



Interagency Relations



Committee

Strategies Document and Phase 2
Action Plans

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 2

 History..... 2

 Reinvigorating the IRC 2

 The IRC and the Strategic Alliance..... 2

 Evaluating Current Communication Issues..... 3

Moving to Phase 2—Identifying and Acting on Solutions..... 7

 Defining the Partnership..... 7

 Identifying Strategies 7

Appendix 1: Action Plan for Roles and Responsibilities..... 9

Appendix 2: Action Plan for Orientation and Training 11

Appendix 3: Action Plan for Processes and Protocols..... 16

Appendix 4: Action Plan for Consultation and Engagement/Addressing Emerging Issues..... 19

Appendix 5: Action Plan for Collaborative Outreach..... 214

Introduction

History

The Interagency Relations Committee (IRC) was originally assembled in 2008 to explore ways Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) and the National Plant Board (NPB) could strengthen its relationship. As a result of several incidents that involved less than optimal communication, several issues were elevated to State Commissioners of Agriculture who in turn reached out to the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). The original IRC evaluated these incidents and explored root causes. The resulting action items placed a heavy focus on strengthening the relationship at the local level between the State Plant Regulatory Official (SPRO) and the State Plant Health Director (SPHD) and establishing more frequent communication between PPQ and NPB leadership through twice monthly calls and biannual face-to-face meetings. The IRC also established protocols to ensure (1) a standardized process for notifying States of new pest identifications and (2) information communicated by PPQ is communicated to SPHDs and SPROs simultaneously. PPQ assisted the NPB in strengthening their Regional and National meeting design and established the position of State Liaison to provide a point of contact to troubleshoot issues and provide advice and guidance to PPQ employees who interact with the NPB. These steps were effective in strengthening the SPHD-SPRO relationship and providing a clearer, more effective framework for communicating between the organizations.

Reinvigorating the IRC

In June 2014, the NPB Board of Directors and PPQ Management Team came together to discuss our longstanding partnership and identify shared priorities for which a collaborative effort at the organizational level could bring forth effective solutions. We defined our partnership as a strategic alliance that encompasses varying levels of engagement. On one end of the spectrum is simple networking or sharing of information. At the other end is full collaboration in which the interests of plant health safeguarding are best served by working side by side and fully integrating efforts. In the middle of the spectrum, engagement may involve coordination, of complementary activities not necessarily carried out together. Through our strategic alliance, we are able to bring together the best expertise, perspectives, authorities, and resources of each organization to further the mutual interest of safeguarding plants and natural resources.

The IRC and the Strategic Alliance

The strategic alliance was formalized in a Strategic Alliance document signed by the PPQ Deputy Administrator and the President of the NPB. Four initiatives were initially pursued under the alliance with an agreement to come together each year, evaluate the health of the alliance and identify new priorities to focus on. In 2015, the leadership of PPQ and the NPB recognized that significant turnover in both organizations and repeated restructurings within PPQ had caused a loss of knowledge of communication protocols and their purpose and caused some slippage in effective communication and engagement. They decided to reinvigorate the Interagency Relations Committee and in 2016, they made enhancing communication the top Strategic Alliance priority.

Evaluating Current Communication Issues

Development of Case Studies

Since June 2015, the IRC has been working to review, update, and reissue existing protocols and gather data on communications that worked well and those that were less than optimal. The IRC asked PPQ and NPB employees to partner in the development of case studies, which were selected based on four categories:

Category 1--Case studies involving decisions with impact on resources

FY 2015 reduction in funding for the emerald ash borer and gypsy moth programs
Authors: Geir Friisoe, Paul Chaloux

Category 2--Case studies involving issues of concern to states that appear to be less urgent/important to PPQ

Ralstonia reported by industry in December 2014
Authors: Bill Thomas, Geir Friisoe

Issues with strength of gypsy moth lure
Authors: Helmuth Rogg, Paul Chaloux, Dave Lance

