



## National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

March 7, 2013

### Minutes

---

#### Participants

John Bowers	Julie Van Meter	Sherry Aultman	Kathy Handy
Brian Kopper	Brad Lewis	Laurinda Ramonda	Susan Schechter
Terry Bourgoin	Avi Eitam	Helmuth Rogg	Eileen Luke
Piera Siergert	Carol Motloch	Lisa Jackson	
Joe Collins	Saul Vaiciunas	Talitha Molet	

---

#### Farm Bill Updates

The FY2013 Farm Bill Draft Spending Plan is undergoing internal PPQ review. After final approval, the public announcement of the FY2013 Farm Bill Spending Plan will be announced through press releases and the Stakeholder Registry.

Once the FY2013 FB Spending Plan has been released, Kristian will send out emails to all of the states informing them which projects have been funded. This will be sent to the SPHDs who will be the ADODRs of the projects. As soon as states know what projects have been funded, work plans should be submitted to the SPHDs as soon as possible in order to get the cooperative agreement process going. The goal is to get as much money obligated as possible by March 27<sup>th</sup>, which is the end of the current Continuing Resolution. Also, sequestration began on March 1<sup>st</sup>. It is unknown how this will affect Farm Bill funds.

Templates for Farm Bill Work Plans and Accomplishment Reports are available on the CAPS R&C site under the 2013 Farm Bill page.

#### NAPFAST survey

CPHST is interested in knowing how NAPFAST and its products are being used by the CAPS community so that the best funding decisions can be made. A survey is being developed asking about NAPFAST use. The survey is about 9-10 questions long and asks how the CAPS community uses the products, what they use them for, and what needs are not being fulfilled by the maps. The survey will be sent out to the SPHDs, SPROs, PSSs, and SCCs. Susan is helping the CPHST team put the survey on the CAPS R&C website so that it is accessible to all.

Before this is published to the CAPS community, CPHST would like the NCC to take the survey first to see if the questions make sense and if any changes should be made before it is sent out to the larger group. CPHST wants to make sure that the questions provide the feedback they are looking for. Some of the questions have comment boxes to enable one to further elaborate on responses. There also will be a comment box at the end of the survey to add in any additional

---

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.



information that may be useful. The survey should be ready by next week. John will send a note out to the NCC when it is ready.

### **capsID & Fact Sheet Manager**

Rick Zink informed John last week that the capsID & Fact Sheet Manager systems are too expensive and labor intensive to support at this time. Ongoing maintenance of the systems also would be expensive. Because of budget restraints, the project has been dropped for now.

### **Commodity Manuals**

It was initially believed that the Fact Sheet Manager would help CPHST save time in manual upkeep, but as the project evolved, it was determined that it likely would not save time. The only benefit was for the field and the cost was not as justifiable. In the short term, CPHST will format all upcoming manuals similar to the [Asian Defoliator Manual](#) that was recently released. The Asian Defoliator Manual has a separate introduction and datasheets are presented as individual pdf files. There will be no Guidelines document as with the previous commodity surveys. Flipbooks will not be continued.

This new format will make it easier for CPHST to update manuals. The 2013 EWB/BB manual will be posted in this new format in the next week or two. The upcoming Palm and Solanaceous manuals also will be published in this manner. CPHST plans to convert the older manuals into this format when they are updated.

### **Bylaws**

At the NCC meeting in Austin, one of the suggested changes to the NCC Bylaws was to make a Farm Bill representative part of the committee. John would like to clear up the intent of the NCC as to whether this means having the Farm Bill representative as a permanent member of the NCC or someone that participates on an ad hoc basis.

The group consensus is that as long as Farm Bill surveys are offered, and since Farm Bill surveys use CAPS survey guidance and approved methods, and is linked to the CAPS program, it makes sense to have a Farm Bill representative on the committee as a permanent slot. John will put this change into the bylaws. Once everything is published, John will send an invitation to the Farm Bill Management Team to select an individual to represent the Farm Bill program on the NCC.

At the NCC meeting it was decided that two SPHDS and two PSSs should still be on the NCC even though PPQ no longer has an Eastern or Western Region. Two of each helps maintain diversity and difference of perspective on the committee. It was agreed that individuals on the NCC committee have to be from different states in order to maintain overall diversity and difference of perspective. This will be the main guidance for the makeup of the NCC. Otherwise, the NCC will strive for diversity with regards to state size, geography, risk, etc., and selection will depend on the circumstance, situation, present members, etc. John posed the question, "If there are two SPHDs and two PSSs on the NCC, what should their individual role



be in the absence of a formal geographical divide? Should a ‘senior’ representative be responsible for communicating with their constituencies, since their role is now nation-wide?”

