



## National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

May 5, 2011

### Minutes

---

#### Participants

John Bowers	Vicki Smith	Helmuth Rogg	Charles Pierre
Matt Royer	Clair Allen	Kathy Handy	
Brian Kopper	Julie Van Meter	Melinda Sullivan	
Kristian Rondeau	Avi Eitam	Talitha Molet	
Rick Zink	Chris Pierce	John Crowe	
Joel Bard	Nancy Richwine	Susan Schechter	
Joe Collins	Laurinda Ramonda	Eileen Luke	

#### 2012 Guidelines

The 2012 CAPS Survey Guidelines have been posted on the CAPS R&C website. If you have not reviewed the 2012 Guidelines in detail yet, please do this very soon. Feedback and/or questions should be directed to John, Brian, or Kristian.

#### Updates

After the 2012 Guidelines were published, there have been several updates that everyone should be aware of. Appendices J-1 and J-2 were updated to include clarifying language to the work plan template. Appendix J-3 was updated to include an additional, optional tab for states to list survey targets not part of a PPQ-funded survey. This will facilitate data entry into IPHIS in 2012. Appendix N was updated to include data entry guidance for the family Veronicellidae. Negative data may be entered at the family level if no species within the family are found. As always, positives can be entered at the species level only.

#### Infrastructure to Survey Ratio

There is some concern that the ratio of Infrastructure to Survey funding is getting out of proportion. In some states, Infrastructure is 70-90% of the total budget. Questions are being asked as to what survey is being accomplished with such a high Infrastructure percentage. To determine if this is just an accounting issue or not, we are asking states to list appropriate personnel, etc. in the survey work plan if they are for the survey effort. If someone or some item belongs in survey, they should be listed in the survey budget. This is meant to accurately show where efforts are being placed. The Infrastructure work plan and budget should be for the SSC position and the required support. This may help improve the current perception of the Infrastructure and Survey budgets. It is important that everything be categorized correctly.

#### Approved Methods

There currently is an informal process in place for interested parties to request that the CAPS program consider alternative survey methodology or diagnostics in addition to what is specified

---

Note: A reminder to the NCC, please distribute CAPS updates, conference-call minutes, and other CAPS-related information to the constituency that you represent in a timely manner. Also, please bring their items, issues, concerns, and opinions back to the NCC for discussion. It is our responsibility that everyone is kept engaged in the CAPS program.



in the Approved Methods. Interested parties can contact Lisa or Melinda directly through phone or email. The requestors will need to provide documentation that supports the proposed alternative trap and/or lure or other survey or diagnostic method (based on science, literature, experiments, etc). Lisa and Melinda will follow up with experts, and the proposal will be discussed with Program management. Do not contact or badger either Lisa or Melinda if there is no supporting documentation, as the request likely will be declined. If Lisa and Melinda continue to get requests for changes to the Approved Methods that have no supporting documentation, then a more formal request process will be put into place to filter these requests out. Please let your constituencies know how the request process works, and to forward this message to others in their state.

If an alternative trap or lure is added, it may or may not be supported by procurement. This is dependent on availability, funding, time of year, etc. Also, if there is already a trap or lure that procurement has for the same pest, they may not invest in an alternative at the current time. Many factors go into whether the CAPS program will support alternative survey methodology in the Approved Methods.

### **Farm Bill Update**

A budget bill has been passed that will fund the Government through to the end of the fiscal year. The Department has submitted the apportionment request to OMB. Farm Bill funds were included in the request. The Department has yet to receive the funds. Currently the Regions and CPHST have been contacting potential cooperators to determine if certain projects are still possible given the late date. This will help update the spending plan and to ensure that when funds are received they can be allocated to appropriate projects as quickly as possible.

Agreements cannot be made yet because the Agency does not have the funds. If a cooperator would like to volunteer to start work on their work plan ahead of receiving their budget, they can do so at their own risk. There is no timeline for when funding will become available. It will happen when the money is appropriated to USDA, and then APHIS, and then PPQ, etc.

A work plan template (similar to the CAPS J-2 appendix) and a supplemental spreadsheet (similar to the J-3 appendix) have been developed for Farm Bill surveys. States doing Farm Bill surveys are requested to submit both the work plan and supplemental spreadsheet when submitting their surveys to the Regions. These documents are posted on the CAPS R&C site under the Farm Bill link in the PPQ box on the lowers, left side of the site. This will allow us to plan for taxonomic help, survey supply procurement, and other needs in a quick and timely fashion. The only difference between the 2012 CAPS J-2 appendix and the Farm Bill work plan template is the Data Management section. **Data from Farm Bill surveys will be entered into NAPIS**, the same data repository for CAPS surveys in 2011.

