



National CAPS Committee (NCC) Conference Call

June 5, 2014

Minutes

Participants

John Bowers	Brad Lewis	Kathy Handy
Brian Kopper	Carol Motloch	Lisa Jackson
Terry Bourgoin	Lisa Ishibashi	Dan Mackesy
Joel Bard	Saul Vaiciunas	Susan Schechter
Piera Siergert	Adrian Barta*	Eileen Luke
Julie Van Meter	Helmuth Rogg	Umesh Kodira

*for Laurinda Ramonda

Financial Plans

We have some recent guidance from the agreements staff regarding Financial Plans. When filling out the Financial Plan, remember to include enough detail so that the agreements staff knows exactly what you mean, especially in regard to salaries in the Infrastructure plan. The agreement specialists would like to be able to determine how the salary was determined. For example, do not just say 'State Survey Coordinator salary,' but rather specify that the figure is an 'annual' salary or how it was determined, e.g., rate/hour*hours/week*weeks. Please provide enough description so that it can be evaluated. This will help in moving the work plan forward and avoid questions in an audit.

Budget - 2015

The House and Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committees have both completed the markups of the Agricultural Appropriations Bill. The next step is a vote by the full House and Senate. The process seems to be on track for a budget by October 1. However... For Pest Detection, the House is recommending the same amount as 2014, which also is the amount in the 2015 President's budget. The Senate is recommending only the slimmest of an increase. Likely we will have the same budget as 2014. Work and Financial Plans should be developed based on your 2014 agreements.

Budget – 2016

The FY2016 budget cycle has begun. The PDMT requested an increase for Pest Detection for FY16. APHIS also requested increases for an export initiative that involves PPQ, VS, IS, and BRS. Included in the export initiative is increase funding for surveys, explicitly surveys to determine pest-free areas. These proposals will be evaluated at the APHIS, Department, and OMB levels, and need to be highly ranked to continue up the ladder. There is a slim chance that a funding increase may be available for 2016, but do not hold your breath as these have to compete Agency and Department wide against other proposals. OMB also has given the

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.



Departments guidance that requested FY16 budgets need to be 2% less than the President's 2015 budget. Increases in one area will have to come from decreases in another area.

State Capacity for Survey

The possibility of an increase raises another question: How much work can a state do? If funding for surveys is increased; can the state do more work with the present staff, can a state hire more staff to help with the increased work, or are states at the limit of what they can do regardless of more available funding? Does it make sense to ask for increases in program funding if the work cannot be done? The answers likely lie at each state's circumstances and situation, however, the NCC should start the conversation with their constituency. Topics for this discussion include size of the survey, additional surveys, the timing of funding, ability to hire, etc. Are their generalities that will help the PDMT with these decisions?

Data Entry for 2015

We have had some questions, so just a reminder that NAPIS will be used for data entry in 2015, as stated in the 2015 Guidelines.

ISPM 6 Revision

ISPM 6: Guidelines for Surveillance is scheduled to be revised next year. As we hear more, we will let you know. Joel Bard has submitted some excellent suggestions for the revision regarding general surveys. His comments are attached at the end of these minutes.

Farm Bill

Remember to enter 2014 survey information for Farm Bill-funded surveys in the Farm Bill Survey Summary Form on the CAPS R&C site. As with Pest Detection/CAPS, information needs to be entered at the time work plans are submitted. In addition to help the PDMT and FBMT coordinate and report work, the information is used to coordinate and arrange identification and diagnostic help, as well as refine the survey supply needs. Please do not forget this important step.

Established by Consensus and Survey

As discussed previously, all 'Established by Consensus' and 'Established by Survey' data will be rolled forward each year until the proper protocol is followed and a record is entered that will negate the established designation. This relieves the states of having to enter a record each year to maintain the designation. This is the last call before implementation. If you have reasons that this should not occur for records from your state, and you have not yet contacted Kathy Handy, then you need to do so now.

New Commodity Surveys

There has been interest expressed in the possibility of developing new commodity surveys. The PDMT would like to implement a new policy with regard to developing new surveys. Staff to do the work is limited and is working on a number of projects in support of the CAPS program. In



order to meet the survey needs of our cooperators and assist staff with the work, we will hereby identify a Champion for each new survey. The Champion will work with Lisa and Melinda, and will be expected to commit time and effort to assist in developing the survey. This includes developing potential pest lists and researching pests and survey methodology, among others. Surveys that have been suggested are listed below (mostly from the Annual NCC Meeting in Gainesville this year). We will need a Champion for each, or else it will fall to the bottom of the priority list. Please add your name to the List of Champions by volunteering to help. Contact Lisa and Melinda to get started. These surveys may not go anywhere without your help.

