



# Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) 2012 National Survey Guidelines April 18, 2011

---

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide direction for the Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) program. These guidelines are written for State Departments of Agriculture, tribal governments, and Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) personnel and collaborators. These guidelines provide a general overview of the CAPS program. Specific details concerning current or yearly survey activities may be obtained from the Director of the Pest Detection Program, the National Program Manager, PPQ Eastern or Western Regional Program Managers, or PPQ State Plant Health Directors.

## MISSION

The mission of the Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) program is to provide a survey profile of exotic plant pests in the United States deemed to be of regulatory significance\* to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), State Departments of Agriculture, tribal governments, and other cooperators through early detection and surveillance activities by:

- Confirming the presence or absence of environmentally and/or economically harmful plant pests that impact agriculture or the environment, and that have potential to be of phytosanitary significance; and
- Establishing and maintaining a comprehensive network of cooperators and stakeholders to facilitate our mission and to safeguard our American plant resources.

*\*The term “regulatory significance” is defined in Appendix A.*

The CAPS program strives to conform to the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) as adopted by The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). The IPPC is an international plant health agreement, established in 1952, that aims to protect cultivated and wild plants by preventing the introduction and spread of pests. The United States is a signatory to The Convention. The IPPC website can be found at: <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=2&L=0>.

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Central to the success of the CAPS program is clarity about the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in cooperative surveys. While the focus is primarily on state cooperators, it also extends to universities, tribal governments, and, potentially, to industry partners, non-traditional parties (i.e., environmental groups), and other organizations concerned about the threat of introduced invasive pest species. Appendices

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

B and C list the roles and responsibilities of the State Plant Health Director (SPHD), State Plant Regulatory Official (SPRO), Pest Survey Specialist (PSS), and State Survey Coordinator (SSC) positions within the CAPS program.

At both the national and state-levels, an organized effort to engage industry early in the survey-planning process is required. This is necessary because the CAPS program will continue to shift its strategy from being solely “pest-specific”, to a format for surveying for several pests based on commodities, taxons, environments and habitats, industries and businesses, and the continuum along pest introduction pathways, with a few exceptions.

The hosts, commodities, industries, and businesses impacted by pests span PPQ’s Eastern and Western Regions, and it is appropriate to address the risks from an agroecosystem perspective. APHIS believes the commodity/ecosystem approach will provide a holistic framework for prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from invasive pests of regulatory significance. APHIS realizes the value of engaging stakeholders throughout this continuum, especially when communicating about pest risks, jointly setting survey priorities, and leveraging resources across organizational boundaries. It is imperative that the State and National CAPS Committees communicate the goals and objectives of the CAPS program. Open dialogue at the national and state level with industry and other stakeholders is of vital importance for the success of CAPS. In order to facilitate this dialogue, PPQ has provided a ranking of pest threats in the form of a prioritized list (Appendix D), guidance on taxonomic support (Appendix E), and guidance on selecting which pests to survey, given the hosts, climate, and other factors unique to each State (see the NCSU-APHIS Plant Pest Forecasting System (NAPPPFAST) website, online at [link not available]).

The National CAPS Committee (NCC) will provide the strategy for identifying pests of “national priority”, as well as “state-level” discretionary pest surveys. The NCC will revise the National Survey Guidelines when annually reviewing the policy, strategy, and performance of the CAPS program. The NCC Bylaws contain more information about the NCC and the roles and responsibilities of the SPHD, SPRO, PSS, and SSC within the CAPS program (Appendix F).

The National CAPS Committee will approve annually a “Priority Pest List.” This list will include the commodity and taxon pests, as well as Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance, which are taken from the AHP Prioritized List (Appendices G-1 and G-2). The Priority Pest List will be based on input by PPQ, the States, the Center for Plant Health Science and Technology (CPHST) (i.e. pest ranking, feasibility of survey, and pest identification), and commodity organizations. States will select from this list to complete the Priority Survey portion of CAPS.

The NCC also will approve annually a list of additional pests of regulatory concern (radar screen) (Appendix H). The State CAPS Committee will determine and recommend survey priorities for pests of State regulatory concern in their state using this list as a guide. Because the emphasis of the CAPS program generally is moving towards a

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

commodity and industry/business focus, PPQ will be encouraging and approving an increasing number of industry-state partnerships for pest survey.

