



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

April 4, 2013

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Joel Bard	Saul Vaiciunas	Talitha Molet
Brian Kopper	Julie Van Meter	Sherry Aultman	Kathy Handy
Rick Zink	Brad Lewis	Laurinda Ramonda	Susan Schechter
Kristian Rondeau	Avi Eitam	Helmuth Rogg	Eileen Luke
Terry Bourgoin	Carol Motloch	Lisa Jackson	

Pest Detection Line Item Funding

Funding for agreements likely will be reduced, but it is not known how much until the PPQ fund holders meet and discuss budget issues. There is a possibility that the program will not be able to fund everything at the levels that were decided on earlier in the year. Everyone should expect a certain reduction of what was submitted, and be prepared to prioritize funding if necessary.

NCC Bylaws

The revised document was sent to everyone on the committee to review. There are a few minor changes that will be addressed, but overall, the content will remain the same unless there are any comments. It was decided that the committee should maintain everyone on the PPQ side; instead of Eastern/Western region SPHD/PSSs, there will be two SPHDs and two PSSs to maintain diversity on the committee. There will not be a junior/senior SPHD/PSS, but the representatives will decide on their own who will communicate with their constituency. A Farm Bill section 10201 representative has been added to the committee. John will send an email to the Farm Bill Management team to request their representation on the committee. The Bylaws will be in the Appendices of the 2014 Guidelines as it has been in the past.

Survey Guidelines

The CAPS team is currently working on getting the 2014 CAPS Survey Guidelines ready. It is taking time to make sure all of the changes dealing with the PPQ reorganization are made on top of all of the yearly changes. The edits currently are available on the CAPS SharePoint site; however states cannot access this. As the documents are edited, John will post them to the CAPS Resource and Collaboration site under '2014 Guidelines' so everyone on the NCC will have a chance to review them before they are finalized. John will leave the track changes in so changes easily can be identified. Do not make edits on the uploaded versions; comments/edits for the documents should be sent to John (cc: Brian).

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.



Consensus data feedback – (document copied on last page of these minutes)

On the last call, John asked the NCC to talk to their constituency and get feedback regarding consensus data. Specifically, once consensus data is submitted, should it be rolled over from year to year?

The feedback given by the NCC suggests that there is still a lot of misunderstanding about what the Consensus data is and what it is used for. The NCC suggests that this issue be brought up to each of the regional Plant Board meetings during the CAPS breakout sessions or other available opportunity. Sherry will work on a talking points document to be used during the regional Plant Board discussions, along with Terry, Saul, Kathy, and Susan. This will allow consistency between the different regional Plant Boards and will help keep the discussion on target.

Changes in NAPIS database

The way pest surveys are tracked in NAPIS should line up with the CAPS Accountability Report for states surveying for pests in more than one commodity. This issue will be addressed while NAPIS undergoes its redesign. John suggested the addition of a data field for data entry. States will put in the survey name for each pest as entered in the Survey Summary Form. Although this adds an extra field to the data entry page, it helps align the Accountability Report with other reporting.

The nomenclatures for sp. / spp. will be changed to spp. This is to ensure that the CAPS program is consistent throughout and aligns reporting with published pest lists. This will not affect records in the database.

CAPS Recognition (document sent earlier)

Julie and Chris sent out their draft for the CAPS Recognition Policy Statement. This will be inserted into the Guidelines as Appendix Q. John will add a blurb in the Guidelines to highlight this addition. The CAPS recognition document will be highlighted in the Appendix changes document as well. An announcement for nominations will come out at the beginning of the year, starting in 2014 (for achievements in 2013). There will be up to 3 awards each year instead of one for each group (SPHD, SPRO, SSC, and PSS). Awards also can be awarded at the group level. NCC members should review the document and let John know if they have any suggestions or thoughts. CAPS Recognition should be highlighted at the upcoming regional plant boards.

Negative data for pests not a Priority Pest

Once a pest is no longer on a Priority Pest List, the NCC should decide whether the negative data validation for the approved methods requirement be removed for reporting negative data. Once a pest is removed from the Priority Pest List, CPHST will no longer update the approved methods for that pest, and survey supplies may no longer be procured by the Survey Supply Procurement Program (SSPP).



One option is to require states that are surveying for the pest to use the last approved method. This would give consistency between negative data from year to year. It also would help states with procurement – they can continue to order the last approved trap/lure until supplies run out.

The other option is to rescind the approved methods restriction for data entry once a pest no longer is a Priority Pest. CAPS still would recommend that states use the last approved method, but this would allow states to use another method if improvements to trapping have been made since the last approved method. Conceivably, negative data for the same pest may be entered using different methodology in the same year. USDA program pests that are not on any of the priority lists will still have approved methods assigned in NAPIS by the programs. The approved method should be used when entering negative data.

The NCC should discuss these options with their constituency and report back to the NCC.

CAPS'opedia

The CAPS'opedia group should be reconvened to determine if any changes need to be made to the material. A new SCC representative will be needed for the group.

Farm Bill

If you have a Farm Bill project, please submit your work plan.

The next NCC call will be on Thursday, May 2, 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.