### **IPHIS**

During the latter part of April, John, Brian, Kristian, Chris, Kathy, and Todd met in Riverdale to plan the transition into IPHIS and determine what needs to be done. The IPHIS system was



carefully reviewed, and an attempt was made to determine if IPHIS, as it is currently configured, could support the CAPS program. The short answer is maybe, the system is not entirely ready for the diversity of the CAPS program, and the way we do business.

IPHIS was initially designed and developed to support emergency response programs, where the finer details of delimiting surveys for regulatory purposes is needed. The system is set up to have a predefined survey complex for every pest response program. This complex constitutes the entire universe of that single-pest program; a target pest, host(s), and survey methodology (usually one trap and one lure). A data-entry template is created based on the pest complex. These templates contain a standardized set of data fields populated with the appropriate items from the complex as necessary. A program may add one or two additional fields. Most fields are pull-down menus, and one selects the appropriate item from the box when filling out the template. IPHIS is activity-based, and one fills out the data-entry template for every activity (install a trap, change a lure, etc.). Without a predefined complex, templates cannot be developed and data entry cannot be accomplished. Data for a pest not defined in the complex cannot be uploaded to the system.

Compare this with the CAPS program, where in 2010, a multitude of unique, bundled surveys encompassing 287 pests as targets were surveyed for somewhere in the country, and a little over 100 pests had approved methods for negative data validation. In IPHIS, the only way to enter data for all these pests is to include them in one big CAPS complex, and to have this ready before the survey season begins. Without this predefined complex, data entry is problematic. This is possible to do, however, and is our only option with the present design of IPHIS. What we think will need to be done is briefly sketched out below. This is our first real crack at seeing where the CAPS program fits in IPHIS. As we start to develop things this year, this may change, and we will just have to see where it goes.

The process starts with a very accurate Appendix J-3, submitted by the states with their work plans to the Regions in August-September. This will include all the survey targets to species that a state wishes to collect survey data for and enter into IPHIS. This may include survey targets not funded by PPQ, but from other sources, state and otherwise, if the state wants to enter that data into IPHIS. The J-3 appendix has been modified for 2012 to include a tab for state and non-federally funded surveys. This will be required if states wish to enter state-funded survey data. It is important to gather this information so that the survey universe can be predefined, and those pests can be part of the CAPS complex and be chosen when developing data-entry templates. For example, Florida has expressed an interest in using IPHIS for their non-federal, state data. In order to be able to enter data for those survey targets, Florida will have to list those pests in the J-3 appendix so that their pest survey universe can be predefined.

The J-3 appendices are then compiled by Brian and Kristian at the Regions, and sent to John, who compiles a national survey and target pest list complete with survey methodology. This will need to be done under a more strict time line than what we do now as Lisa and Melinda will need



time to review the national J-3 for adherence to the Approved Methods. (As a side note, John C. and Joel also review the national J-3 for survey supply procurement and taxonomic identification needs). Once finalized, the J-3 spreadsheet is reformatted and sent to the IPHIS contractors to update the resource files and build the CAPS complex. This needs to be done annually. Only the contractors and a few national data managers have the authority to build complexes. For CAPS, this represents a potential bottleneck. Additionally, the complex will have to be validated and verified by the CAPS program before it is published to the system.

Our current thinking is that once the CAPS complex is built, validated, and published to the system, the individual states will develop data entry templates for their particular surveys and target pests based on the CAPS complex. States will develop a template for a grape survey, for example, and choose those pests of interest to that state. Survey methodology for those pests that have approved methods will come automatically as each pest is chosen when building the template since they are linked in the CAPS complex. States will develop for their own use templates for the surveys they plan to do that year. A state may then develop grape, small grains, and EWB/BB templates with their unique pests of interests. This is the only way we could fathom to accommodate the wide variety a surveys that are conducted as part of the CAPS program. National templates are out of the question because of the wide variety of pests bundled in a particular survey. An EWB/BB survey in one state is not the same as an EWB/BB survey in another state. The limiting factor in all of this is that the survey universe, i.e., complex, has to be known ahead of time before the surveys are conducted, and that data for a pest cannot be uploaded into the system without it being added to the complex.

