



# Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) 2021 National Pest Surveillance Guidelines April 22, 2020

---

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide pest surveillance direction for the Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Program. These guidelines are for State Departments of Agriculture, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ), tribal governments, and collaborators that conduct pest surveillance activities with Pest Detection and Plant Protection Act Section 7721 (PPA 7721; formerly Farm Bill) Goal 1 Survey - National Priority Surveys funding. These guidelines and the referenced resources provide general and specific direction on Program processes and how pest surveillance activities should be conducted. Questions concerning current or yearly survey activities may be obtained from the National Policy Manager for Pest Detection, National Operations Manager for Pest Detection, Science & Technology CAPS Support, or members of the National CAPS Committee (NCC).

## 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 U. S. 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, the environment, or our natural resources 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 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.

## PROGRAM OVERVIEW & ORGANIZATION

Central to the success of the CAPS program is clarity about the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in cooperative surveys. This includes surveys conducted by PPQ and State cooperators funded through the Pest Detection line item and PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey. While the focus of these survey guidelines is primarily directed to PPQ state

offices and 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.

At both the national and state-levels, an organized effort to engage industry early in the survey-planning process is recommended. This is necessary because the strategy of the CAPS program continues to stress bundled surveys that target multiple pests based on commodities, taxa, environments and habitats, industries and businesses, and the continuum along pest introduction pathways.

The hosts, commodities, industries, and businesses impacted by pests span the country nationally, and it is appropriate to address the risks from an agro-ecosystem 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. To ensure success of the CAPS program, it is imperative that the CAPS community communicate the goals and objectives of the CAPS program to industry and other stakeholders at the national and state level. In order to facilitate this dialogue, PPQ has provided a categorization of pest threats in the form of a [Prioritized Pest List](#), [Approved Methodology for Pest Surveillance](#), and other resources available on the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration website](#).

The CAPS program is managed by the Pest Detection Management Team (PDMT). The PDMT consists of the PPQ National Policy Manager for Pest Detection in Policy Management, the PPQ National Operations Manager for Pest Detection in Field Operations, and the Science & Technology Assistant Director for CAPS Support. The PDMT has overall responsibility for program policies, operations, and scientific support of the CAPS program. The PDMT is supported by the National CAPS Committee (NCC). The NCC is composed of representatives from each of the core constituencies in the CAPS community. Responsibilities for the PDMT and the NCC also are found in the [National CAPS Committee \(NCC\) Bylaws](#). The Domestic Diagnostic Coordinator in PPQ National Identification Services (NIS) also supports the Program and CAPS community through various [taxonomic services](#).

The NCC will revise the National Pest Surveillance Guidelines when annually reviewing the policy, strategy, and performance of the CAPS program. The NCC also will approve annually a Priority Pest List. The PDMT has implemented a [transparent process for assessing pests](#) for the Priority Pest List. States will select pests from the Priority Pest List to complete the Priority Surveys in CAPS and National Priority Surveys under PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey.

The State CAPS Committee will determine and recommend survey priorities for pests of state regulatory concern. The State Plant Health Director (SPHD) and State Plant Regulatory Official (SPRO), in consultation with the Pest Survey Specialist (PSS) and

State Survey Coordinator (SSC), will consider the recommendations and advice of the State CAPS Committee and select pests that are important to their State as per the guidance given in these Guidelines. This collaboration will allow flexibility on a state-by-state basis. PPQ encourages industry-state partnerships for pest surveys.

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. [Activities](#) performed by SSCs that result in advancing the overall program's effectiveness will support this assessment process. The [Infrastructure Report Template](#) is provided for the SSC to report on activities in support of the Pest Surveillance mission across all programs for which activities were conducted in their state. The roles and responsibilities of the core constituencies, SPHD, SPRO, PSS, and SSC, can be found [here](#).

The SSC, in collaboration with the PSS, will make use of pest risk information from various sources. Such sources include: pest datasheets; pest-risk assessments; pests categorized through the [Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pests](#) process; "risk zones" and other information communicated to the SPHDs by the NOM; pests that need to be surveyed per the PPQ Management 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; and select agents that present some threat for potential bioterrorism.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE & SURVEYS**

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. However, the CAPS program needs to be sufficiently flexible to address national priorities that may have shifted since pests were first 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 or the designated plant health regulatory authority in the State through cooperative agreements administered through the PPQ Field Operations office. The annual APHIS Pest Detection "line item" appropriation and PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey allocations are the funding sources for CAPS and PPQ surveys. Funds from the Pest Detection line item and PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey 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 process for CAPS is linked to justifications from each State for: (I) Infrastructure and (II) Surveys to address National Priority Pests. Pests of state concern should be bundled with National Priority Pests in Bundled Surveys. (The funding process for PPA 7721 projects is determined by the PPA 7721 Program).