Category 3--Emerging issues for which info/response is not fully developed or state/federal role is unknown or unclear

Response to flag smut in Kansas
Authors: Jeff Vogel, Craig Southwick (note: there may be PPQ hot wash information available on this issue as well)

Response to *Dickeya*
Authors: Ann Gibbs, Lynn Evans-Goldner

Thousand canker disease
Authors: Collin Wamsley, Scott Pfister

Category 4--Successful communications strategies

Plum Pox response in Pennsylvania
Authors: Mafalda Weldon, Coanne O'Hern, Ruth Welliver, Laurene Levy

Evaluation of Case Studies

The IRC evaluated the case studies based on two questions:

What worked well?

- ***Good communication between SPHD & SPRO*** - When the SPHD and SPRO were engaging in good communication, it had a positive impact on the outcome. When the relationship wasn't as strong, communication breakdowns were more likely. SPHD engagement helps ensure SPRO awareness of the issue and its importance; reinforces Agency message/decisions; provides opportunity to follow up and to identify issues for clarification. It also allows the SPHD and SPRO to establish communication protocols. Part of identified breakdowns were the result of numerous TDYs and instability in the workforce. Recent hiring should improve the situation.
- ***A clear communication structure*** - Having a clear communication structure (E.G. Farm Bill) and a commitment to communicate with clear expectations and timeframes that are honored.
- ***Flexibility*** - In evolving situations, being flexible and providing regular e-mail updates while the issue is active.
- ***Single point of contact*** - Having a designated point of contact with clear lines of communication and timely communication. Not having others in the organization injecting themselves into the process.
- ***Engagement across lines in PPQ*** - Sometimes issues can be worked out locally but what does that mean for issues that need to be addressed more broadly? Are they being identified and communicated across PPQ?
- ***A systematic process*** - as was the case for TCD. A new pest complex was identified, the New Pest Advisory Group evaluated it, a pathway assessment was developed, and there was a conference to bring researchers, the Forest Service, PPQ and States together for discussion and knowledge sharing. This cleared the way for states to work together to harmonize state regulations. However, researchers were not always providing helpful input into the mix.

What needs to happen?

- ***Communicate early in the response***- PPQ should notify, at least affected states, as early as possible. Even where information is limited, communicate what you can and can't communicate. PPQ should proceed with the understanding that some states can respond to a new pest in the absence of Federal action, but they need a decision from us before acting.

- ***Establish clear communication lines***- For the Chinese hickory furniture situation, the communications lines in PPQ were unclear and protocols were not followed. There were delays in PPQ's decision making. EANs were put off for 2 weeks and there were no communications in the time gaps. From May to September, no treatment was identified for use and little was communicated about treatment. Treatments were not always ground-truthed with operational realities. It wasn't clear who was driving the issue and there was no organized direction. There were no progress reports. The whole issue seemed to drift. When there is a new pathway, there is uncertainty about whether or how to regulate it and it affects timely response. Need to see more urgency in response/decision C
- ***Improve the speed of Federal decision making***- *Dickeya*: the speed of Federal decision making on the regulatory status was too slow. This industry is more challenging to deal with than some others. When the BMP document was issued, it wasn't clearly communicated that it was for the next crop year. Need to consider the concerns of states/industry about submitting samples that could lead to regulation, but also need to ensure that issues are surfaced before they become a problem whenever possible.
- ***Address uncertainty***- PPQ needs to figure out how to respond when learning about new pests and dealing with issues on the fly.
- ***Provide outreach to cooperators and stakeholders***- PPQ and the NPB should work to increase understanding among the research community about the impacts of public announcements for emerging pest issues where little is known about impacts and potential response. (TCD and *Dickeya*)
- ***Address novel pest pathways***- PPQ needs to find a better way to address new pathways that are outside the traditional field or forest environment (log furniture). These products are still potentially in international commerce, but have not led to infestation. Are the right staffs in PPQ coordinating the issue? Are they reaching out appropriately? Port issues cross over to other areas when the pest moves beyond the port.
- ***Jointly discuss needs with cooperators***- PPQ should be aware that some pests are of concern to the states even when they're not a Federal concern. *Ralstonia* is a good example. PPQ acted without knowing State concerns and was in discussion with industry without including State counterparts.
- ***Improve efficiency***- For new pest/pathway issues, it would have been more productive for states to spend downtime (while awaiting ID or decision) to do some "what-if" planning if it's identified as actionable.
- ***Manage responsibilities***- When a key player in PPQ is on leave/training, there needs to be a back-up and a hand-off of issues.
- ***Communicate openly***- PPQ should tell states something even if it's bad news or uncertainty.

