editorial  | The OCS should address the need to comment on drafts by a large number of users without losing the original draft and easing the work of the Secretariat to compile, format, post and forward these comments to other users for further consideration.Secretariat members are registered by the administrators of the system and OCS Managers registration can be validated by Secretariat members.As the Secretariat oversees the entire system, its members would need to have administrative powers in all areas. They need to be in the capablecity of delivering prompt solutions and manage the development of the Standard Setting Process as it moves forwards. | edits   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 29.  | *17*  | Substantive  | The OCS should address the need to comment on drafts by a large number of users without losing the original draft and easing the work of the Secretariat to compile, format, post and forward these comments to other users for further consideration.Secretariat members are registered by the administrators of the system and OCS Managers registration can be validated by Secretariat members.As the Secretariat oversees the entire system, its members would need to have administrative powers in all areas. They need to be in the capacity of delivering prompt solutions and manage the development of the Standard Setting Process as it moves forwards. | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 30.  | *18*  | Substantive  | Secretariat users may perform the following actions (only some users will access all of them), including:- creating groups in the system - creating Level 1 users - uploading documents for commenting in a streamlined way - defining the schedule for commenting (insert start and end dates of commenting periods) - inviting Level 1 users to comment on drafts - receiving compiled comments automatically at the end of each commenting period - formatting drafts within the system.  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 31.  | *19*  | Substantive  | Secretariat users do not need to see the work of any other user and are there to carry out administrative tasks and offer administrative support to Level 1 users. However, it is possible for some Secretariat users to imitate any user in order to check and solve possible problems.  | nous sommes favorable à cette disposition. cependant, il va falloir mettre en place un système de traçabilité afin d'identifier l'utilisateur qui a procédeé aux modifications   | English  | Algeria  | Noted. The Secretariat will only use this feature if requested or for testing purposes. |
| 32.  | *20*  | Substantive  | A compiling tool should be developed for the Secretariat to handle the comments received. The system should generate an output as per the following scheme, available for download in Excel and Word: | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 33.  | *21*  | Editorial  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comm.no.**  | **Para.no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Original text**  | **Modified text**  | **Explanation**  | **Author (group)**  |
| 25  | 1  | Technical  | Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | Movement of g Growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | International trade involves the movement, so text deleted is redundant.  | Ecuador, Mexico, OIRSA, Belize  |

 | It should be design a table structure or column appropriately with the wide of landing page.   | English  | Thailand  |  Ok, consideration added in the text. |
| 34.  | *21*  | Substantive  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comm.no.**  | **Para.no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Original text**  | **Modified text**  | **Explanation**  | **Author (group)**  |
| 25  | 1  | Technical  | Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | Movement of g Growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | International trade involves the movement, so text deleted is redundant.  | Ecuador, Mexico, OIRSA, Belize  |

   | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 35.  | *22*  | Editorial  | **4.3 Models for use of the OCS Options** | For clarity | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 36.  | *22*  | Substantive  | **4.3 Models for use of the OCS** | ok | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 37.  | *23*  | Substantive  | Level 1 users will be able to choose Option One or Option Two. | ok | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 38.  | *24*  | Substantive  | **4.3.1 Option One: core activity with level 1 users**  | ok | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 39.  | *25*  | Substantive  | Option One should be used when there are limited resources for activities of inserting, saving, sharing and submitting comments. Under this option, there would be two types of level 1 users: | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 40.  | *26*  | Substantive  | * 1. **OCS Manager** **(main function: submit comments), *mandatory user*** who should be granted access to documents once they are open for commenting, with the capacity to submit them to the Secretariat. They are the Contact Points (CP) of each group.5
	2. **OCS Deputy (main function: verify comments)**, ***optional user*** created by the OCS Manager, who has its same capacity, except the final submission of comments.
 | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 41.  | *27*  | Substantive  | Only Level 1 users may share comments externally and there is no default setting. The option to share externally is only limited to comments directly inserted by Level 1 users or verified by a Level 1 user. Only then they may be shared with:- a specific Level 1 user from another group - a set of Level 1 users, also identifiable through regional representation - globally.  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 42.  | *28*  | Substantive  | Login credentials are the only requirement, making sure that the right users have the appropriate rights and permissions. | More information of login credential should be provided in this document and example of credential should be added as annex. | English  | Thailand  |  Ok, further information added. |
| 43.  | *28*  | Substantive  | Login credentials are the only requirement, making sure that the right users have the appropriate rights and permissions.  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 44.  | *29*  | Substantive  | The basic workflow would be as follows:1. OCS Manager receives notification that a draft is available to comment
2. OCS Manager reviews and comments on it as necessary
3. OCS Manager submits all the comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | ok | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 45.  | *30*  | Substantive  | There is one possible alternative to this workflow:1. OCS Manager has appointed an OCS Deputy
2. OCS Manager and Deputy receive notification that a draft is available to comment
3. OCS Deputy verifies all the comments, modifies them as necessary and notifies the OCS Manager once completed
4. OCS Manager verifies and submits all the comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 46.  | *31*  | Substantive  | This is a minor alternative and should prevent the OCS Manager from directly commenting. The reason for this is because the role of OCS Deputy should be a global role to ease the OCS Manager from his/her duties except submitting comments to the Secretariat (i.e. if the OCS Manager is a high level person with limited time to deal with the system, he/she may delegate all his/her functions to the OCS Deputy but the final submission to the Secretariat).  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 47.  | *32*  | Substantive  | Level 1 users should be presented the following options while interacting with the draft:***- Save as draft***: to temporarily save the work done and resume it later ***- Cancel***: to discard the work done without saving ***- Save and Verify***: to include in the final submission comments sent by Level 2 and 3 users ***- Share Comment(s)***: to share comments internally and externally, according to the sharing rules. Comments are shared internally within levels (level above can see comments by level below), and level 1 users can change the default internal sharing rule that level 3 users can see each other’s comments when they are saved as draft. Comments can be shared externally by level 1 users only when they are saved and verified. Even if submitted, comments should remain available for sharing until the consultation period has ended ***- Submit to Secretariat***: only for OCS Manager to submit all comments to the Secretariat: this is a global command that should send all verified comments to the Secretariat ***- Ready for submission*** button: only for OCS Deputy to send comments to the OCS Manager for the final submission. This should be a global command, since the OCS Deputy should use it to notify the OCS Manager that his/her commenting phase has completed and there are comments for him/her to submit to the Secretariat.  | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 48.  | *33*  | Substantive  | If none of the actions above is taken, the system should automatically save any text that has been inputted. | les actions indiquées dans le paragraphe 32 sont à maintenir et à mettre en oeuvre. | English  | Algeria  | Yes, this is foreseen by the plan.  |
| 49.  | *37*  | Substantive  | **Level 3 users, *Commenters* (main function: comment)**. These are at the third level of the hierarchy and can be added by one of the higher level users. Commenters automatically belong to the group of the user who added them into the system and may not interact with the other groups directly (unless invited by Level 1 and 2 users of another group). These users, once registered, will have the possibility to add comments upon invitation by the OCS Manager, Deputy or Assistant **on a specific draft** Level 3 users can only save, discard or send their work to the next available Level of users | It would be very helpful if any comments generated by level 3 users could be shared with other level 3 users so they may be able to interact and produce more harmonized comments.   | English  | United States of America  | Yes, this option is foreseen in the next paragraph, but the role can be unchecked by level 1 users. |
| 50.  | *40*  | Substantive  | **Table 1 - OCS users and their available actions**  | It should be made available action for level 1 users to select and modify all of the comments. | English  | Thailand  | This is foreseen and only possible only after the level 2 and 3 users have verified their comments (and thus, made available to the levels above). |
| 51.  | *41*  | Substantive  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AVAILABLE ACTIONS**  | **USERS**  |
| **--------------------------------------------------------Option 2-----------------------------------------------------------** **---------------------Option 1---------------------**  |
| **LEVEL 1**  | **LEVEL 2**  | **LEVEL 3**  |
| **OCS Manager**  | **OCS Deputy**  | **Assistant**  | **Commenter**  |
| mandatoryone per group | optionalone per group | optionalone per draft | optionalas necessary per draft |