### **Infrastructure**

Funds are provided to each state to support the State Survey Coordinator (SSC); specifically 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 and/or industry meetings, outreach, etc.); and departmental overhead typical for this position. If a need is demonstrated for data management support, i.e., part-time salary/benefits, it may be appropriate to include these expenses in Infrastructure. A justification must be provided. [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.

Out of state travel for the SSC (or other state cooperator) is capped at \$3,000, and will be approved only for CAPS-specific meetings that the individual attends in their role as the state CAPS representative (e.g., Regional Plant Board meeting and National CAPS Meeting). It is strongly suggested that travel to the Regional Plant Board Meeting be incorporated into the Financial Plan. Funding may be augmented to the cooperative agreement for travel to a National CAPS Meeting in years when it is held. It is not appropriate to charge to the Pest Detection agreements travel to other meetings not specific to the CAPS program. Similarly, it is not appropriate to charge to Pest Detection PPQ travel to other meetings not specific to the CAPS program. In-state travel to conduct surveys should be addressed in the Survey work plans. Other in-state travel needs should be clearly aligned with supporting CAPS initiatives.

Care also should be taken to make equipment requests that are needed in the current year and are not being carried over from a previous agreement. Equipment requests should support the SSC only, and SSCs are encouraged to provide PPQ an IT inventory to ensure needs are being met, equipment is replaced in a reasonable time frame, and equipment procured to support CAPS activities remains available to the program. Funding currently is not available, nor should be requested, to support equipment needs beyond that of the SSC.

Personnel expenses for conducting survey activities should be addressed in the Survey work plans. Survey expenses are not allowed in Infrastructure funding.

Infrastructure costs will be addressed during the formulation of the total budget for each State. States should plan on Infrastructure funding based on the previous year or the amount communicated to the State by the NOM. For FY21, **the maximum possible Infrastructure award for each state is the amount that each state received for FY20.** This funding level may change, however, as the PDMT explores ways to standardize funding using a national perspective. States are encouraged to leverage funding from other programs to cover and reduce Infrastructure costs. The remaining amount of the

State's total will be designated to Survey (see the funding section below). A written work plan specifically for Infrastructure must be provided that is separate from Survey as explained in the Work Plan Submission section below.

### **Priority Pest List**

In previous years, the Priority Pest List was composed of the [Commodity and Taxonomic Manual Lists](#) and the Pests of Economic and Environmental Importance (EEI) List. The Commodity and Taxonomic Manual Lists grouped Priority Pests by commodity (e.g. Corn) or taxonomic (e.g., Cyst Nematodes) manuals. The EEI list represented Priority Pests that had been evaluated using the Objective Prioritization of Exotic Pests (OPEP) Impact Assessment model, and were found to belong in Category 1 (high and some moderate impact pests). As of 2021, the Priority Pest List has been fully evaluated eliminating the need for the EEI list. For more information about this process, see the [Development of the Priority Pest List](#).

For the 2021 Guidelines, one plant pathogen will be added and 25 pests will be removed from the Priority Pest List. For more information see the [Summary of Pest List Changes](#). Pests removed from the Priority Pest List may be appropriate for bundled surveys. See the [Bundling Former Priority Pests](#) spreadsheet and [Guidance for Bundling Former Priority Pests](#) document.

The 2021 Priority Pest List will contain 104 pests, down from 128 in the 2020 Priority Pest List. The majority of priority pests are grouped by Commodity and Taxonomic Manual lists. Eleven priority pests are not associated with a commodity or taxon manual, and are supported by the [Host Matrix](#).

### **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. **The CAPS program is a national program, and as such, the primary focus is on National Priority Surveys that target Priority Pests.** 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., Small Grains and Exotic Woodboring & Bark Beetle Surveys) prepared by S&T as presented in past years (designated Designed Surveys), and/or 2) unique bundled surveys developed by the States (designated 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 S&T and have the same format for surveying for multiple pests within 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. The 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 2021.