- ***Involve appropriate parties in communication***- PPQ staff should be sure that SPHDs are in the loop when reaching out to individual states for information or consultation. SPHDs cannot reinforce positions or messages if they're not aware of them.
- ***Consider logistics*** - While PPQ works to resolve funding issues, be mindful that some states will have to make survey and hiring decisions sooner than others based on weather and climate.

Focus Groups

The IRC identified three case studies that the group felt could yield additional valuable insights through additional discussion. Three focus groups were held to facilitate this discussion and delve more deeply into each incident. The three focus groups were:

- Thousand canker disease (considered to be largely successful)
- Pine furniture incident (considered to be largely successful)
- Hickory furniture incident (considered to be unsuccessful)

The participants selected were directly involved in these responses and were from PPQ and impacted states. The same set of questions was used across focus groups to ensure a consistent process. Each group had a facilitator to guide the sessions and ask follow-up questions where appropriate, a designated note taker, and a critical issues manager to organize the session and validate the notes. The anonymous participant responses, recorded in the notes, were organized into the following categories:

- Understanding the Scope of PPQ and NPB
- Managing and Sharing Information
- Making Decisions
- Working together (PPQ and NPB)
- Communicating Internally in PPQ
- Communicating Internally in NPB
- Working with Cooperators and Stakeholders

Moving to Phase 2—Identifying and Acting on Solutions

Defining the Partnership

The IRC met during the week of March 20, 2017. As part of its discussion, the IRC came to consensus that a partnership:

- Is not threatening
- Understands one another's responsibilities, pressures, and strengths and weaknesses, as well as the capabilities and limitations on each side
- Understands that we function as a team
- Finds shared goals (safeguarding American Agriculture)
- Shares decision making
- Displays trust on both sides
- Collaborates in problem solving
- Communicates openly, honestly, and frequently
- Acts with good intention and assumes good intention
- Supports professionally expressed disagreement
- Shares in successes and failures equally
- Accepts that mistakes will be made and acknowledges mistakes
- Is multi-faceted and can occur within and across organizations
- Exists at multiple levels, between individual state, at a regional level, and at a national level

Identifying Strategies

With this concept of partnership in mind, the IRC used the data collected from the case studies and focus groups to drive its discussion and planning. The Committee developed problem statements based on the issues identified in the focus group sessions. The group then used the problem statements to discuss root causes and, based on the root causes, identified strategies that could be used to address the root causes.

The Interagency Relations Committee identified the following strategies:

1. Clarify roles and responsibilities around decision making, coordination, and communication at all levels.
2. Create a culture of communication and collaboration by increasing understanding of authorities and the many factors that affect public policy development.
3. Ensure that effective protocols and processes are used to support early engagement, sustained communication, and effective decision making on emerging issues.
4. Educate partners and key stakeholders on consequences of acting in the absence of regulatory decisions or evaluation of impacts of new pests.

The strategies have been translated into solution-oriented action plans. These action plans are focused on implementing solutions around roles and responsibilities, protocols and processes, orientation and training for PPQ and NPB, consultation and engagement, emerging issues, and collaborative outreach. The action plans can be found at the end of this document. The overarching goal is to ensure a culture of communication and collaboration in PPQ and the NPB supported by effective coordination, protocols, and processes.

