

# **GB STRATEGY REVIEW: MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **Background**

This paper sets out the main findings and recommendations of the GB Strategy review, based on a paper presented to the GB Programme Board in April 2014. Relevant articles from the proposed EU Invasive Alien Species Regulation are presented alongside the recommendations.

## **1. Governance/Funding**

### ***What we found:***

- a. General concern of lack of transparency, particularly with the operation of the Programme Board;
- b. The Programme Board bogged down in detailed delivery issues rather than substantive strategic issues;
- c. Concern over lack of senior level representation on the Programme Board, particularly with regard to Agencies where level of seniority has declined since its inception;
- d. There needs to be a full and proper assessment of the resources available, to inform what the Board can achieve currently; and a further evaluation of the resources required to deliver any additional work made necessary as a consequence of the IAS Regulation and the Strategy Review.
- e. Push from some quarters for NGO seat at the Programme Board;
- f. Scottish and Welsh Country Working Groups considered valuable, setting country-specific priorities and focusing on delivery;
- g. Rapid Response Working Group has not made sufficient progress;
- h. Media and Comms group lacking focus, expertise and access to resources;
- i. Secretariat performs a critical and highly effective co-ordinating role but concerns that it is under-resourced;
- j. GB spends a fraction of what Australia/New Zealand spends on INNS and what GB spends on animal/plant health threats.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Role of the Programme Board should primarily be focused on strategic issues including future threats and resourcing;

C. Lee and O. Booy

19/5/14

1

2. Maintain the membership of the Programme Board as Government-only;
3. Encourage more senior representation on Programme Board, particularly from the Agencies;
4. Undertake an assessment of resources required to underpin the GB Strategy and implement the EU IAS Regulation.
5. Invite Animal/Plant/Fish Health/Biosecurity colleagues onto the Programme Board to strengthen links;
6. To complement Scottish and Welsh Working Groups, re-invigorate English Working Group with focus on delivery, clear terms of reference and strong NGO/trade presence;
7. Reinvigorate stakeholder sounding board and maintain annual Stakeholder Forum as mechanisms to allow stakeholders to be kept informed and enable Government to gauge views on particular issues;
8. Develop pathway, sector or species-specific groups but these should be clearly defined, focused with clear outcomes e.g. avian group;
9. Reinvigorate Rapid Response Working Group (more in Rapid Response);
10. Greater input in Media and Comms group from NGOs/trade and specialists in communications;
11. Embed INNS throughout relevant biosecurity strategies/initiatives;
12. Involve/incentivise local authorities to help deliver Strategy.
13. Secretariat to continue to make use of extra, short term resources to deliver specific projects;

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

***Article 27 - Committee***

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee. That committee shall be a committee within the meaning of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 and may be assisted in its tasks by the Scientific Forum referred to in Article 28.

## 2. Prevention

The GB Strategy covers a number of distinct issues within the prevention chapter, including: pathway management, risk analysis, ISAPs, horizon scanning and contingency planning. We have considered these separately below.

### Pathways

#### ***What we found:***

- a. Greater priority should be given to pathway management;
- b. Pathway prioritisation is required before the development of pathway action plans. This should learn from experience elsewhere (i.e. from Australia/New Zealand; Animal and Plant Health);
- c. Pathway Action Plans should be developed for priority pathways, with the use of working groups. Consideration should be given to establishing a working group with oversight of all pathways.

#### ***What we recommend:***

1. A robust approach to prioritising pathways should be developed. This should be based on potential impact and effectiveness of management. Insight from Animal and Plant Health and other countries should be sought;
2. Priority pathways should be analysed to identify how they operate (e.g. origins, route, volume, temporal, spatial trends) and how risk can be reduced most effectively;
3. Pathway Action Plans should be developed for priority pathways in partnership with relevant trade and NGO partners. They should consider: pre border, border and post border actions. They should consider, but not be limited to: awareness raising, voluntary agreements, codes of conduct, legislation and regulation;
4. Where relevant, greater engagement should be sought with other EU Member States and 3rd countries to improve pre border prevention;
5. Greater integration with the Animal and Plant Health regimes should be sought, e.g. on Border Inspections;
6. Pathway Action Plans should be monitored and evaluated.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