Proposed Survey	Champion
Dry beans / Peas, Pulse Crops	
Orchards (apple, pear)	
Small Fruit / Berry (blueberries, raspberries, strawberries, etc.)	Saul
Sorghum / Canola	
Sunflower	
Cucurbits (squash, pumpkin, cucumber, etc.)	
Small Vegetables (lettuce, etc.)	
Nut Trees	

(Remember, you can also develop your own bundled survey according to CAPS Guidelines.)

NPAG Notices

The New Pest Advisory Group (NPAG) will be releasing information about selected new pests. NPAG Notices are short, one-page informational documents designed to highlight pests analyzed by NPAG that pose potentially serious pest threats to U.S. agriculture and natural resources. NPAG Notices do not contain sensitive information and may be shared with stakeholders. To facilitate dissemination of NPAG Notices, they will be posted on the CAPS R&C site. The link can be found in the left hand ribbon on the site. Currently, two NPAG Notices are posted: *Blosyrus asellus* and *Chrysodeixis chalcites*. A communication will be sent when others are posted. Use these to help develop your surveys.

NPDN Taxonomic Training Videos

A link has been placed on the Taxonomic Services page of the CAPS R&C site that points to training videos that the NPDN has developed. The Advanced Taxonomic Training video series was produced as a component of a 2012 Farm Bill cooperative agreement entitled "Delivery of Taxonomic Training through Distance Education." The videos featured expert lectures and hands-on training by a variety of experts. The videos cover the following groups; Aleyrodidae, Aphididae, Auchenorrhyncha, Coccidae, Diaspididae, Pseudococcidae, and Pentatomoidea. Please check them out as they are quite useful.

The next NCC call will be held on Thursday, July 3, 2014, at 1:00 pm eastern time.



Joel Bard's comments regarding General Surveillance

“The USA would like to suggest revising ISPM No. 6, *Guidelines for Surveillance* to more clearly define the differences between Specific Surveys and General Surveillance which are the two approved means of gathering valid pest absence or presence and pest distribution information. ISPM No. 6 guidelines for conducting Specific Surveys are clear about who may collect such information, what their level of training should be, what effective survey methodologies be used and what data should be collected so that ultimately, a minimally acceptable level of validity is established. In contrast, guidelines for General Surveillance are rather vague.

The way ISPM 6 is currently written, it is almost impossible for NPPO's to determine, with any confidence, when General Surveillance is an acceptable alternative to Specific Surveys. Consequently, NPPO's must rely almost exclusively on Specific Surveys to gather pest information. Sooner or later continuing widespread funding reductions will force NPPO's to reduce their reliance on the more costly Specific Surveys in favor of cheaper General Surveillance activities. However, unless better guidelines are provided for use in performing General Surveillance, resulting data will lack sufficient harmonization to reliably demonstrate whether a pest is present or absent.

If a revision of ISPM 6 provided clear guidelines as to what constitutes good General Surveillance and workshops at Regional Plant Protection Organization meetings could be used to provide practical examples of how to implement these guidelines, we believe General Surveillance guidance would gain greater acceptance as valid means of pest information collection. The guidelines would not only need to provide direction on how to conduct general surveillance but just as importantly, direction as to when General Surveillance is appropriate. Typically, it would be reserved for pests that have a lower risk of introduction since General Surveillance is less rigorous than Specific Survey. It could also be used to supplement Specific Surveys, for example, to confirm years of negative data gathered via Specific Survey for pests like the Old World Bollworm, *Helicoverpa armigera*. This pest has never been found in the U.S. in spite of decades of Specific Survey.

Finally, in the last 10 years or so it has become almost as common in the United States for the public to find new pest introductions as it is for the NPPO to detect them through Specific Survey. The NPPO's response to this phenomenon has been to ask vested stakeholders and the general public for assistance in recognizing and reporting new pest introductions. APHIS even has an Outreach element in its current Strategic Plan that sets goals for making greater use of these stakeholders to enhance pest detection. Practical General Surveillance guidelines are the key to enabling NPPO's to better utilize these groups to gather valid pest absence or presence and distribution data.”