Appendix 1: Action Plan for Roles and Responsibilities

Strategy: Clarify roles and responsibilities around decision making, coordination, and communication.

Problem Statement: PPQ roles and responsibilities for decision making and communications are not clear within either organization. There is a lack of central coordination and, with respect to Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection (AQI), no process for identifying key issues, who needs to be involved, and when and how to engage them.

Root Causes:

- PPQ has a complex organizational structure in PPQ- we don't have a simple way to explain how to navigate
- Changes in PPQ staffing have created a lack of continuity and unknowns for roles/responsibilities in PPQ and NPB.
- The historical handling of AQI issues has been different from the handling of domestic pest issues
- Turn over or changes creates a lack of consistency when handling pest issues

Purpose:

The purpose of Strategy 1 is to clarify PPQ and NPB roles and responsibilities around decision making, coordination, and communication in order to clearly communicate and understand each organization's structure (and how to navigate), plan for changes in staffing and establishing continuity, and to coordinate plant pest issues AQI or domestic.

Outcome:

The strategy can be broken down into several sub-steps:

1. Collect Organizational charts of both organizations- related to communication process.
 - a. Process to update this list (include frequency and staff changes)
2. PPQ review of Position descriptions – develop a program directory for NPB/external users
 - a. Posting in easily accessible place
3. Establishing a protocol for PPQ to notify State and the rest of the plant board of a critical issue (pest detection). When does the Plant Board president get notified with the state versus the entire NPB?
4. A Protocol/process for communicating AQI issues to states potentially impacted by movement.
5. Establishing a protocol for PPQ presenting information to NPB Executive Committee versus Board of Directors versus entire NPB.
6. Develop guidance document for states (for communicating with other states and PPQ)

Leads: Larry Nichols, Steve Crook

IRC Champions: Matt Travis / Larry Nichols

Completion Date:

Objective: Improve communication and coordination on critical pest issues by clarifying roles and responsibilities around decisions, coordination, and communication for PPQ and NPB.

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Developing PPQ organizational charts for communication based on pest/program.	June 2018			
Develop a process to update PPQ communication organization charts.	June 2018			
Developing guidance document for communication based on role/responsibility with NPB- also include how states raise issues to PPQ	June 2018			
Developing protocols for communication based on role/responsibility with PPQ	June 2018			

Appendix 2: Action Plan for Orientation and Training

Strategy: Create a culture of communication and collaboration by increasing understanding of authorities and the many factors that affect public policy development

Problem Statement: There is a lack of understanding or acceptance within PPQ, the NPB and among external stakeholders of Federal and State authorities, available resources and other factors as they relate to decision making and regulatory response.

Root Causes:

- There has been a loss of institutional knowledge due to staff turnover or reassignment of new people and new positions in both PPQ and the NPB
- There is currently no standardized onboarding process for new employees other than Plant Health Safeguarding Specialists in PPQ; new employees do not receive foundational information on key topics such as the Plant Protection Act (PPA) and the budget and appropriations processes, which can make some decisions difficult to understand
- New supervisors may not have the experience to mentor employees and help employees to link their work to mission goals
- There may be insufficient reinforcement at leadership levels that the role of regulation is evolving
- There has been a reluctance to accept that regulation is one of multiple pest response options, which may be due to a lack of broader knowledge or acceptance of factors other than science that support sound public policy
- States have many different authorities, resources, stakeholders, and economic situations or drivers and therefore take different approaches to regulating
- The NPB and Regional Plant Boards facilitate discussion and exchange of information among states and it is not always well understood within PPQ that they do not have authority over individual states
- Harmonization among state regulations may not be broadly accepted; need to begin with basic communication about the pest

Purpose: To provide clearer communication systems amongst NPB members to cultivate a more informed membership. Establish a broader familiarity amongst NPB members and PPQ of the range of regulatory options available, what has triggered them in the past [institutional knowledge issue created with staff turnover] and how, and through, what process could they be triggered in the future [collaboration is encouraged] Structured, additional interaction with PPQ and NPB **regional** leadership would have the effect of providing a clearer line of communication at a level lower than the national level of both organizations [enhances PPQ's understanding (and vice versa)] of the working of the NPB at the regional level and further individual states. Continue to change the culture (adversarial in some locations). Better communication and understanding between PPQ, state departments of agriculture, and NPB will lead to better and more widespread collaboration.