**Article 13 - Action plans on the pathways of invasive alien species**

1. Member States shall, within 18 months from the adoption of the list referred to in Article 4(1) of this Regulation carry out a comprehensive analysis of the pathways of unintentional introduction and spread of invasive alien species of Union concern, at least, in their territory, as well as in their marine waters as defined in Article 3(1) of Directive 2008/56/EC, and identify the pathways which require priority action ('priority pathways'), because of the volume of species or of the potential damage caused by the species entering the Union through them.
2. Within three years from the adoption of the list referred to in Article 4(1) , each Member State shall establish and implement one single action plan or a set of action plans to address the priority pathways it has identified pursuant to paragraph 1 of this Article. Action plans shall include timetables for action and shall describe the measures to be adopted and, as appropriate, voluntary actions and codes of good practice, to address the priority pathways and to prevent the unintentional introduction and spread of invasive alien species into or within the Union.
3. Member States shall ensure coordination with the aim of establishing one single action plan or a set of action plans coordinated at the appropriate regional level according to the provisions of Article 22(1). Where such regional plans are not established, Member States shall establish and implement action plans covering their territory, as far as possible coordinated at the appropriate regional level.
4. The action plans referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article shall include, in particular, measures based on an analysis of costs and benefits, in order to:
  - a. raise awareness;
  - b. minimise contamination of goods and commodities, and any vehicle and equipment by specimens of invasive alien species , including measures tackling transportation of invasive alien species from third countries;
  - c. ensure appropriate checks at the Union borders, other than the official controls pursuant to Article 15;
5. The action plans developed in accordance with paragraph 2 shall be transmitted to the Commission without delay. At least every six years after the last transmission, Member States shall review the action plan and retransmit it

to the Commission.

**Article 15 (paragraphs 1 and 2 only) - Official controls**

1. By ... (12 months after entry into force), Member States shall have in place fully functioning structures to perform the official controls necessary to prevent the intentional introduction into the Union of invasive alien species of Union concern. These official controls shall apply to the categories of goods falling within the Combined Nomenclature codes to which a reference is made in the list of invasive alien species of Union concern, pursuant to Article 4(5).
2. Competent authorities shall perform the appropriate risk-based controls on the goods mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article verifying that:
  - a. they are not on the list referred to in Article 4(1); or
  - b. they are covered by a valid permit as referred to in Article 8.

### 3. Risk Analysis

#### ***What we found:***

- a. There is concern that resources and action in GB are not sufficiently prioritised (too much focus is paid to well-established species). The risk analysis mechanism needs to be developed to help prioritise resources more strategically;
- b. Specifically in relation to the risk assessment process:
  - The process is sometimes too slow;
  - There needs to be a more transparent link between risk assessments and policy decisions;
  - The results of risk assessments need to be communicated more clearly;
  - Accuracy of current risk assessment process is favourable compared to other schemes.

#### ***What we recommend:***

1. The risk analysis mechanism should be further developed to support strategic prioritisation of resources, in particular through the development of a risk management tool;
2. The link between risk assessments, risk management and policy decisions should be made more transparent and better communicated;
3. Continue to review and revise the risk assessment mechanism in the light of international developments (particularly in relation to the EU Regulation, and those of Animal and Plant Health);
4. Increase the speed of the process by:
  - focusing on the production of rapid risk assessments;
  - expanding the database of risk assessment experts;
  - providing better/clearer guidance to support risk assessment experts;
  - producing summarised datasheets to make it easier for experts to undertake risk assessment.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

**Article 5 - Risk assessment**

1. The risk assessment referred to in Article 4(3)(d) shall be carried out, across the current and potential range of invasive alien species, having regard to the following elements:
  - (a) a description of the species with its taxonomic identity, its history, natural and potential range;
  - (b) a description of its reproduction and spread patterns and dynamics including an assessment of whether the environmental conditions necessary for reproduction and spread exist;
  - (c) a description of the potential pathways of introduction and spread, both intentional and unintentional, including where relevant the commodities with which the species are generally associated;
  - (d) a thorough assessment of the risk of introduction , establishment, spread in relevant biogeographical regions in current conditions and in foreseeable climate change conditions;
  - (e) a description of the current distribution of the species including whether the species is already present in the Union or in neighbouring countries and a projection of its likely future distribution ;
  - (f) a description of the adverse impact on biodiversity and the related ecosystem services, including on native species, protected sites, endangered habitats, as well as on human health, safety, and the economy including an assessment of the potential future impacts having regard to available scientific knowledge ;
  - (g) an assessment of the potential costs of damage;
  - (h) a description of the known uses and social and economic benefits deriving from those uses.
2. The Commission shall carry out the risk assessments referred to in Article 4(3)(d), having regard to the elements referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article, when proposing species for listing as invasive alien species of Union concern. Whenever a Member State submits a request for the inclusion of a

species on the list of invasive alien species of Union concern it shall be responsible for carrying out a risk assessment having regard to the elements of paragraph 1 of this Article. Where necessary, the Commission may assist the Member States in the development of such risk assessments in so far as it relates to their European dimension.