The National Program Manager (NPM) will provide overall direction for the CAPS program. The NPM is responsible for the Cooperative Agreement with Purdue University, which provides the administrative and financial framework for the National Agriculture Pest Information System (NAPIS) database, Pest Tracker (the public face of CAPS survey efforts), the CAPS Resource and Collaboration site, and other related websites.

The NPM also is the chairperson of the NCC. The NPM, with input from the NCC and the National Plant Board (NPB), sets plant pest detection priorities and implements survey and detection activities in the United States. The NPM also coordinates communication between the NCC, PPQ Regional Program Managers (RPM), and NPB on prioritizing pest survey needs, providing information on pest risk, managing the allocation of pest detection funds and resources, and formulating a pest list for future surveys.

The NPM also participates in the annual budget formulation and ensures survey technologies are identified for use by the CAPS community. The NPM has nationwide responsibility to coordinate activities of CAPS through the RPMs and to ensure that the database for CAPS survey data meets the needs of CAPS. The NPM is responsible for ensuring that CAPS is included in the planning and implementation of national PPQ programs, and also is responsible for the tracking the performance of the CAPS program.

The Eastern and Western Regional Program Managers (RPMs) will be responsible for reviewing State performance, and are accountable for the *administration* of the CAPS program at the PPQ Regional level. The PPQ Regions supervise the SPHDs, who fiscally and programmatically are accountable for periodic and final CAPS reports. The RPMs communicate programmatic issues to the States through the SPHDs, who ensure fiscal and programmatic accountability by reviewing periodic and year-end reports.

The SPHD and SPRO, in consultation with the SSC and PSS and considering the recommendations and advice of the State CAPS Committee, are responsible for the selection of pests that are important to their State. This collaboration will allow flexibility on a state-by-state basis. In order to provide this flexibility, performance measures must be in place early in the planning process so that there is cooperator accountability where Federal funds are provided. These performance measures will enable the assessment of accomplishments made toward pest selection and survey objectives outlined in CAPS cooperative agreements. A summary of activities performed by SSCs that resulted in advancing the overall programs effectiveness will support this assessment process.

The SSC, in collaboration with the PSS, will make use of pest risk information from various sources. Such sources include pest data sheets; pest risk assessments; NAPFFAST; pests ranked through the Analytic Hierarchy Process, as conducted by

CPHST (Appendix D); “risk zones” and other information communicated to the SPHDs by the RPMs; pests that need to be surveyed per the PPQ Leadership Team’s endorsement of recommendations of the PPQ New Pest Advisory Group (NPAG); industries’ suggestions for coordinated survey/monitoring of pests of mutual concern; changes in patterns of risk or commerce that indicate domestic survey is merited along a risky pest pathway; PPQ-regulated “domestic/emergency program pests”, and select agents that present some threat for potential bioterrorism.

## **FUNDING & WORK PLANS**

PPQ intends to allocate funds to each State in a fair and transparent manner. Each State needs to be able to predict the minimal level of Federal funding it will receive from year-to-year in order to plan surveys and acquire/retain a resource base. Therefore, PPQ intends and strives to fund each State at a level commensurate with need. However, the CAPS program needs to be sufficiently flexible to address national priorities that may have shifted since pests were first being considered for survey due to new pests that may have been found, or specific direction APHIS may have received in the federal funding appropriations.

Funds to support CAPS are generally provided to State Departments of Agriculture and other cooperators through cooperative agreements, which are administered through the PPQ Regional offices. The annual PPQ Pest Detection “line item” appropriation is the major funding source for CAPS. Funds from the Pest Detection line item also may be used, in some cases when pests are found that are new to the United States or are found in new areas of the country. However, The CAPS Program is focused on early detection, and these surveys, if approved, are not intended to intensively delimit the extent of spread of a pest around a specific infestation site.

The funding allocation process is linked to justifications from each State for: (I) infrastructure, (II) surveys to address national priority pests, and (III) surveys to address pests of state concern.