Outcome:

Develop a more informed NPB membership and PPQ field employees with fewer concerns and less need to contact NPB or PPQ leadership to deal with their concerns

Leads: Joe Collins, Katie Hough, Craig Montgomery

IRC Champions: Wendy Beltz, John Caravetta, Ann Gibbs

Completion Date:

Objective:

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Develop an orientation package and mentoring system for new SPROs/SPHDs				
Provide orientation training to new SPROs. Include information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The NPB website “basement” b. Communication of pest issues among states c. PPQ’s communication protocols d. Joint communication protocols and what to expect e. Federal-State regulatory authorities 				
Include PPQ/NPB key partnership-focused topic module on regional and National Plant Board meeting agendas.				
NPB strategic plan – highlight communication protocols				
Create an outreach tool to be a brief primer on available resources and other factors as they relate to decision making and regulatory response, for NGOs. Highlight successful engagement of NGOs.				
Provide orientation training to new National Operations Managers (NOM), National Policy Managers (NPM), and State Plant Health Directors (SPHD).				

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plant Protection Act 2. Relationship with NPB 3. Communication with NPB 4. Differences between PPQ and NPB and the differences between states 5. PPQ's communication protocols 6. Joint communication protocols and what to expect 				
<p>Provide refresher training to existing NOMs, NPMs, SPHDs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refresher on importance of relationship between NPB and PPQ 2. Refresher on communication 3. PPQ's communication protocols 4. Joint communication protocols and what to expect 				

Objective: Make sure existing onboarding programs (officer level and above) in PPQ include the NPB/PPQ communication protocols and tools.

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
PPQ's Cross Functional Managers Group (CFMG) is made up of Science and Technology, Field Operations, Policy Management and the Deputy Administrators office. The CFMG will establish on-boarding norms for Supervisors and above. The CFMG will ensure that on boarding for supervisors and above includes information related to PPQ/NPB working relationship and communication protocols.				
The State Plant Health Director (SPHD) and National Operations Manager (NOM) orientation sessions will include presentations from National Plant Board leadership				
Within PPQ, It will be the responsibility of supervisors to orient staff to the PPQ NPB relationships				

Objective: Develop modules for PPQ employees and NPB members on key topics including federal and state authorities (PPA), PPQ's decision framework, PPQ and NPB communication protocols, an NPB overview, a PPQ overview (mission, safeguarding continuum), Federal budget process, and alternatives to rule-making.

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Most of this information is available. The Interagency Relations Committee (IRC) should coordinate the development of webinars to share information with a wide audience including both PPQ and NPB.				
Explore the use of PPQ's DAP to identify a person to carry out this project.				
If possible, use recorded webinars/technology so that the information is available to not present				

Objective: For new SPHD orientation (perhaps through webinars), hold expert panels of National Policy Managers (NPM), National Operations Managers (NOM), State Plant Health Directors (SPHD), State Plant Regulatory Officials, (SPRO), to talk about how the NPB and PPQ work together. Roles and Responsibilities

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
PPQ is including these panels in both the SPHD and NOM orientations being planned for July, 2017				
Consider recording the panels so that the information is available to those not present				

Appendix 3: Action Plan for Processes and Protocols

Strategy: Ensure that effective protocols and processes are used to support early engagement, sustained communication, and effective decision making on emerging issues.