The group consensus was that this is agreeable. This would lead to a senior and junior status for the SPHDs and PSSs (similar to the Senior and Junior status of Senators in Congress). The responsibility of the senior (the individual who was on the committee first) will be to assume the communication role first. The junior member would be the backup.

### **Consensus data in NAPIS (see the appendix to these minutes)**

Currently, consensus data has to be put in every year for it to show up on the maps each year. Over the last 5 – 6 years, states have been inputting this information sporadically. States will sometimes put a pest in as “established by consensus” and then not update it the following years. This was not a big deal until NAPIS added the option to look at survey maps by year. This can make it look as though the pest is no longer present and could potentially cause trade issues. It may be that many individuals entering data assumed that this was automatically updated each year.

Kathy suggests that NAPIS push consensus data as an automatic update each year to save states from having to re-enter it every year. The other option is to remove consensus data. Kathy would like the NCC to talk to their constituency to see what they prefer. She needs agreement from the states before this can be pushed automatically because this option only is supposed to be entered if there is consensus from the state department, cooperative extension, PPQ, and the state CAPS committee.

Kathy will run a report from NAPIS for all data that is marked “established by consensus” for all time. The spreadsheet will be sent to the NCC for review. Members should talk to their constituency and come back in the next month or so to discuss.

**Note:** Pest Tracker maps only show the survey efforts and should not be used as distribution maps for pests.

### **NCC Meeting Follow-up Discussions**

#### **IPHIS**

At the NCC meeting, Nancy Leathers stated that a CAPS Business Analysis would be completed by an outside contractor to document the CAPS program in order to understand how the program functions to determine how it aligns with IPHIS. The result would to determine how IPHIS could meet the program’s present needs, and what would need further development. However, she later stated she misspoke. This plan is still out there, but they do not currently have the funding for the effort. Because of this, little has moved forward with getting IPHIS ready to support the CAPS program. Because of this, it is very likely that we will use NAPIS for 2014. The decision on which system to use will be made on a year by year basis on October 1.



### Presentations and Documents

John has been loading the presentations and other documents from the meeting onto the NCC page of the CAPS R&C site. Please check the files and make sure they are the latest updated versions. Susan will check on uploading the 2010 CAPS Conference in Kansas City meeting notes, which currently are no longer on the site.

Let John know if anything is missing or if anything needs to be updated so the correct material is available for reference.

John also sent out the Austin meeting minutes. Please look the notes over and make sure that it reflects what you intended. If anything should be changed, contact John ASAP so the document notes can be finalized.

### Awards Policy

Julie recently talked to Chris about the CAPS Recognition Awards Policy and should have something before long for the group to look at.

### **Target Date for Guidelines**

The core group is updating the Guidelines during this month. The target date for the Guidelines completion is April 1. The Guidelines probably will not be published until April 15. If something is not finished by this time (i.e. CPHST is still working on the 2014 AHP list) the Guidelines can be updated as it is completed.

**The next NCC call will be on Thursday, April 4, 2013, at 11:00 am eastern time.**



## Consensus Data in NAPIS

To enter consensus data into NAPIS, the State Plant Regulatory Official (SPRO) from the state department of agriculture or department of natural resources (or their representative), expert personnel from the state cooperative extension service, and the PPQ State Plant Health Director (SPHD) must concur that the subject pest/beneficial organism is present within a discrete set of spatial and temporal points. The State Survey Committee must be allowed to comment on the issue.

This represents a collective scientific opinion, general agreement, or consensus within the state that the organism is present, and therefore declares that there is no further need to conduct survey for the specified organism. This declaration also can be described as "common scientific knowledge." If a state chooses to reverse the "consensus determination," there must be the same concurrence of the expert personnel within the state, with a justification provided to the CAPS Management Team. Consensus can be used only for positive records.

Historically, the CAPS program has supported agricultural trade. Subsequently, the credibility of NAPIS depended on its ability to portray reality. Pest species which are widespread and may have impacted agricultural exports were to be represented across their range. There was no need to conduct survey for these species when it was generally known that they are present.

In the past, states entered consensus data into NAPIS for a particular year. Each year thereafter, upon agreement from the state, the user services specialist at Purdue would carry over that data to succeeding years. In early 2006 there was a change in personnel, and this process was interrupted. A few states (2 or 3) have continued to enter some consensus data yearly. The maps displayed in Pest Tracker (public interface for NAPIS) reflect consensus data. However, since the data is not automatically rolled over each year there is conflicting information displayed to the public and our trading partners giving the impression that the pest no longer exists in a county or state.

We are asking the NCC to reach out to their constituency to ask those states with recorded consensus data if they would prefer to have it automated each year. There would be a greatly improved IT process that would not be burdensome. Additionally, we welcome discussion or decisions regarding the entry of future consensus records.