The IPHIS contractors have been given our combined pest list with approved methods and survey methodology, and they will build the complex. The plan is to test this process this year and determine if our conceptual plan really works. If so, the CAPS program will develop guidance on how to create templates and what to include. This will ensure that all data is collected and uploaded in a consistent manner. If not, we will need to re-evaluate where we stand with IPHIS. This process will not solve all the questions we have about IPHIS, but will get our foot in the door. For example, we still need to determine how a new pest gets reported, one that is not in the predefined complex, and what that process will look like.

There were some questions and concerns about how this would be accomplished and what resources would be required to do this. This is one of those issues we still need to resolve.

### **NAPIS/Pest Tracker**

An initial call has been set up with the IPHIS contractors, Purdue, and the CAPS program to begin discussing how data from IPHIS will be transferred to NAPIS so that our survey efforts will be displayed in the Pest Tracker maps. This currently is not done. The Pest Tracker website is our only forward-facing outreach effort for our survey results, and is viewed by stakeholders, states, foreign countries, trading partners, and the general public. IPHIS does not have a public outreach component. These maps need to stay current and up-to-date. Unfortunately, the only



way current IPHIS data can show up in Pest Tracker is to manually enter the data into NAPIS. The successful outcome of these discussions will result in summarized county-level data being seamlessly transferred from IPHIS to NAPIS for the purpose of supporting the Pest Tracker website, and eliminate double data entry. This needs to be ready before next year.

For 2011, those states using IPHIS for survey data, and wish that data to be displayed in the Pest Tracker maps, will need to enter data in NAPIS in order for it to show up in Pest Tracker. John will send out guidance through the NCC to let everyone know the procedures that should be followed. NCC members should pass this on to their constituency as well. John will keep the group updated as progress is made.

The Pest Tracker maps will be updated very soon. The maps will show a new pattern for surveys in progress. States intending to survey for a particular pest, based on the submitted J-3 appendix, will be designated using a cross-hatch pattern. There also will be a zoom function so that states can zoom in and see all of their counties. An identifier will show information about individual counties. Counties with current surveys will show up only on the maps for 2011; they will not show up in other years or the 3 year map. Remember, these maps are not distribution maps; they are only maps showing what places have entered survey data for a particular pest. Please check the legend. If there are still questions, contact either Kathy or Susan.

As of now, historic data will still be kept in NAPIS. There currently has been no talk about moving all this data over into IPHIS. This is a discussion we will need to have with the states to determine what options they may prefer with the data in NAPIS.

### **Stone Fruit Outreach Documents**

We are developing a page on the CAPS R&C site for the stone fruit outreach documents. These include pest data sheets, a PowerPoint presentation that can be customized, and a brochure. Everything except the brochure is completed. The brochure is going through final Departmental clearance and should be available soon. Since this is intended for a broader audience, a higher degree of approval is necessary. The page will go live once all the final documents are posted. The materials will be available to download for local printing for anyone who wants to use them. Hard copies also will be available. A matching, coordinated display that can be used for meetings and other occasions is available, and can be shipped to whoever needs it. So far the display has made an appearance at the Empire State Fruit & Vegetable Expo, and is scheduled for two appearances in Texas, one being the Texas State Fair. If you would like to use the display, please contact John.

### **CAPS Data**

Recently, an email was sent out via the NCC asking what data CAPS needs to collect when conducting surveys. The Program needs to discuss this. Is there data that may not be important now but that would be important in an emergency situation? What fields in the template are needed to complete your job? What information do you, your support, your bosses,



administrators, etc. need? This should be discussed with everyone in your constituency. In John's case, he found that the J3 appendix is the single most important document to him. This may not be the case with everyone, so let John know.

### **Survey Supply Procurement**

The new survey supply ordering module in IPHIS is scheduled to be available for testing later this summer. If all goes well, an informational webinar will be held soon afterwards, likely in early fall. The old Lotus Notes survey supply database will not be used. The change to a new system will allow both states and PPQ to order their own supplies according to the needs within their respective offices. While this module is within IPHIS, and accessible via eAuthentication, it has no connection at present to the data collection part of the system.

There currently is a survey available that asks what supplies your state or office actually uses (see the minutes to the April NCC call). The goal is to try and identify which items on the survey supply list are still needed. If no one uses a particular item, we will drop that from the procurement process. The survey is available on the CAPS R&C site at [http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/supplies\\_survey](http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu/supplies_survey). It would be helpful if everyone filled out the survey. The last box, Future Needs, is very important. This is the time to let John C. know what you may want or need from survey supply procurement in the future. Please pass this message on to your constituency and any others that may have an interest.