Problem Statement: As issues arise, PPQ does not always engage the NPB early enough and does not sustain communication with the NPB and other partners about decisions and actions throughout the lifecycle of the issue.

Root Causes:

- PPQ lacks accessible, documented communication processes and work flows which results in ambiguity about who is responsible for communicating and what information should be communicated to whom and when, both up and down the chain internally and with cooperators and stakeholders
- The protocols and tools are available but are not easily accessible
- Decisions are not always communicated through established channels
- PPQ fails to develop communication plans on a routine basis
- PPQ and NPB can be reluctant to share information or communicate what they know because assumptions may need to be validated (e.g. in an evolving budget situation), or there may be concerns about how information will be used or interpreted, or there may be questions about whether or not there is good intent
- Within PPQ there are varying levels of trust
- PPQ has a culture of over-thinking an issue
- PPQ may not have adequately communicated the importance of using the protocols/ tools and needs to create the expectation that they will be used
- Some PPQ personnel are not accepting of the simultaneous communication protocol and need to be aware that this protocol supports the final decision not the interim dialog
- The PPQ decision making process (the PPQ decision framework) has not been disseminated or socialized which can lead to a lack of understanding of when, why, and how decisions are made and inhibits the communication of decisions.
- The goal when dealing with a new pest is often ill-defined because there is no trigger or process to differentiate whether an issue is local or national or evolving from local to national.
- The NPB's structure and rotation schedule for officers means that continuity is provided only by the most experienced officers and the Executive Secretary. There is a lesser degree of stability in the leadership, which means knowledge is not always transferred effectively within the NPB.
- The diversity of membership in the NPB and differences in authorities, power structures, resources, and interests means that ideas and actions can differ widely across states.

Purpose: Establishing clear protocols and creating a transparent decision model helps create predictable processes and an orderly flow of information within PPQ and between PPQ and the National Plant Board. Making these protocols more accessible and creating expectations for their use will ensure employees not only have the right tools to be effective in engaging the NPB, but they are using those tools for engagement.

Outcome: Engaging the NPB sooner and more effectively will open stronger lines of communication and support greater trust between the organizations. It also creates the opportunity to gain additional insights, perspectives, and expertise as discussions occur and decision making evolves.

Leads: Paula Henstridge, Ann Gibbs

IRC Champions: Paula Henstridge and Geir Friisoe

Completion Date:

Objective:

Action Item	Due Date	Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Identify a PPQ site for a PPQ/NPB Partnership toolkit to house the communication protocols and tools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicitly link the compliance and enforcement matrix to the SPHD/SPRO dialog 			Paula Henstridge	
Require the SPHD to engage the SPRO in the use of the compliance and enforcement matrix and outreach planning tool when there is a local issue. This will help identify steps that can be taken locally and could be particularly helpful to support action while PPQ is evaluating the situation. NPB will inform SPROs of PPQ's requirement.				
Validate and reaffirm that existing communication protocols and tools are important and expected be followed at all levels. PPQ Management will discuss this with their chain of command. This will be an ongoing discussion as new protocols are developed or the protocols need to be refreshed.				
Refresh, update and recirculate the decision framework				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a library of applications of the decision framework • Revisit the communication portion of the decision framework 				
<p>Field Operations (FO) and Policy Management (PM) will work together to review and develop SOPs for managing urgent, domestic, and AQI issues (Including when day to day operational issues need to be elevated for PM coordination).</p>				
<p>The NPB will evaluate its leadership structure to ensure continued continuity through the Executive Secretary and by the development and deployment of training and orientation for new members.</p>				
<p>Develop a process to conduct hot washes after critical incidents</p>				

Appendix 4: Action Plan for Consultation and Engagement

Strategy: Ensure that effective protocols and processes are used to support early engagement, sustained communication, and effective decision making on emerging issues.

Problem Statement: As issues arise, PPQ does not always engage the NPB early enough and does not sustain communication with the NPB and other partners about decisions and actions throughout the lifecycle of the issue.