### **I. Infrastructure**

#### **Tier 1**

These base-level funds are provided to each state to support the State Survey Coordinator (SSC), and are capped at \$100,000. The funds are to be used to cover expenses related to salary; benefits/fringe; standard support equipment (including but not limited to: desktop computer, laptop computer, cell phone, or other PPQ-recommended equipment); in-state travel (cooperator/industry meetings, outreach, etc.); out of state CAPS related travel (e.g. National CAPS Conference, etc.); and departmental overhead typical for this position. Also, care should be taken that equipment requests are needed in the current year and are not being carried over from a previous agreement. Equipment requests should support the SSC only. **Personnel expenses for conducting survey activities should be addressed in the Survey work plans. Survey is not allowed in Infrastructure funding.**

## **Tier 2**

Base-level funds may be supplemented up to 50 percent above the Tier 1 level, **provided that the justification is sufficient**. Justification for Tier 2 funds should be clearly addressed in the work plan narrative. Examples of a justifiable increase include:

- When there is a demonstrated need for data management support, which may include part-time salary/benefits for a data management position and associated standard support equipment;
- When additional outreach beyond Tier 1 funding levels is merited. Outreach should enhance survey and pest detection efforts, and should be linked to an active survey effort in the State in a manner that enhances the CAPS program (see Appendix I for a more detailed explanation) ; and
- When States have very high cost-of-living expenses and other high overhead expenses. States with higher cost of living expenses could be eligible for this increase if the need is clearly justified by the State cooperative agreements officer, the need is confirmed by the APHIS cooperative agreements officer, and the need is supported by known locality costs as determined by the Federal Government's pay schedules.

*Note: maximum possible Infrastructure award: \$150,000. Written work plans for specific surveys must be provided (see next section). Infrastructure costs will be addressed during the formulation of the total budget for each State.*

## **II. Priority Surveys**

**Priority Surveys** are those survey initiatives that have been identified by the National CAPS Committee as being of high priority to merit a priority survey effort (see Appendix G for the Priority Pest List). **The CAPS program is a national program, and as such, the primary focus is on national priority surveys.** The focus of these surveys is on detecting pests in areas where their presence (or absence) is unknown by focusing on the host(s) and/or environment of given pests, or on location-specific criteria, particularly in situations where a state has evidence of risk from prior emergency actions against certain types of facilities or operations.

In response to comments and suggestions from the states and our stakeholders to provide more flexibility for surveys, the NCC has decided to continue to present a 2-prong approach for Priority Surveys. Priority Surveys may consist of 1) traditional commodity-based and similarly-formatted surveys (e.g., Exotic Woodboring & Bark Beetle Survey) prepared by CPHST as presented in past years (designated Designed Surveys), and/or 2) unique bundled surveys developed by the States (designated Bundled Surveys). States must apply at least 75 percent, and can use up to 100 percent, of their total survey dollars to support Priority Surveys (Designed Surveys and/or Bundled Surveys).

1. **Designed Surveys:** Included in this category are the traditional commodity-based surveys and those surveys not necessarily based on commodities, but have been prepared by CPHST and have the same format for surveying for multiple pests within

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

an environmental niche, business model, or taxonomic group. The intent of these surveys is to detect pests not known to be present in those areas of the nation where a particular commodity is grown, in a particular environment or habitat, or associated with various business models. A future goal of the CAPS program is to conduct national surveys and obtain a national dataset for exotic pests in commodities, habitats, and businesses of national importance. The following are appropriate for conducting a Designed Priority Survey in 2012, and may be approved at full funding levels.

- Commodity-based surveys:\* (Corn, Cotton<sup>☆</sup>, Grape, Oak, Pine, Small Grains, Soybean, and Stone Fruit<sup>☆</sup>);

<sup>☆</sup> New for 2012.

- Taxonomic group-based surveys:\* Exotic Wood Borer and Bark Beetle (EWB/BB) and Cyst Nematodes

\* Not all pests listed in a commodity-based, EWB/BB, or cyst nematode survey need be targeted by an individual State. Target only those pests that are important and make biological, environmental, or economic sense to the State. Selecting a portion (e.g., 5 of the ten pests) of the pests listed in a commodity survey guide fulfills the requirement of conducting that survey.

2. **Bundled Surveys:** The intent of the Bundled Surveys is to give the States the flexibility to design their own surveys, within certain parameters. **The survey must concentrate on multiple, high priority pests and efficiency of survey.** A State may create a bundled survey that is **based on a common factor**, such as site, habitat, environment, business, etc., that makes biological, environmental, and/or economic sense in that State. The survey must include pests from the Priority Pest List (Commodity Pests [Appendix G-1] and/or Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance [Appendix G-2]). Pests of importance to a State not on the Priority Pest List, but in common with the other pests, may be included in the bundled survey. States must show justification for the bundled survey. An example of a Bundled Survey is a Nursery Survey with a selection of several pests from the Priority Pest List that are important to the State, with perhaps a pest or two not on the Priority Pest List, but of State importance. The challenge is for the States to decide what works best for the agriculture and environment in their State. The survey effort for pests added by the State (including diagnostics, trapping supplies, etc.) must be less than half of the cost of this particular survey. Surveys for pest management purposes will not be allowed. See Appendix O for examples.