3. The Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts, in accordance with Article 29 to further specify the type of evidence acceptable in Article 4(3)(b) and provide a detailed description of the application of points (a) to (h) of paragraph 1 of this Article. The detailed description shall include the methodology to be applied in the assessment of such elements taking into account relevant national and international standards and the need to prioritise action against species associated with, or that have the potential to cause, significant adverse impacts on biodiversity or the related ecosystem services, as well as on human health or the economy being considered as aggravating factors. It is of particular importance that the Commission follow its usual practice and carry out consultations with experts, including Member States' experts, before adopting those delegated acts.

## 4. Horizon Scanning and Contingency Planning

### ***What we found:***

- a. Horizon scanning needs to be better integrated and communicated;
- b. There is a need for more contingency plans;
- c. Funding to deliver contingency plans should be agreed in advance as part of the planning process;
- d. Where possible generic contingency plans should be developed, for example based on taxonomic group or environment.

### **What we recommend:**

1. A clear process for horizon scanning should be adopted, involving a broad range of stakeholders. It should track emerging threats and review these on a regular basis, making more use of international intelligence and trends in pathways;
2. More contingency plans should be developed for high priority species, as identified by the Programme Board;
3. Contingency plans should be developed in consultation with stakeholders and clearly identify: roles and responsibilities, funding, communications, etc.;
4. Expertise and capacity for delivering contingency responses should be developed across government and relevant stakeholders, for example by developing centres of excellence and sharing capacity with Animal and Plant Health.

**There is no specific corresponding section within the EU IAS Regulation**

## 5. Early detection, surveillance, monitoring

### ***What we found:***

- a. NNSIP is an important hub. It needs to be maintained and developed (e.g. updated species information, better links with NBN, functionality, etc.);
- b. Good progress on alert mechanism, but
  - needs promotion and better integration with other schemes (Animal and Plant Health as well as international surveillance schemes e.g. that of EPPO);
  - The process of verification and reporting should be more robust;
  - Stakeholders want both email and online system.
- c. Gaps in existing surveillance (e.g. freshwater invertebrates) should be identified and prioritised;
- d. Dedicated surveillance required for priority species, vulnerable habitats and high risk pathways. Hotspot analysis should be used to target surveillance;
- e. Data flow remains a critical issue, particularly between government bodies. Much greater buy in across government, trade and NGO sector required.
- f. Need to integrate with WFD, MSFD and EU Regulation requirements.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Continue to maintain and develop NNSIP; increase efforts to improve data flow, particularly from government agencies;
2. Alert system to be more robust, with clear protocols, resources for verification and lines of reporting. Integrate with other relevant and developing schemes (e.g. Animal and Plant Health, response to IAS Regulation, EPPO, NOBANIS etc);
3. Review detection and surveillance capabilities in the light of policy requirements (WFD, MSFD and IAS Regulation), horizon scanning and pathway analysis. Priority gaps should be identified and remedied;
4. Dedicated surveillance systems, targeted using hotspot analysis, should be developed for high priority species and/or pathways;
5. High priority species should be made notifiable where appropriate.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

***Article 14 - Surveillance system***

1. Within 18 months from the adoption of the list referred to in Article 4(1) , Member States shall establish a surveillance system of invasive alien species of Union concern, or include it in their existing system, which collects and records data on the occurrence in the environment of invasive alien species by survey, monitoring or other procedures to prevent the spread of invasive alien species into the Union.
2. The surveillance system referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall:
  - (a) cover the territory, including marine territorial waters, of the Member States to determine the presence and distribution of new as well as already established invasive alien species of Union concern;
  - (b) be sufficiently dynamic to detect rapidly the appearance in the environment of the territory or part of the territory of any invasive alien species of Union concern, whose presence was previously unknown;
  - (c) build upon, be compatible with, and avoid duplication of relevant provisions for assessment and monitoring laid down by Union law or under international agreements and make use of the information provided by the existing systems of surveillance and monitoring set out in Article 11 of Directive 92/43/EEC, Article 11 of Directive 2008/56/EC and Article 8 of Directive 2000/60/EC;
  - (d) take into account the relevant transboundary impacts and transboundary features, to the extent possible .