Root Causes:

- PPQ lacks accessible, documented communication processes and work flows which results in ambiguity about who is responsible for communicating and what information should be communicated to whom and when, both up and down the chain internally and with cooperators and stakeholders
- Decisions are not always communicated through established channels
- PPQ fails to develop communication plans on a routine basis
- PPQ has a culture of overthinking an issue
- PPQ does not always develop communication plans on a routine basis
- PPQ and NPB can be reluctant to share information or communicate what they know because assumptions may need to be validated (e.g. in an evolving budget situation), or there may be concerns about how information will be used or interpreted, or there may be questions about whether or not there is good intent
- Within PPQ there are varying levels of trust
- There are instances where PPQ may over-think an issue
- PPQ may not have adequately communicated the importance of using the protocols/ tools and needs to create the expectation that they will be used
- Some PPQ personnel are not accepting of the simultaneous communication protocol and need to be aware that this protocol supports the final decision not the interim dialog
- The PPQ decision making process (the PPQ decision framework) has not been disseminated or socialized which can lead to a lack of understanding of when, why, and how decisions are made and inhibits the communication of decisions.
- The goal when dealing with a new pest can be ill-defined because there is no trigger or process to differentiate whether an issue is local or national or evolving from local to national. – Sometimes there is confusion about how to respond. Evolutionary nature of an emerging pest issue challenges communication.

Purpose: Under this strategy, PPQ will design a mechanism with NPB leadership to discuss emerging pest issues. PPQ will also create a process (including criteria) to be used by the PPQ Management Team to determine when the agency would potentially provide support for pests that are not of Federal regulatory significance (e.g., facilitate dialog, identify available science or expertise, support methods development).

Outcome:

The expected outcome is to increase communication with NPB throughout our emerging pest evaluation process. Success will be determined when PPQ can accomplish the work required to evaluate emerging pests, NPB has the timely information they need to make decisions, provide

input, and follow up, and emerging plant health issues are addressed in a rapid and sustained manner.

Leads: Mary Palm, Valerie Defeo, Dana Rhodes

IRC Champions: Matt Rhoads, Scott Pfister, Collin Wamsley

Completion Date:

Objective: Develop enhanced process to engage SPRO throughout evaluation process

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Determine how SPHD interacts with SPRO during pest evaluation process	June/July 2017			Identify when SPHD discusses pest status with SPRO to better understand gaps in communication
Develop mechanism to engage NPB. Identify when NASDA needs to be engaged.				
Evaluate PPQ's pest response process to determine where appropriate to include SPRO in discussions	August 2017			QPAS and PDEP are currently evaluating their processes
Develop enhanced process to engage SPRO/NPB throughout evaluation process	September/October 2017			Determine if conversation with SPRO is sufficient and they can communicate out to NPB or if other regular NPB notification required
Update communication pieces in emergency framework and decision framework- possible output could be a job aid				
Create a list of pests that are not federally regulated, but have received federal support.	June 2017			The list does not need to be exhaustive
For each of the listed pests, document the purpose and type of federal support.	June 2017			
Identify outcomes of that support and if the intended purpose was achieved.	June 2017			

Create a list of the types of Federal support provided.	July 2017			
Identify criteria associated with determining why federal support was provided.	August 2017			
Determine a trigger for PPQ providing federal support.	August 2017			
Create a checklist of management options associated with providing federal support to be used during decision making.	September 2017			
Build the checklist, criteria and trigger(s) into the new pest response manual	September 2017			

Notes: Ideas from Collin

Examples of pests not federally regulated: Dickeya, wheat flag smut, corn Xanthomonas, spotted lanternfly, Thrips setosus.

Determine a trigger for PPQ involvement/support of a pest that is not federally regulated:

A.

1. Poses a significant threat to a state or states plant resources, and
2. Artificial movement via interstate commerce is likely, and
3. State regulatory actions could prevent the spread.

