

## Farm Bill Section 10201

### Feedback on FY12 Suggestions

#### Evaluation Process

Suggestions were evaluated by Section 10201 Goal Teams. Teams included representatives from APHIS, the National Plant Board, USDA's Agricultural Research Service, USDA's National Institute of Food and Agriculture, USDA's Forest Service, and the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance.

Goal Teams used the criteria described below to evaluate suggestions. After the Goal Teams completed their evaluations, they met to discuss preliminary funding priorities in an effort to identify synergies across goal areas and to ensure that critical needs or unexplored opportunities to strengthen prevention, detection, and/or mitigation efforts through the FY12 Spending Plan.

The intent of seeking suggestions from stakeholders was to facilitate the development of a comprehensive plan to address early pest detection and rapid response that takes into consideration a diversity of expert opinions on the types of efforts and initiatives that are likely to accomplish the goals of Section 10201. Because this is not a grant program, APHIS has significant flexibility to create a spending plan that addresses the goals of Section 10201.

#### Evaluation Criteria and Other Considerations

The evaluation team members evaluated the technical factors of the individual suggestions using the evaluation criteria described below.

- *Strategic Alignment* – This criterion was used to assess the extent to which the suggestion aligned with the strategic objectives of Section 10201 of the Farm Bill and the revised strategies and goal-specific categories outlined in FY12 stakeholder guidance documents.
- *Impact* – This criterion was used to assess the extent to which the suggestion will make an impact and produce results in areas of priority as defined by the individual goal area. This may include, but is not limited to, facilitating trade through the reporting of negative survey data, solving phytosanitary and trade issues in a sustainable manner, mitigating risky behaviors, and/or improving emergency response capacity. Impact might also be measured in terms of ability to succeed on a larger scale than in the past.
- *Feasibility* – This criterion was used to assess the extent to which the suggestion can be accomplished based on key factors such as (but not limited to) availability of resources, best utilization of partner relationships, and existence of a clearly defined process.
- *Past Performance, Best Practices and Innovation* – This criterion was used to assess the extent to which the suggestion will be successful based on past success in similar endeavors or the extent to which the suggestion uses best practices and innovation to offer new and improved approaches to achieving success.

In addition to the evaluation criteria described above, the teams also considered several other factors when developing the spending plan. These other factors addressed sensitive regulatory decision making and appropriated funding issues that are currently impacting several PPQ programs and were used to aid the evaluation teams in determining if the use of Farm Bill funding was appropriate. The factors described below were carefully weighed by each team as they worked together to develop the FY12 Spending Plan.

- *Recently Detected Pests That Will Not Be Regulated at the Federal Level* – Section 10201 of the Farm Bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to determine if an agricultural pest is a Federal concern. In those situations where a pest is detected, but APHIS will not pursue Federal regulatory action due to any number of circumstances, the decision to use Farm Bill funding was carefully weighed to determine if the suggestion would effectively provide short-term assistance to a state but without an expectation for long-term support from APHIS.
- *PPQ Programs with Budget Increases* – In those situations where a Federal regulatory program had received an increase in its operational budget, evaluators were asked to consider if the work proposed by the suggestion was the same as that which was already funded through Federal appropriations.
- *PPQ Programs with Reduced or Eliminated Budgets* – In situations where appropriated funding for existing PPQ programs was significantly reduced or eliminated, evaluators were asked to consider if the work proposed by the suggestion was the same as the work that was being reduced or eliminated by Congress (such as general survey or large-scale control activities for certain pests).

It is not the intent of the Farm Bill to fill voids created by shifts in Congressional funding, to augment programs that were already well funded, or to fund initiatives that could be construed as Federal pest detection, surveillance, or response programs when it was determined that a Federal regulatory response is unwarranted.

## **General Feedback**

In FY12, APHIS received 502 suggestions requesting more than \$97 million. A total of 321 suggestions were included in the final Spending Plan of \$50 million. Common characteristics of successful suggestions included:

- Strong alignment with Section 10201 risk criteria, including the number of international ports of entry in a state; the volume of international passenger and cargo entry into the state; the geographic location of the state and if the location or types of agricultural commodities produced in the state are conducive to agricultural pest and disease establishment due to climate, crop diversity, or natural resources of the state; and whether the Secretary has determined that an agricultural pest or disease in the state is a federal concern
- Clear focus on pests and/or diseases of significant regulatory concern (specifically Federal quarantine pests)

- Demonstrated benefit to more than one State based either on the nature of the work as scoped or the future potential to scale the work to a regional or national level
- Well-defined and achievable objectives and clear evidence that the technical approach will yield expected results
- Ability to yield significant and tangible results in one year
- The use of a new, innovative, or entrepreneurial approach
- A sufficiently detailed budget that allowed evaluators to determine if the scope of proposed work was commensurate with requested funding and that didn't seek to replace State funding with Federal funding or include expenses that are marginal to the successful implementation of the project
- Implementation durations of 3-years or less with funding requests for start-up costs associated with longer term projects (longer than 3 years) clearly defined
- A description of potential accomplishments in terms of real or tangible products and not just abstract concepts
- Evidence of progress towards achieving stated goals for projects requesting continued funding

## **Feedback by Goal Area**

### **Goal 1: Survey and Analysis**

*Analysis* – In FY12, the majority of suggestions that were recommended for funding focused on the development of new analytical tools for pathway visualization, risk analysis, survey methodology and economic decision making. The selected suggestions had clearly defined objectives with significant potential impact compared to cost. Additionally, many of the suggestions had synergy with or expanded the current scope of exotic pest detection efforts.