***Article 16 - Early detection notifications***

1. Member States shall use the surveillance system established in accordance with Article 14 and the information collected at official controls provided for by Article 15 to confirm early detection of the introduction or presence of invasive alien species of Union concern.
2. Member States shall notify in writing the Commission without delay of the early detection of the presence of invasive alien species of Union concern and inform the other Member States, in particular:
  - (a) the appearance on their territory or part of their territory of any species included on the list referred to in Article 4(1) whose presence was previously unknown in their territory or in part of their territory;
  - (b) the re-appearance on their territory or part of their territory of any species included on the list of invasive alien species of Union concern after it has been reported as eradicated.

## 6. Rapid response

### ***What we found:***

- a. More resources should be targeted towards eradicating species where eradication is considered feasible;
- b. Lack of funding and clear lines of responsibility are critical issues – related to lack of clear statutory responsibilities;
- c. Other barriers to delivering rapid responses include:
  - Access to land;
  - Capacity and expertise to deliver the response;
  - Communications and handling sensitive situations;
  - Restrictions on use of eradication techniques and speed of granting permits.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Risk analysis should be used to help identify and prioritise more species for rapid eradication in GB;
2. Rapid eradication of priority species, as determined by the Programme Board, should be a clear priority for delivery bodies;
3. Agencies should regularly update the Programme Board on progress towards eradicating priority species;
4. Contingency plans, with clear roles, responsibilities and funding should be developed in advance of suspected incursions. Where relevant, industry and the NGO sector should be involved;
5. The Rapid Response Working Group should:
  - Review lessons learnt from rapid responses to date;
  - Review and improve protocols for undertaking rapid eradication;
  - Engage with industry and NGO stakeholders to identify their roles in supporting rapid eradication initiatives;
6. Capacity and expertise in delivering rapid response should be identified and developed. Practitioners should be encouraged to share good practice within GB, across the EU and internationally;
7. Review media and communications lessons learnt in relation to sensitive eradication attempts and provide guidance for improvement.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

***Article 17 - Rapid eradication at an early stage of invasion***

1. After early detection and within three months after the transmission of the early detection notification referred to in Article 16, Member States shall apply eradication measures and notify those measures to the Commission and inform the other Member States.
2. When applying eradication measures, Member States shall ensure that the methods used are effective in achieving the complete and permanent removal of the population of the invasive alien species concerned, with due regard to human health and the environment, especially for non-targeted species and their habitats, and ensuring that animals are spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering.
3. Member States shall monitor the effectiveness of the eradication. Member States may use the surveillance system provided for in Article 14 to this effect. The monitoring shall also assess the impact on non-targeted species, as appropriate.
4. Member States shall inform the Commission of the effectiveness of the measures taken and notify the Commission when a population of an invasive alien species of Union concern has been eradicated. They shall also provide this information to other Member States concerned.

***Article 18 - Derogations from the rapid eradication obligation***

1. Member States may, based on robust scientific evidence decide, within two months of the detection of an invasive alien species referred to in Article 16, not to apply eradication measures if at least one of the following conditions is met:
  - (a) eradication is demonstrated to be technically unfeasible because the eradication methods available cannot be applied in the environment where the species are established;
  - (b) a cost-benefit analysis demonstrates on the basis of the available data with reasonable certainty that the costs will, in the long term, be exceptionally high and disproportionate to the benefits of eradication;
  - (c) eradication methods are not available or are available but have very serious adverse impacts on human health , the environment or other species .

In this case, the Member State concerned shall notify without delay the Commission of its decision in writing. The notification shall be accompanied by all the evidence referred to in points (a), (b) and (c) of this Article.

2. The Commission may decide, by way of implementing acts, to reject the decision notified in accordance with paragraph 1 of this Article where the conditions set out therein are not met.
3. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 27(2). The draft implementing acts shall be submitted to the Committee referred to in Article 27(1) within two months of the date of notification.
4. Member States shall ensure that containment measures are in place to avoid further spread of the species to other Member States when, pursuant to paragraph 1 of this Article, no eradication measures are applied.