An example of something that would not fit the above criteria would be brown marmorated stink bug. 1 and 2 above are true but not 3.

B. Could it affect international trade?

C. Is it eligible for FRSMP?

D. How could PPQ and NPB leadership (and affected states?) work together to make a determination?

E. How would it be communicated/discussed with NPB to arrive at a decision (this question overlaps with some of the other Strategy areas).

F. What form of support? (pathway assessment, development of survey methods and phytosanitary treatments, involvement with international trade partners?, farm bill 10007 funding to help address the pest?)

Appendix 5: Action Plan for Collaborative Outreach

Strategy: Educate state partners and academic stakeholders about the consequences of holding information about a new pest detection or taking action before PPQ and NPB officials evaluate the pest's potential impact and decide whether/how to regulate the pest. Potential/unintended consequences might include:

- Disruption of domestic or international trade due to dissemination of incorrect or incomplete information about a pest situation
- Inability to eradicate a pest because we could not delimit and control it when it was first detected (when the possibility of eradication was greatest)
- Decreased opportunity to conduct trace-backs/trace-forwards and close pest entry pathways, making us vulnerable to similar pest incursions in the future
- Unabated pest spread and increased mitigation costs
- Over response or over regulation of a situation especially by states who "hear about something through the grapevine"

Problem Statement:

PPQ and NPB are not actively or consistently educating state/academic stakeholders about the potential/unintended consequences of holding pest detection information or taking action before PPQ and NPB officials evaluate the pest’s potential impact and decide whether/how to regulate the pest.

Root Causes:

- Stakeholder motivations vary when it comes to holding or releasing information about or taking action in response to a new pest detection. Different stakeholders have different interests and goals, including the desire to pursue financial or competitive gain, publish research, or respond to internal or external pressures.
- Stakeholders are generally unaware of the consequences of their actions.

Purpose: To develop consistent messaging and identify specific communications methods PPQ and NPB should use to explain when/how/why state and academic stakeholders should share new pest detection information and/or take (or not take) action in response to a new pest detection.

Outcome: Informed stakeholders will notify PPQ and NPB of new pests immediately after detection.

Leads: Heather Curlett, John Caravetta

IRC Champions: Heather Curlett, John Caravetta

Completion Date:

Objective: A detailed communications plan that includes a suite of information materials and key messages tailored to each audience.

Action Item	Due Date	Date Completed	Assigned To	Comments
Assemble working group				

Interagency Relations Committee Strategies Document and Phase 2 Action Plans

Identify key audiences and their information needs				
Determine core messaging for each group				
Identify most appropriate method(s) for delivering information to each audience (i.e., brochure, stakeholder announcement, presentation, etc.)				
Develop schedule/determine frequency for delivering information to key audiences				

Appendix 6: Parking Lot

The issues in the table below were considered to be simple steps that can be taken without recourse to a working group effort.

Parking lot	Solutions
Lack of guidance for how to submit pest specimens for confirmation (forms, process, people...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPQ's National Identification Services (NIS) needs to provide guidance and ensure it has clear policy related to processing of diagnostic requests other than at the port environment context (309 vs. 391) There needs to be a reach back to the Plant Board before NIS comes up with policy (Matt Rhoads and Craig Southwick) • Review SPHD SPRO dialog to include conversations about Smuggling Interdiction and Trade Compliance (Paula Henstridge)
The NPB relies too heavily on email as the method of sharing information with its members.	NPB Executive committee will discuss
APHIS employees who engage Public Information Officers (PIO) in the States are not always aware that the PIOs generally work for the State Commissioner of Agriculture, which could result in the SPRO not being aware of the engagement. Building such awareness would help them know when and how to loop SPROs in.	Heather Curlett and John Caravetta will work with APHIS, Legislative and Public Affairs develop some recommended protocols for how and when to keep the Communications Officers of the State Departments of Agriculture (PIOs) in the loop.
Share compliance and enforcement matrix at regional plant board meetings	AEDs?