*Survey* – The survey suggestions that were recommended for funding provided brief, but sufficiently detailed information on the scope of the suggested survey. These suggestions were also consistent with the national guidance that was provided at the outset of the suggestion open period. Suggestions that did not follow this guidance or that did not specify the target pests, the mechanism for reporting data, and the possible return on the investment were not rated highly. Additionally, suggestions where the budget was deemed high or excessive, especially in instances where there was insufficient detail to determine if the proposed scope of work was commensurate with the requested funding were not rated highly.

### **Goal 2: Domestic Inspection**

In FY 12, the majority of suggestions that were recommended for funding utilized canine detection teams to improve plant pest detection in domestic settings that present high risk of moving plant pests, and to promote regulatory compliance. Additionally, those suggestions that had clearly defined processes and demonstrated significant partner engagement were rated highly.

### **Goal 3: Pest Identification and Technology**

In FY12, the majority of suggestions recommended for funding clearly indicated how plant pest detection efforts would improve within a one to three year time. Individual submitters who sought to understand the needs of pest programs by contacting APHIS staff prior to submitting their suggestion tended to address the most important issues and their suggestions tended to receive superior ratings for alignment with FY12 Farm Bill goals and objectives. Additionally, suggestions that were concise yet included technical descriptions, explained the benefits of the proposed work, did not include unnecessary steps or procedures, and itemized the budget with sufficient detail to allow reviewers to determine if funding requests were reasonable for salaries, equipment, supplies, travel and other expenses were highly rated. Suggestions to renew project funding for the second or third year that described progress and expectations for completion were more highly rated than those that did not provide the same information.

### **Goal 4: Safeguarding Nursery Systems**

In FY12, the majority of suggestions rated highly had clearly defined expected outcomes that were both tangible and measurable. Additionally, these suggestions often sought to make effective use of existing resources, can be accomplished in the near-term, and were sustainable in the long-term. Multi-year suggestions that were still in an exploratory or developmental stage and were part of a national coalition for managing pests and diseases in specialty crops also rated well. Suggestions that appeared to supplement existing, routine, state-level activities with federal funds and/or that requested funding for large infrastructure outlays (e.g., software development) were not recommended for funding.

### **Goal 5: Education and Outreach**

In FY12, the majority of suggestions recommended for funding typically provided a clear outline of activities that would be initiated and completed with FY12 funding, even if the suggested project was a multi-year effort; demonstrated a solid understanding of the target audience(s) and how to reach them; illustrated how suggested activities would build upon or enhance previously funded work; demonstrated an effort to engage a diversity of cooperators to amplify efforts; and proposed methods to obtain concrete measures of the impact of the suggestion's activities and deliverables. Examples include efforts to engage, recruit, and train the public and first detectors to look for and report high-consequence pests, particularly at vulnerable points in the safeguarding system (such as distribution centers) or along high-risk pathways; initiatives to develop or enhance relationships with key partners, such as Tribal Nations, to strengthen our safeguarding network and enhance pest detection or response capabilities; or efforts to create or sustain broad public awareness of invasive pests and the simple steps everyone can take to prevent their introduction or spread.

Suggestions that were not recommended for funding typically addressed pests or pathways of uncertain impact; did not clearly demonstrate how reaching a suggested audience would increase or enhance pest detection, reporting, or response efforts; or did not demonstrate how the proposed technical approach (including potential purchases of large amounts of equipment) would achieve the educational or outreach goals of the suggestion.

## **Goal 6: Enhanced Mitigation**

In FY12, the majority of suggestions that were recommended for funding typically involved multiple states and cooperators and addressed pest issues for which established pest program funding did not exist. Examples include a regional approach to host range testing of potential biological control agents of the brown marmorated stink bug, a regional strategic system for early detection of invasive species, management strategies and tactics for exotic pests during shipping, and sterilization and disposal of agricultural quarantine waste at ports. Suggestions that were not recommended for funding typically addressed pests of uncertain impact and were not clearly linked to existing APHIS pest mitigation efforts, technical experts or end users.

### **To Request Feedback Specific to Your Suggestion**

You may contact the Farm Bill Section 10201 FY12 Review Team by email at [PPQ.Section.farmbill-10201@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:PPQ.Section.farmbill-10201@aphis.usda.gov). Please include your name, phone number, the title of your suggestion, and the suggestion number (if known). A representative from the Goal Team that reviewed and evaluated your suggestion will contact you.

### **To Provide Feedback on the Farm Bill Section 10201 FY12 Suggestion Submittal and Evaluation Process**

Each year, we strive to improve the suggestion submission and evaluation process. To provide feedback on the FY12 submission and evaluation process, please complete the survey located on the National Plant Board Web site at <http://www.nationalplantboard.org/index.html>.