## 7. Mitigation, control and eradication

### ***What we found:***

- a. Long term management of well-established species is often not well coordinated or strategic at a regional or national level. ISAPs largely focused on eradication, but strategies including containment and control should also be developed for established species;
- b. Priorities for well-established species are not always well communicated to stakeholders, who as a result are uncertain how to provide support;
- c. Slowing the spread of species (i.e. biosecurity) is a critical part of long term management. Biosecurity initiatives should be more ambitious, better resourced and joined up with other relevant government initiatives;
- d. LAGs play an important role in long term management as well as a wide range of other actions;
- e. GB islands are particularly important to protect, even if the species is well established in the mainland;
- f. Species actions already underway in GB are not well monitored or recorded.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. A decision support system is required to help prioritise strategic responses for well-established species at a GB, national and regional level. Resources should be focussed on delivering these strategic responses;
2. More ISAPs are required to help communicate strategic priorities at a GB, national and regional level. These should:
  - Be developed in partnership with stakeholders;
  - Clearly set out the strategic approach (on a regional basis if relevant) so that all stakeholders at varying scales can support the plan.
3. There is a need for greater awareness of, and compliance with, good biosecurity practice.
  - Methods and pathways of internal spread within GB should be assessed and prioritised according to risk;
  - Biosecurity plans should be identified to target priority pathways, including focussing effort in key areas of spread (i.e. hotspots) and areas most likely to be effected (e.g. sensitive habitats).
4. Species-specific actions underway in GB should be recorded on a central database. This should be a minimum requirement of any government sponsored control work;

5. Maintain LAGs' independence but improve mechanisms to facilitate/support them to effect better co-ordination, prioritisation of action, access to funding etc., potentially through a dedicated LAGs' co-ordinator.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

**Article 19 - Management measures**

1. Within 18 months of an invasive alien species being included on the list of invasive alien species of Union concern at the latest, Member States shall have in place effective management measures for those invasive alien species of Union concern which the Member States have found to be widely spread on their territory, so that their impacts on biodiversity, the related ecosystem services, and, where applicable, on human health or the economy are minimised.

Those management measures shall be proportionate to the impact on the environment and tailored to the specific circumstances of the Member States, be based on an analysis of costs and benefits and also include, as far as feasible, the restoration measures referred to in Article 20. They shall be prioritised based on the risk evaluation and their cost effectiveness.

2. The management measures shall consist of lethal or non-lethal physical, chemical or biological actions aimed at the eradication, population control or containment of a population of an invasive alien species. Where appropriate, management measures shall include actions applied to the receiving ecosystem aimed at increasing its resilience to current and future invasions. The commercial use of already established invasive alien species may be temporarily allowed as part of the management measures aimed at their eradication, population control or containment, under strict justification and provided that all appropriate controls are in place to avoid any further spread.
3. When applying management measures, Member States shall ensure that the methods used have due regard for human health and the environment especially for non-targeted species and their habitats and that, when animals are targeted, they are spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering, without compromising the effectiveness of the management measures .
4. The surveillance system provided for in Article 14 shall be designed and used to monitor how effective eradication, population control or containment measures are in minimising the impacts on biodiversity, the related ecosystems services, and, where applicable, on human health or the economy. The monitoring shall also assess the impact on non-targeted species, as appropriate.
5. Where there is a significant risk that an invasive alien species of Union

concern will spread to another Member State, the Member States in which the species is present shall immediately notify the other Member States and the Commission. Where appropriate, the Member States concerned shall establish jointly agreed management measures. In the cases where third countries may also be affected by the spread, the Member State affected shall endeavour to inform the concerned third countries.

***Article 20 - Restoration of the damaged ecosystems***

1. Member States shall take appropriate restoration measures to assist the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed by invasive alien species of Union concern unless a cost-benefit analysis demonstrates, on the basis of the available data and with reasonable certainty, that the costs of those measures will be high and disproportionate to the benefits of restoration .
2. The restoration measures referred to in paragraph 1 shall include at least the following:
  - (a) measures to increase the ability of an ecosystem exposed to disturbance caused by the presence of invasive alien species of Union concern to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of disturbance;
  - (b) measures to support the prevention of reinvasion following an eradication campaign.