- Commodity-based surveys:\*\* Corn, Cotton, Oak, Pine, Small Grains, Soybean, and Tropical Hosts
- Taxonomic group-based surveys:\* Exotic Wood Borer and Bark Beetle (EWB/BB), Cyst Nematodes, and Mollusks

\* Not all pests listed in a commodity- or taxon-based 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., 50% or greater) of the Priority Pests listed in a commodity survey guide fulfills the requirement of conducting that survey.

\* Grape, Palm, Solanaceous, and Stone Fruit Commodity Surveys will not be offered through CAPS for 2021 funding. These and other surveys that are based on [Specialty Crop Commodities](#) (e.g., Orchard [Apple, Pear, etc.] and other fruit, vegetable, and specialty crop surveys) should be suggested for PPA 7721 funding. Likewise, Asian Defoliator and Pathway surveys are more aligned with the language of the PPA, and will not be supported for funding through CAPS.

\* States are discouraged from submitting similar work plans or suggestions to both the CAPS and PPA 7721 programs. Projects or surveys not adhering to these Guidelines may not be reviewed or funded in either venue.

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 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. 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. Guidance is offered on pests previously on the Priority Pest List, but for one reason or another have been delisted. See [Guidance for Bundling Former Priority Pests](#) for more information. States must show justification for the bundled survey. An example of a Bundled Survey is a Nursery and Retail Plants Survey with a selection of several pests from the Priority Pest List that are important to the State, with 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, environment, or natural resources 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 pests that are established, endemic, native, or indigenous in that state for the purpose of management will not be allowed. States that choose to conduct surveys for pests of state regulatory significance should bundle these pests with National Priority Pests in Bundled Surveys. See [Examples of Bundled Surveys](#) for other examples.

### **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 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 [OPEP](#) prioritization process. This emphasis will create a flexible system allowing states to add additional pests of concern.

States should devote the majority of survey efforts to sites where the risk is highest. However, in accordance with [ISPM No. 6: Surveillance](#) (revised 2018), Section 2.2.5, States also may want to consider complementing surveys by random sampling sites 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.

## **FUNDING & WORK PLANS**

### **Overall Funding Formula**

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 completely at the time these guidelines are published. Therefore, for FY21 planning, states should use the final FY20 budget for their state as a general rule-of-thumb, with the limit on

Infrastructure mentioned above. The PDMT will provide further advice as more information becomes available.

The CAPS program needs a transparent, sustainable, and flexible funding model that is adaptable and predictable in a changing political and financial environment, and one that is based on risk, performance, and/or economics. The PDMT will be working in this direction in the coming years. Further guidance will be made available as more is known about this process and the FY21 budget.

The present funding formula is simply:

$$\text{Infrastructure} + \text{Priority Surveys} = \text{Total Funds Awarded.}$$

A state may plan up to, but not over the Total funding amount. Infrastructure funding cannot be greater than the previous year, or as directed by the NOM, but can be less by shifting appropriate funding to Survey. The remaining dollars of a state’s total dollar amount are for Survey(s). It is important to only charge to Infrastructure those items that are in accordance to the guidance given in this document, or from guidance given by the National Policy Manager and National Operations Manager after the publication of this document. As mentioned above, personnel expenses for conducting survey activities should be addressed in the Survey work plans. Survey expenses are not allowed in Infrastructure funding. An example of this formula is as follows:

| State | Infrastructure    | Priority Survey | Total     |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| XX    | \$75,000          | \$30,500        | \$105,500 |
|       | Designed Survey 1 | \$20,000        |           |
|       | Bundled Survey 2  | \$10,500        |           |
|       | Total             | \$30,500        |           |

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 into the Priority Surveys. States can use up to 100% of their survey dollars with Priority Surveys in which pests of State concern have been included.

**Work Plan Submission**

Each state will submit work plans, including detailed financial plans, for the Infrastructure project and each survey they plan to conduct (see the options for Survey work plans below). The use of the [Infrastructure Work Plan Template](#) and [Survey Work Plan Template](#) is required (see the Online Work Plan section below). The combined total funding requested should not exceed the guidance given by the National Operations Manager. The [Survey Summary Form](#) must be completed online on the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration site](#) (a CAPS Resource & Collaboration login will be required). The



online Survey Summary Form must be completed when the work plans are submitted to the SPHD's office. No work plans will be reviewed or approved without a completed online Survey Summary Form. Once the state submits the completed information, the state PPQ office will be required to acknowledge review before it will be reviewed by the National Operations Manager. The State's data will be available to Field Operations online. States will not be able to access other state's information.