### **III. State Discretionary Surveys:**

State Discretionary Surveys are surveys that a State may choose to conduct for pests of regulatory significance within their State (see Appendix H for the Additional Pests of Regulatory Concern list). States may choose to survey for a pest or group of pests (a

bundled survey is preferred for efficiency) of lower national priority (not on the Priority Pest List), but important in their State for agricultural, environmental, or economic reasons. As in Priority Surveys, the State may focus on the host(s) of given pests or on location-specific criteria, particularly in situations where a state has evidence of risk from prior emergency actions against certain types of facilities or operations. Justification must be provided identifying why these surveys and pests are of concern to the State, and why this particular survey or pest cannot be included with a priority Bundled Survey as described above with high priority pests. **Surveys for pests that are established, endemic, native, or indigenous in that state for the purpose of management, except as noted below, should not be proposed as the survey will not be funded.** The State also assures that local/county survey needs are adequately addressed regarding pests of State concern. See Appendix O for examples.

Examples of these pests include:

- Pest of phytosanitary significance in interstate commerce;
- Pests of phytosanitary significance for exports;
- Offshore Pest Information System (OPIS) reported pests;
- Industry partnerships for specific commodities; and
- Pests that otherwise are under “state phytosanitary management” (formerly referred to as “official control”).

A process currently is being considered whereby APHIS may recognize the latter category of pests but it is not yet available at the time these guidelines were prepared. When no Federal pest quarantine regulations are in place, States should try to be consistent in how they carry out pest management measures. Conversely, where Federal requirements are in place, States should have consistent intrastate regulations prepared;

States are eligible for up to 25 percent of their survey dollars to support State Discretionary Surveys for pests of State regulatory concern (where the other 75 percent would be used to survey for APHIS’ high priority pests).

### **Pathway Approach to Survey:**

When planning surveys, the NCC encourages the States to use a pathway approach when deciding on pests and locations to survey. States should plan to survey where the risk is highest. This type of targeted detection survey or risk-based survey enhances the ability of the CAPS Program to identify and target high risk areas, zones, locations, and sites that have the highest potential for exotic pest introductions, and to successfully provide early detection of these pests. This concept can be combined with any survey using sound analytical tools, known risk sites, past history of pest detections in a State, and other avenues of information. It is understood that risk factors can be examined along a “risk continuum” beginning at offshore sites (points of origin) to points of potential establishment (commodity production areas, natural lands), and numerous risk points in between (wholesale distribution centers, nurseries, intermodal sites, rail yards, etc.). The

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

identification of risk points and development of targeted surveys will maintain the focus of the survey program on our top commodities at risk and the high priority pests as identified through the AHP process. This emphasis will create a flexible system allowing states to package additional pests of concern to their specific states.

States should devote the majority of survey efforts to sites where risk is high. However, in accordance with ISPM No. 6, Section. 2.3, states also may want to consider a percentage of random sites to “to detect unexpected events.” The emphasis should be put on high risk sites, but it may be important also to incorporate sites of somewhat lesser risk into a survey. This is a state-by-state decision based on the perceived risk and resources available in a particular state.

### **Overall Funding Formula**

*Infrastructure + Priority Surveys (minimum of 75 percent of survey dollars) + State Discretionary Surveys (up to 25 percent of survey dollars) = Total funds awarded.*

Funding for the CAPS program is provided by Congress through the Pest Detection line item in the Federal Budget. Pest Detection also funds several other initiatives in support of the CAPS program. Due to Presidential and Congressional priorities, as well as the budget cycle, funds available for the next survey year are not known at the time these guidelines are published. For fiscal year (FY) 2012, we will use FY 2011 totals as a general rule-of-thumb, with a few exceptions. Examples of this formula are as follows:

#### State 1:

\$75,000	Tier 1 Infrastructure
\$35,250	Available for survey based on previous year's budget
\$26,438	Priority Surveys (75 percent of \$35,250)
\$8,812	State Discretionary Surveys (25 percent of \$35,250)
\$110,250	Total cooperative agreement

#### State 2:

\$100,000	Tier 1 Infrastructure
\$25,000	Tier 2 Infrastructure
\$75,000	Available for survey based on previous year's budget
\$56,250	Priority Surveys (75 percent of \$75,000)
\$18,750	State Discretionary Surveys (25 percent of \$75,000)
\$200,000	Total cooperative agreement