## 8. Building Awareness

### ***What we found:***

- a. Building awareness is critical to the Strategy going forward;
- b. Our current approach lacks the boldness of Australia's or New Zealand's, particularly at borders;
- c. Anecdotal evidence and recent research from Leeds University suggests "Check, Clean, Dry" and "Be Plant Wise" campaigns have had some success, but little evaluation and concern momentum may be waning;
- d. NNSS website important and valued tool;
- e. Broad initiatives are costly; targeted initiatives more cost effective;
- f. Public attitudes survey provided a useful baseline but needs repeating to gauge change and inform communications strategy;
- g. Scope to disseminate information has been impacted by recent marketing freeze in England;
- h. NGOs have good experience of campaigning, more flexibility and less affected by the vagaries of Government;
- i. Whilst some NGOs/trade bodies have been committed and effective at disseminating information, others need to be more involved.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Commitment to on-going action to reassess public attitudes to inform communications strategy;
2. Media and Comms group to review its existing plan, with input from NGOs/trade and specialists in communications;
3. Charge Media and Comms group to:
  - a. Maintain and build on success of existing campaigns but evaluate them and look to refresh;
  - b. work with NGOs/trade bodies to make better use of existing mechanisms to disseminate consistent messages e.g. monthly magazines;
  - c. More targeted communications aimed at key sectors including codes of practice;
  - d. Work with Animal and Plant Health colleagues to develop consistent messaging around biosecurity and maximise opportunities;
  - e. Consider on-going messaging campaign at ports/airports as in Australia/New Zealand to target key (and captive) audience.
4. Continue to maintain, update and develop the NNSS website;

5. Continue to develop training tools including online resources.

**Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

***Article 26 - Public participation***

Where action plans are being established pursuant to Article 13 of this Regulation and where measures are being established pursuant to Article 19 of this Regulation, Member States shall ensure that the public is given early and effective opportunities to participate in their preparation, modification or review using the arrangements already determined by the Member States in accordance with the second subparagraph of Article 2(3) of Directive 2003/35/EC.

Note: there is also reference to awareness raising in Article 13 (pathway action plans)

## 9. Legislation

### **What we found:**

- a. Lack of statutory powers of compulsion/access in England and Wales seriously impacts on our ability to take appropriate control measures;
- b. Concerns expressed over length of time to list under schedule 9 in England and Wales, with Wildlife and Countryside Link recommending an emergency listing process;
- c. Existing powers could be used more effectively;
- d. Enforcement is inconsistent across Agencies.

### **What we recommend:**

1. The Programme Board to consider and make recommendations on adequacy of legislative regimes, including powers to implement EU regulation;
2. Species control orders should be introduced in England and Wales as a matter of urgency;
3. Schedule 9 in its present form in England and Wales is fit for purpose;
4. Improve enforcement and ensure consistent approach across regulators.

### **Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

#### **Article 4 (paragraph 1 only) - List of invasive alien species of Union concern**

1. The Commission shall adopt, by way of implementing acts, a list of invasive alien species of Union concern on the basis of the criteria laid down in paragraph 3 of this Article . Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 27(2). The draft implementing act shall be submitted to the Committee referred to in Article 27(1) by ... (20) .

#### **Article 7 - Restrictions**

Invasive alien species of Union concern shall not be intentionally:

- (a) brought into the territory of the Union, including transit under customs supervision ;
- (b) kept, including in contained holding;
- (c) bred, including in contained holding;
- (d) transported to, from or within the Union , except for the transportation of species to facilities in the context of eradication;

- (e) placed on the market;
- (f) used or exchanged;
- (g) permitted to reproduce, grown or cultivated , including in contained holding;
- (h) released into the environment.

**Article 10 (paragraph 1 only) - Emergency measures**

1. Where a Member State has evidence concerning the presence in, or imminent danger of introduction into its territory of an invasive alien species, which is not included on the list of invasive alien species of Union concern but which the relevant competent authorities have found, on the basis of preliminary scientific evidence, to be likely to meet the criteria set out in Article 4(3), it may immediately take emergency measures, consisting of any of the restrictions set out in Article 7(1).

**Article 12 - Invasive alien species of Member State concern**

1. Member States may establish a national list of invasive alien species of Member State concern. For these invasive alien species, Member States may apply, in their territory, measures such as those provided for in Articles 7, 8, 13 to, 17, 19 and 20, as appropriate. Those measures shall be compatible with the TFEU and be notified to the Commission in accordance with the Union law.
2. Member States shall inform the Commission and the other Member States of the species they consider as invasive alien species of Member State concern and of the restrictions set out in accordance with paragraph 1.

Note: more detail on Articles 4 and 10 can be found in the full Regulation.