Contractual items listed in the [Financial Form](#) must be detailed and described in an additional Financial Form. It is necessary for the program to know and evaluate costs associated with the Contractual item. A separate Contractual Financial Form is provided in the file to list Contractual costs.

Work Plan Options: States have flexibility to combine their Pest Detection surveys into one submitted Survey work and financial plan, or to submit separate work plans for each survey. Funding will be tracked based on each work plan whether written as a combined or individual survey. Individual states will determine which options work best for them based on their state financial and accounting policies, systems, and processes. This guidance is only for Pest Detection funding, and only for Survey. A separate work and financial plan for Infrastructure is required. There is no change in the guidance for entering survey and target pest information into the Survey Summary Form. Surveys, target pests, and funding per individual survey need to be entered as in previous years even if a state decides to combine their surveys into one work plan. This will aid in reporting of program performance measures. An [Example of a Combined Survey Work Plan](#) can be found on the [2021 Guidelines](#) page of the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration](#) website.

Note on Terminology: The term 'Bundled' is used to target multiple pests in a survey. The term 'Combine' is used to incorporate two or more surveys into one work and financial plan.



Online Work and Financial Plan Template: New for 2021, an Online Work and Financial Plan Template will replace the Word templates used previously. This will be **required** as a final step in the State's process before signatures and submission to the ADODR (SPHD) and Field Ops for approval. A Word version of the template will be available on the 2021 Guidelines page for drafts and reviews. States will enter the same information into the online version as they previously did in the Word template. The output will be a pdf file ready for electronic signatures and submission to Field Operations. The online work and financial plan will improve efficiency by enabling the Pest Detection team to query various components of the plans across the country, as well as facilitate work plan development in future years. States requested this improvement through the NCC.

Note: The Online Work and Financial Plan Template is to be used for Pest Detection / CAPS work plans only. The online work plan should not be used for any other PPQ pest program. Extension to 2021 PPA 7721 Goal 1 Survey will be decided at a later date.

Survey Summary Form: Continuing in 2021, there will be fields in the Survey Summary Form for CAPS, PPA 7721, and PPQ Pest Detection surveys where States will be asked to indicate the specific hosts, commodities, environments, or habitats in which they plan to conduct surveys. This information is not always apparent from the survey name. APHIS and PPQ are conducting industry sector meetings to hear the topics, issues, and concerns that are important to the various commodity industries. Being able to provide survey information on a commodity basis allows for constructive dialogue. Please keep this in mind when preparing 2021 work plans. This request is specific to the Survey Summary Form only but should be included in the work plan as well. This is not a new data entry requirement. See [Guidance for Selecting Survey Names](#).

### **Cooperator Cost Share**

Neither the CAPS nor PPA 7721 Programs require cooperator cost share to be entered into a cooperative agreement. If, however, a cooperator chooses to enter a cost share amount on the financial forms, then they must adhere to guidance governing that cost share, and the amount should match the SF-425 at the end of the agreement. See the addendum to the March 6, 2014 NCC conference call that addresses cooperator cost share. (<http://download.ceris.purdue.edu/file/2347>)

For 2021 work and financial plans, only cooperator cost share reported on the financial forms should be entered into the Survey Summary Form in much the same manner that surveys and target pests described in the work plan should be listed on the Survey Summary Form. If no cooperator share is entered in the financial forms, then no cooperator share needs to be entered into the Survey Summary Form. We are making this change for transparency and to make sure we are accurately reporting on cooperator cost share when this information is requested. This information will assist the Pest Detection Program with answering requests and questions from the Agency, Department, and Congress, and preparing budget requests.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

All cooperative agreements are administered through PPQ Field Operations, and are the means by which funds are provided to each State and cooperator. APHIS is using the ezFedGrants system for the complete administration of cooperative agreements. The CAPS Program will use the same initial submission process as in previous years before the ezFedGrants system comes into play (i.e., States will submit work and financial plans to the SPHD, who will upload them to the Field Operations SharePoint site for review by the National Operations Manager). Once work plans are signed by the Recipient Organization Authorized Representative (ROAR) and ADODR, the ADODR will need to follow the steps below. While Pest Detection and PPA 7721 work and financial plans are processed similarly, they are handled separately due to the different funding sources. The [Survey Summary Form](#) should be passed along at the same time as the work and financial plans.