| Submit Comments | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Appoint Deputy | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Verify Comments | ✓ | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Appoint Assistant | ✓ | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Select Comments | **http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png** | **http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png** | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Appoint Commenters | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |
| Add Comments to drafts | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Send Comments to Assistant | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | ✓ |
| Send Comments to OCS Deputy | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | ✓ | ✓ |
| Send Comments to OCS Manager | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Share Comments Internally | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Share Comments Externally 7  | ✓ | ✓ | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png | http://www.clker.com/cliparts/I/g/N/3/j/R/red-cross-mark-hi.png |

 | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 52.  | *43*  | Substantive  | Once a commenting period is over, the Secretariat may invite a Steward or Lead of Working Group (Level 1) to provide responses on compiled comments. The process is very similar to the one for OCS Managers: in its relevant additional column (“Steward’s responses”) the Steward has to add responses to comments submitted by OCS Managers.The Steward or Lead of Working Group will review comments, add his/her responses and submit them by the deadline set by the Secretariat. The Steward may invite level 3 users to have their feedback (i.e. Assistant Stewards or expert drafting group members), but only the Steward or Lead of Worging Group is entitled to verify those responses and make the final submission.Even if there is a difference in the time frame, terminology and recipients, the workflow is the same; thus, the Steward or Lead of Working Group should have the same rights as a OCS Manager, only on a different version of a document and with a different output. | There is no Steward position in CODEX standard setting process. It may be comparable with Lead of Working Group who has responsibility on the draft.   | English  | Thailand  | Ok, we added this note in brackets at the beginning of the paragraph. |
| 53.  | *43*  | Substantive  | Once a commenting period is over, the Secretariat may invite a Steward (Level 1) to provide responses on compiled comments. The process is very similar to the one for OCS Managers: in its relevant additional column (“Steward’s responses”) the Steward has to add responses to comments submitted by OCS Managers.The Steward will review comments, add his/her responses and submit them by the deadline set by the Secretariat. The Steward may invite level 3 users to have their feedback (i.e. Assistant Stewards or expert drafting group members), but only the Steward is entitled to verify those responses and make the final submission.Even if there is a difference in the time frame, terminology and recipients, the workflow is the same; thus, the Steward should have the same rights as a OCS Manager, only on a different version of a document and with a different output. | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 54.  | *44*  | Substantive  | A user-friendly layout is needed that could present the Steward with the original and modified document along with the comments (see example below): | Would the system allow for modifications directly on the draft as the steward verifies them? | English  | United States of America  | We have considered this option, but that would be outside of the scope of having a commenting system (not an editing system) and it would require additional IT developments that cannot be granted with the current budget. |
| 55.  | *44*  | Substantive  | A user-friendly layout is needed that could present the Steward with the original and modified document along with the comments (see example below): | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 56.  | *45*  | Substantive  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comm.no.**  | **Para.no.**  | **Comment type**  | **Original text**  | **Modified text**  | **Explanation**  | **Author (group)**  | **Steward’s responses**  |
| 25  | 1  | Technical  | Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | Movement of gGrowing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)  | International trade involves the movement, so text deleted is redundant.  | Ecuador, Mexico, OIRSA, Belize  | I agree, text modified.  |

 | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 57.  | *47*  | Substantive  | Finally, it should be possible for other types of users to add comments on separate sets of documents. User levels may be 1, 2 or 3 depending on the user types and on the drafts open for commenting. Thus, the system may be used to comment on reports and papers for expert consultations or by governing bodies (i.e. commenting on reports by the IPPC Bureau and Expert Consultations on Diagnostic Protocols). | ok   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 58.  | *49*  | Substantive  | http://ocs.ippc.int/ippc/imagesdata?ty=doc&fi=/20140422091541_20140422091538_586_OCSRequirementsForITPlan_2014-04-21_IntoOCS/20140422091538_586_OCSRequirementsForITPlan_2014-04-21_IntoOCS.docx_html_2cedc890.png | l'organisation proposée est intéressante et permettra une meilleure gestion et exploitation des projets soumis à examen.   | English  | Algeria  |  Ok |
| 59.  | *53*  | Substantive  | **Workflow 2.a** – Commenting with the presence of Commenters (OCS Manager with no OCS Deputy):1. OCS Manager receives notification that a draft is available for commenting
2. OCS Manager appoints one or more Commenters to the available draft
3. Commenters comment as necessary, providing an explanation for each comment
4. Commenters send all comments to the OCS Manager (through “Save and send” button)