#### State 3:

\$100,000	Tier 1 Infrastructure
\$50,000	Tier 2 Infrastructure
\$250,000	Available for survey based on previous year's budget
\$187,500	Priority Surveys (75 percent of \$250,000)
\$62,500	State Discretionary Surveys (25 percent of \$250,000)
\$400,000	Total cooperative agreement

With the change in the Survey Guidelines to include Bundled Surveys, the challenge to the States is to be creative in the planning of surveys and target pests. Pests of State concern should be incorporated whenever possible into the Priority Surveys. **It is hoped that the States will use up to 100% of their survey dollars with Priority Surveys in which pests of State concern have been included.** If this challenge to the States is successful, and can be continued into the future, then the present funding ratio will cease to be a factor.

### **Work Plan Submission**

Each state should submit work plans, including detailed financial plans, for the Infrastructure project and each survey they plan to conduct. The survey work plans should be distinguished by Priority Surveys or State Discretionary Surveys. Templates for Infrastructure and Survey can be found in Appendix J. The combined total requested should not exceed the guidance given by the RPM. For 2012, States are asked also to submit an Excel spreadsheet with the list of surveys and pests proposed in the work plans. The format can be found in Appendix J-3. Downloadable files will be available on the CAPS Resource and Collaboration website (<http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu>). States are strongly encouraged to list State contributions to the survey effort on the financial plan. This information will assist the Pest Detection Program answer requests and questions from the Agency, Department, and Congress, and prepare future budget requests

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

All cooperative agreements are administered through the PPQ Regions, and are the means by which funds are provided to each State and cooperator. APHIS is exploring how it may streamline cooperative agreements, including online electronic forms or other means of expediting the submission of information from potential cooperators, and reporting results. A single system is not yet available at the time these guidelines were prepared; however, electronic forms may be used and submitted per the guidance of the PPQ Regions and provided herein. Note that a synopsis of all grants and agreements provided to a cooperator by the Federal government, including APHIS, are now posted on the Internet ([www.USAspending.gov](http://www.USAspending.gov)). This was a requirement of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA). Likewise, APHIS is required to report accomplishments via “performance measures” in CAPS. Cooperators will be provided guidance on means to adhere to this new level of transparency.

As required by OMB Circular A102 and 7CFR 3016, and as outlined in Article 4 of the Notice of Cooperative Agreement Award between the Cooperator and USDA-APHIS-PPQ, the Cooperator’s designated representative shall submit to APHIS’ authorized representative properly certified semiannual **Federal Financial Report** (FFR) SF-425, no later than 30 days after the end of the second quarter and a final FFR no later than 90 days after the Agreement expires or terminates. Any requests for an extension of time to submit the FFR must be justified and made in writing to APHIS’ authorized representative before expiration of the initial 30 or 90 days period allowed for submitting the report. Extensions of time to submit the FFR are subject to the discretion of APHIS’

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

authorized representative and, if allowed, shall be provided by the authorized representative in writing.

Also, as per Article 4 in the Notice of Cooperative Agreement Award, the Cooperator's designated representative shall certify and submit to APHIS' Authorized Representative a semiannual **Accomplishment Report** on activities outlined in the Work Plan and Financial Plan. The reports will be used by APHIS to verify compliance with provisions of this Agreement. They are due no later than 30 days after the end of the second quarter and a final report is due no later than 90 days after the Agreement expires or terminates. Any requests for an extension of time to submit the report must be justified and made in writing to APHIS' authorized representative before expiration of the initial 30 or 90 day period allowed for submitting the report.

**New for 2012.** The use of standardized reporting templates for both Infrastructure and Survey will be required for 2012 agreements. These standardized templates are a result of working group discussions and discussions at the 2010 CAPS Conference in Kansas City. The NCC accepted the templates and recommended that they be used for 2012 surveys. The reporting templates can be found in the new Appendix P.

An extension of the Cooperative Agreement may be granted if requested by the cooperator, and is supported by the SPHD, APHIS cooperative agreement officer, and approved by the Regional Director. The SPHD may request semiannual or quarterly reports which, if requested, are due within 30 days of the end of the reporting period.