- 1) Before submitting a new work and financial plan, the ADODR should check the [Accountability Report](#) on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website to ensure data from previous years surveys have been entered into the appropriate database (National Agricultural Pest Information System (NAPIS)). If the data has not been entered, the ADODR should communicate this deficiency to the cooperator. Once the missing data is entered, or an acceptable justification is provided, submission of new work and financial plans may proceed. New work plans will not be processed until data entry requirements are met.

For example: For review of a 2021 work plan (Pest Detection and PPA 7721), the ADODR should check and determine that all 2019 and earlier data from the cooperator has been entered into NAPIS. Surveys for 2020 are in progress, and all the 2020 data is not expected to be available when 2021 work plans are due. However, 2019 and earlier data should be available and properly entered into NAPIS.

- 2) Save the Infrastructure and Survey(s) files in the .pdf format separately. Do not combine work plans or work plans funded by a different line item.
- 3) The ADODR will then upload the Infrastructure and Survey(s) .pdf files to the [Field Operations Cooperative Agreements Work Plan Management Site](#) by clicking Upload under the Work Plans section and following the steps. Once completed, Field Operations will be notified that a work plan has been submitted for review. The ADODR should also notify the appropriate National Operations Manager(s) by email.
- 4) The PPQ National Operations Manager will review the work and financial plan for adherence to the National Pest Surveillance Guidelines, review the Accountability Reports to confirm data entry requirements have been met, and either approve the work and financial plan, or communicate back to the states on suggested changes.
- 5) Once a work and financial plan have been approved, the National Operations Manager will notify the agreements specialist that it is approved, and the process to develop a cooperative agreement can begin.
- 6) ezFedGrants will be used to process all cooperative agreements. The [ezFedGrants External Portal Homepage](#) can be accessed by entering 'grants.fms.usda.gov' into your browser. Cooperators will respond to an opportunity established by the PPQ agreements staff. This information will be communicated to the cooperator and enable the cooperator to find the opportunity in ezFedGrants.

The following aids are available on the [ezFedGrants](#) page of the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration](#) website.

- [ezFedGrants Access](#)
- [Application Management](#)
- [Submitting Claims and Reports](#)
- [Internal Program Manager User Guide](#)
- [External User Guide](#)
  
- Job Aids are located at:  
<https://www.nfc.usda.gov/FSS/ClientServices/ezFedGrants/index.php>

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 the means to adhere to this level of transparency.

As required by OMB Circular A102 and 7 CFR 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 a 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’ 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 and financial plans. 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.

The use of the standardized [Infrastructure Report Template](#) and [Survey Report Template](#) are **required** for all agreements as tools for reporting accomplishments. These standardized templates are a result of NCC working group discussions. The NCC accepted the templates and has required their use.

- 1) The cooperator will need to upload the accomplishment reports to the [ezFedGrants External Portal Homepage](#)

- 2) The ADODR will be notified that an accomplishment report has been submitted and will review it through the ezFedGrants system. Once approved by the ADODR, Field Operations will be notified that an accomplishment report has been submitted for review.
- 3) Both the ADODR and National Operations Manager should refer to the CAPS [Accountability Report](#) on the CAPS Resource & Collaboration website before signing off on the final Accomplishment Report. The Accountability Report matches the information in the Survey Summary Form with data entered into NAPIS and is an indicator of the fulfillment of the cooperative agreement.



The CAPS program recognizes the value of supporting the SSC position through Infrastructure funding. Without this support, CAPS, PPA 7721, and other PPQ program surveys and projects, including outreach, in the states would not be possible. These activities, however, are not being captured and documented sufficiently to argue in support of continued Infrastructure funding in the face of the apparent numerical inequality between Infrastructure and Survey funding. In an attempt to capture the various activities funded under the Infrastructure component, a new reporting section with suggested metrics was added to the [Infrastructure Report Template](#) in the 2014 Guidelines. This reporting feature is required for all Infrastructure agreements. It is only through the efforts of the states to report on the various activities carried out in the states under Infrastructure that the CAPS program can document the merits of continued Infrastructure funding.