## 10. Research

### ***What we found:***

- a. Research on invasive non-native species is not well coordinated in GB and lacks strategic focus;
- b. Funding bodies should be encouraged to fund more research on invasive non-native species and to align with strategic priorities;
- c. Benefits could be made by collaborating more closely with other countries (particularly Ireland);
- d. More practical research is required on control and management methods, working with practitioners and facilitating the sharing of good practice.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Establish a working group with responsibility for improving coordination, developing a strategic plan, communicating with the research community and influencing funders of research;
2. Publish strategic research requirements set against the priorities of the GB Strategy and other policy needs (e.g. IAS Regulation, WFD, MSFD);
3. Collate and maintain a database of commissioned research on invasive non-native species in GB (and elsewhere where relevant);
4. Seek opportunities for collaboration with other countries in order to maximise benefits and reduce duplication of effort;
5. Encourage practitioners to record, report and share good practice, for example by hosting an annual seminar on management techniques and/or encouraging publication of advances in the relevant literature.

### **Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

#### ***Article 28- Scientific Forum***

The Commission shall ensure the participation of representatives of the scientific community appointed by the Member States to provide advice on any scientific question related to the application of this Regulation, in particular as regards Articles 4, 5, 10 and 18. They shall meet in a Scientific forum. The rules of procedure of that forum shall be established by the Commission.

## 11. Information Exchange

### ***What we found:***

- a. Mainstreaming of INNS into wider policies/initiatives needs improving;
- b. Lack of co-ordination across the LAGs network means the benefits of action may not be maximised or deliver against regional or national priorities;
- c. Recognise the need to develop formal mechanism to share information and develop strategies with those Member States with shared objectives;
- d. NNSS could make better use of new media.

### ***What we recommend:***

1. Continue to input into wider policy and biosecurity initiatives;
2. Continue to work closely with Irish counterparts through BIC (more in Research section) and Invasive Species Ireland steering groups;
3. Host annual forum of MSs with shared objectives (consistent with EU Reg and need for regional co-ordination);
4. NNSS to further embrace new media;
5. Develop message board (similar to ALGE's) to improve information exchange – note a LAGs message board has now been set up;
6. Strengthen support for the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.

### **Relevant section from the EU IAS Regulation:**

#### ***Article 22 - Cooperation and coordination***

1. Member States shall, when complying with their obligations under this Regulation in relation to invasive alien species, make every effort to ensure close coordination with all Member States concerned and, where practical and appropriate, use existing structures stemming from regional or international agreements. In particular, Member States concerned shall endeavour to ensure coordination with other Member States that share:
  - (a) the same marine subregions in accordance with Article 4(3) of Directive 2008/56/EC, regarding marine species;
  - (b) the same biogeographical region in accordance with Article 1(c)(iii) of Directive 92/43/EEC, regarding non marine species;
  - (c) the same borders;
  - (d) the same river basin in accordance with Article 2(13) of Directive 2000/60/EC regarding fresh water species;
  - (e) any other common concern.

At the request of the Member States involved, the Commission shall act to facilitate the coordination.

2. Member States shall, when complying with their obligations under this Regulation in relation to invasive alien species, endeavour to cooperate with third countries, as appropriate, including by using existing structures stemming from regional or international agreements, for the purpose of meeting the objectives of this Regulation.
3. Member States may also apply the provisions such as those of paragraph 1 of this Article to ensure coordination and cooperation with other relevant Member States as regards invasive alien species of Member State concern identified in national lists adopted in accordance with Article 12(1). Member States may also establish mechanisms for cooperation at the appropriate level for these invasive alien species. Such mechanisms may include exchange of information and data, action plans on pathways and exchange of best practice on management, controlling and eradication of invasive alien species, early warning systems and programmes related to public awareness or education.

#### ***Article 25 - Information support system***

The Commission shall progressively establish an information support system necessary to facilitate the application of this Regulation.

1. By ... (26) the system shall include a data support mechanism interconnecting existing data systems on invasive alien species, paying particular attention to information on the invasive alien species of Union concern, so as to facilitate the reporting pursuant to Article 24.
2. This data support mechanism shall become a tool to assist the Commission and the Member States in handling the relevant notifications required in Article 16(2).
3. By ... (27) \*, the data support mechanism referred to in paragraph 2 shall become a mechanism for exchanging information on other aspects of the application of this Regulation. It may also include information on invasive alien species of Member State concern, pathways, risk assessment, management and eradication measures, when available.