The SPHD, as ADODR of the cooperative agreement, shall submit to the Region the State's semi-annual and year end reports no later than the 30 or 90 day period allowed for submitting the reports, and include a written summary evaluation. The evaluation should include input from the PSS, and address each funded project in the cooperative agreement. The evaluation depends upon the work plan and must address the funding criteria previously agreed to by the State and the SPHD, and the performance of the State in carrying out the cooperative agreement. A work plan monitoring tool is available to assist in the review of the State's performance. The CAPS Accountability Report can be accessed through the NAPIS database (<http://napis.ceris.purdue.edu/htbin/mynapis.com>) or the CAPS Resource and Collaboration web site (<http://caps.ceris.purdue.edu>). A login is required for both sites.

By February 1 of each year, the regional offices will submit a CAPS Agreement Allocation Review (compilation of the J-3 appendix) for the current year to the NPM. The report will be listed by State and include the names of proposed projects, including surveys and target pests, amount of funds approved by project, and the total allocations by state (including infrastructure).

The overall annual process involved in conducting effective CAPS activities is lengthy. It includes identifying pest threats; ranking pest risks; engaging scientists and stakeholders to determine the merits of survey to determine a pests status in the United States; allocating funds for surveys at the State level and for special projects; conducting

surveys; analyzing the data collected; writing periodic/annual reports; and evaluating the accomplishment of survey and CAPS program annual objectives. A planning calendar is provided in this document, showing significant milestones including administrative deadlines (Appendix K).

Here is the link to the GPO National Archives and Records Administration website where the CFRs can be reviewed: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/cfr-table-search.html>

## **DATA MANAGEMENT**

Data requirements have undergone some changes since last year. The Agency will be capturing all data collected by PPQ and PPQ-funded agreements in the Integrated Plant Health Information System (IPHIS). However, given the complexities of the CAPS program, we are not yet at the point where all CAPS surveys can be fully incorporated into IPHIS. CAPS leadership is working with the IPHIS staff to assure full CAPS functionality will be provided in IPHIS. The plan is for all CAPS data to be entered into IPHIS for the 2012 field season. The CAPS community will be kept informed, via the NCC and other venues, as IPHIS survey templates and other tools become available for use in CAPS.

### **Negative Data**

The documentation of negative data is extremely important and valuable. Negative data from national surveys support trade and exports, and benefit American agriculture. The CAPS program strives to insure that all negative data is valid, and results from active survey efforts. The CAPS program has developed guidelines to assist in data entry of valid negative data. The CAPS-Approved Survey Methods can be found in Appendix M. This matrix enables one to determine the appropriate pests that can be considered negative for a survey effort based on the survey methodology, trap/lure combination, etc. Data entry will be checked/validated against the approved survey method for each pest on the Priority Pest List. Data not conforming to the approved method will not be accepted into the database.

Additional guidance for data entry is given in Appendix N for selected target pests (Exotic Woodboring and Bark Beetles, mollusks, and nematodes) at the genus and species level. Because of incomplete taxonomy, diagnostic difficulty, lack of survey methodology, or other reasons, some target pests are listed only at the genus level. In certain instances, it may not be appropriate to enter positive or negative data at the genus level. All positive records should be at the species level.

PPQ is striving to assure:

- Survey data and diagnostic results are entered as close to real time as possible, including both positive and negative results;
- Data elements (format, content) are standardized nationally;

## 2012 National CAPS Survey Guidelines

- Data will be uploaded into IPHIS as appropriate, and made available per existing protocols in the CAPS program;
- Data management processes and information will be provided nationally.

### **APPENDICES**

**Appendix A Regulatory Significance**

**Appendix B Roles and Responsibilities**

**Appendix C Roles and Responsibilities - Table Format**

**Appendix D Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) Prioritized Pest List**  
(from CPHST)

**Appendix E Taxonomic Support & Sample Submission Guidelines**

**Appendix F National CAPS Committee Bylaws & Rotation Schedule**

**Appendix G Priority Pest List for 2011**

(consists of Commodity Pests and Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance)

**Appendix H Additional Pests of Regulatory Concern for 2011**

**Appendix I Outreach**

**Appendix J Infrastructure and Survey Templates with Excel Spreadsheet for Survey and Pest Lists**

**Appendix K CAPS Timeline**

**Appendix L IPHIS Guidance, Templates, etc.**

**Appendix M CAPS-Approved Survey Methodology for Negative Data**

**Appendix N Data Entry Guides for Selected Taxonomic Groups**

**Appendix O Examples of Bundled Surveys**

**Appendix P Reporting Templates**