While the CAPS program is designed to follow the calendar year, an extension of the Cooperative Agreement may be granted if requested by the cooperator, and it is supported by the National Operations Manager, ADODR, APHIS Cooperative Agreement Officer and approved by the Executive Director of Field Operations. Extension requests must provide an explanation/justification for the program delay and will only be granted due to programmatic reasons /extenuating circumstances (e.g., weather delays, problems in hiring of personnel, etc.) and should not be used simply to extend the agreement. Reporting frequency of the accomplishment and financial reports, either quarterly or semiannual, will continue as noted in the Notice of Award.

The SPHD, or their designee, as ADODR of the cooperative agreement, shall submit to Field Operations 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. The [CAPS Accountability Report](#), a work plan monitoring tool, is available to assist in the review of the State's performance. It can be accessed through the [CAPS Resource & Collaboration](#) web site. A CAPS login is required.

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. The [CAPS Program Cycle](#) is provided showing significant milestones including administrative deadlines.

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

## DATA MANAGEMENT

The NAPIS is the final repository for all Pest Detection and CAPS survey results. As such, all data generated from 2021CAPS, PPA 7721 National Priority, and PPQ Pest Detection surveys will be entered into NAPIS. See the documents below for more detail.



- [Data Entry Roles and Responsibilities](#)
- [Data Management Guidance](#)
- [Data Entry Guides for Selected Taxonomic Groups](#)

The Agency has been capturing data collected by PPQ and some PPQ-funded agreements in the Integrated Plant Health System (IPHIS), and more recently under the Domestic Data Framework (DDF). The emphasis has been on PPQ emergency and domestic program pests with regulatory considerations. Given the complexities, nuances of the CAPS program, and the integrated CAPS Information Systems develop at Purdue University, these systems cannot support the CAPS program. We realize, however, that PPQ is using IPHIS and the DDF for various administrative, survey management, and/or programmatic reasons. For PPQ staff that use IPHIS and/or the DDF for data management of Pest Detection-funded surveys, PPQ will continue to share Pest Detection survey data with the States as defined and agreed upon in the data sharing and responsibilities article in the General Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and the cooperative agreements between PPQ and the States. The Article entitled Data Sharing and Responsibilities, appears in both the General MOU and in each cooperative agreement.

Data management requirements and functions continue to undergo development. Improvements are being made in IPHIS, DDF, and NAPIS to support the regulatory and CAPS communities, respectively. These systems were conceived and developed with different purposes. At the present time, these systems are not connected or linked. This likely will be the case for the foreseeable future. Regardless, the PDMT is committed to ensuring that program and cooperator needs are met. The CAPS community will be kept informed, via the NCC and other venues, as to progress regarding data management needs. For 2021, as stated above, PPQ Pest Detection, CAPS, and PPA 7721 National Priority surveys require that NAPIS be the final repository of survey data. See [Data](#)

[Entry Roles and Responsibilities](#) for guidance on entering survey information into the SSF and survey results into NAPIS.

The NAPIS database can be accessed at: <https://napis.ceris.purdue.edu/>  
A system login is required. Contact [capsis@purdue.edu](mailto:capsis@purdue.edu) for assistance.

### **Negative Data**

The documentation of negative data is extremely important and valuable. Negative data from national surveys support trade and exports and benefits American agriculture. The CAPS program strives to ensure 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 file [Approved Methodology for Negative Data](#) 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 and 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 [Data Entry Guides for Selected Taxonomic Groups](#) for selected target pests 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 only, it may be appropriate to enter negative data at the genus level. All positive records should be at the species level.

PPQ is striving to ensure:

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

### **CAPS RECOGNITION**

The National CAPS Program wishes to recognize outstanding activities and achievements by members of the CAPS community, including SSCs, PSSs, SPROs, and SPHDs. Individuals or groups (which may include additional cooperators) also will be considered. The purpose of the [CAPS Recognition](#) program is to recognize individuals or groups for specific achievements and accomplishments resulting from work done in support of Pest Detection activities in the previous calendar year. A call for nominations will be sent out by the NCC during the first week of January. Nominations will be reviewed by the NCC. The [CAPS Recognition Nomination Form](#) should be used to nominate worthy individuals or groups.

## **OTHER RESOURCES**

Several files previously found on the Guidelines page have been moved to the National CAPS Committee, CAPS Recognition, and Taxonomic Services pages. These files will usually not be updated with the publication of the Guidelines, but on an as needed basis. This will reduce the number of files on the Guideline page, and reduce the work required to update the Guidelines annually while still maintaining the information needed to develop work plans and conduct surveys.