5. OCS Manager verifies (which can be selected and modified) and submits all final submission comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | OCS Manager should be able to select and modify the comments prior to verification.   | English  | Thailand  | Text not taken onboard due to terminology, but the concept is agreed on and further explained in the revised text of the plan: Selection is made by level 2 users, while Verification is made by level 1 users. These actions both entail that the user can see the comments made by users at lower levels, chose one of them per paragraph per comment type and modify it as needed. The different terms are used to differentiate the actions performed by different levels of users. Final submission is only made by the OCS Manager (the procedure is explained in the core text). |
| 60.  | *54*  | Substantive  | **Workflow 2.b** – Commenting with the presence of Commenters (OCS Manager with OCS Deputy):1. OCS Manager and OCS Deputy receive notification that a draft is available for commenting
2. OCS Deputy appoints one or more Commenters to the available draft
3. Commenters comment as necessary, providing an explanation for each comment
4. Commenters send all comments to the OCS Deputy (through “Save and send” button)
5. OCS Deputy verifies all comments (which can be selected and modified) and sends them to the OCS Manager (through “Ready for submission” button)
6. OCS Manager submits verified comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | OCS deputy should be able to select and modify the comments prior to verification.   | English  | Thailand  | See response above. |
| 61.  | *55*  | Substantive  | **Workflow 3.a** – Appointing Assistant (one per draft), with OCS Manager, no OCS Deputy and no Commenters:1. OCS Manager receives notification that a draft is available for commenting
2. OCS Manager appoints an Assistant for the available draft
3. the Assistant comments as necessary, providing an explanation for each comment
4. the Assistant sends all comments to the OCS Manager (through “Save and send” button)
5. OCS Manager verifies (which can be selected and modified) and submits all final submission comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | OCS Manager should be able to select and modify the comments prior to verification.   | English  | Thailand  | See response above. |
| 62.  | *56*  | Substantive  | **Workflow 3.b** – Commenting with Assistant (one per draft) and Commenters, with OCS Manager and no OCS Deputy:1. OCS Manager receives notification that a draft is available for commenting
2. OCS Manager appoints an Assistant or Commenters for the available draft
3. the Assistant appoints one or more Commenters for the available draft
4. Commenters and the Assistant comment on the draft, providing an explanation for each comment
5. Commenters send all comments to the Assistant or OCS Manager who selects them
6. the Assistant sends selected comments (which can be modified) to the OCS Manager (through “Save and send” button)
7. OCS Manager verifies (which can be selected and modified) and submits all final submission comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | OCS manager would be able to send the draft to commenter directly. After recieving the comments from the commenter, OCS Manager should be able to select and modify the comments prior to verification.   | English  | Thailand  | Workflows are actually planned to be mutually exclusive. In fact, an OCS Manager would appoint an OCS Deputy to work in his/her place (with the Manager still being able to make the final submission); a level 1 user (OCS Manager and Deputy) may also appoint an Assistant per each draft, and may not be able to edit the Assistant’s (and the Commenters’, if they are added) comments until when they have saved and sent them to the level above. |
| 63.  | *57*  | Substantive  | **Workflow 3.c** – Commenting with Assistant (one per draft) and Commenters, with OCS Deputy:1. OCS Manager and Deputy receive notification that a draft is available for commenting;
2. OCS Deputy appoints an Assistant or Commenters for the available draft
3. the Assistant appoints one or more Commenters for the available Draft
4. Commenters and the Assistant comment on the draft, providing an explanation for each comment
5. Commenters send all comments to the Assistant or OCS Deputy who selects them
6. the Assistant sends selected comments (which can be selected and modified) to the OCS Deputy for verification (through “Save and send” button)
7. OCS Deputy verifies selected comments (which can be modified) and forwards them to the OCS Manager for submission
8. OCS Manager submits all verified comments to the Secretariat before the deadline.
 | Level 1 users (OCS manager and Deputy) would be able to recieve the comments from commenters directly. After recieving the comments from the commenter, OCS Deputy should be able to select and modify the comments prior to verification.   | English  | Thailand  | See response above. |
| 64.  | *58*  | Editorial  | These workflows are mutually exclusive and they are optional (except for the first one, which should be the basic and default workflow). Since in most of the cases, the only applied workflow is the direct commenting, it is important to let OCS users to know these options since it emerged from a recent survey that most active users are not aware of it. Also, if there are modifications to the Group structure in due course, the OCS should make all comments and documents available to the newly appointed user (i.e. if an Assistant is appointed later, he/she should receive all sent comments and have access to all documents, etc.). | edit   | English  | United States of America  |  Ok, text was revised. |
| 65.  | *63*  | Substantive  | **Footnote** 5: Groups are going to be defined by the Country ,or the Region or working group under Subsidiary body of CODEX Alimantarius to which the OCS Manager (CP) belongs to. | It should be define a word "Groups" to cover CODEX standard setting process. | English  | Thailand  |  Ok, text was amended to incorporate suggestion. |