1. Attendance and apologies

Present: John Mumford - Imperial College London (Chair)
Richard Baker - CSL
Gordon Copp – CEFAS
Mark Rees – Sheffield University
Niall Moore – Non-native Species Secretariat
James Aegerter – Non-native Species Secretariat
Verity Hunter - Non-native Species Secretariat

Apologies: Kenny Black - SAMS

The Chair welcomed MR as a new member to the panel.

NM outlined the current position with the NNRAP and its role and functions for the benefit of MR.

JA made a presentation on the suggested procedures to be followed during the risk analysis process. This included suggestions for a streamlined rapid response risk analysis mechanism. JM suggested that for this rapid element the risk management component should be given priority with a full risk assessment to follow later, which was accepted by the panel. However, RB noted that risk assessments can also be undertaken very quickly and shortened versions of risk assessment schemes exist, e.g. for UK Plant Health and EPPO. The panel also agreed that there should be more direct interaction between it and the species specialist during any rapid risk analysis procedure.

There was discussion on when a risk assessment should be signed off – specifically if this should be before or after it was available on the Secretariat website. It was agreed that the ‘sign off’ should have a form of words attached to it as a form of disclaimer.

2. Actions from March Meeting

ACTION 1 – JA to complete this asap.

ACTION 2 – deferred to next meeting.
**ACTION 3 – 5** JA made a presentation covering these actions.

**ACTION 6** – Discharged.

**ACTION 7** – JA circulated a draft standardised front-end summary page for comment.

**ACTION 8 – 11** Discharged.

### 3. Review of Risk Assessments

The Chair asked the panel for their comments on the six RAs which had been completed and distributed to the panel. The following details what has been agreed by the panel.

*Pacifastacus leniusculus* – Signal crayfish

**Section A**
- There was some missing information on where this species can be kept under ILFA.
- Current action against this species needs to be specified.

**Entry**
- The ‘Low’ uncertainty is to be expected for this species.
- 1.9 and 1.10 - need to give more justification for the choice of main pathway.

**Spread**
- There is inadequate referencing for 2.4 (or 1.15/1.16 need to be more detailed to justify the score).
- 2.3 - Is it the altitude of much of Scotland or its large amount of moorland which is the cause of its scarcity there (or has it just not spread there yet?).

**Impacts**
- 2.13 – a score of ‘major’ social harm looks too high for this species. Moderate would be more suitable given the guidance.

**Conclusions**

It was agreed that the Risk Assessment (RA) was fit for purpose, subject to completion of the minor alterations suggested above.

*Orconectes limosus* – Spiny-cheek crayfish

**Section A**
- Question 1 needs more detail on where the species is present – suggest moving some of the comments from question 10.
Entry

- 1.1 – The use of the word ‘many’ is seen as odd as there are only three populations known. Is it referring to other species of crayfish? This needs clarification.
- 1.2 and 1.3 - There needs to be more justification as to why this pathway is the one chosen. Are there any references, pers. comms. etc? (suggest moving up some comments from the ‘Summarise Entry’ section).
- 1.26 - the pathway for introduction into north London contrasts with the supposed most important pathway dealt with earlier. Is this consistent?

Impacts

- 2.13 – a score of ‘major’ social harm looks too high for this species. Moderate would be more suitable given the guidance.

Conclusion

It was agreed that this RA is fit for purpose, subject to completion of the minor alterations suggested above.

**Procambarus clarkii – Red swamp crayfish**

Section A

- There needs to be more information on how long the species has been present in GB.

Establishment

- There need to be more details on where this species is established in Europe and its climatic tolerances.
- The summary provides many of the details that should be contained in the individual cells further up.

Impacts

- Question 2.12 – comparison with the situation in Spain. Is this an appropriate comparison given climatic differences?

Conclusion

The panel agreed that this RA was considered fit for purpose subject to the completion of the minor alterations suggested above.

**Eriocheir sinensis – Chinese mitten crab**

Entry

- 1.2 – There needs to be some justification (references, etc.) for why this pathway was chosen as the critical one.
• 1.9 – This question needs to be answered and a score put in the first column.

Spread
• 2.1 – 2.3 - There need to be comments to justify the scores.
• 2.4 – There is a need for more clarity on the exact areas that are threatened by future expansion of this species.

Impacts
• 2.10 – This is given as minimal but what about the costs of damage to banks by burrows?

Conclusion
This RA was considered to be currently incomplete - lacking in justification for several of the categories as outlined above. It is recommended that the panel reconsiders a revised version.

*Rana catesbeiana* – American bullfrog

Section A
• There needs to be more information on where the species is currently present in GB (how many populations, etc.).

Entry
• 1.2 - There needs to be more justification on why this pathway was chosen.

Spread
• Some of the comments in the ‘Summarise’ section need to be included further up in the RA in individual comments boxes.
• 2.4 – Are there any references to justify the comments here?

Conclusion
The panel agreed that this Risk assessment was fit for purpose subject to the completion of the minor alterations suggested above.

General points of relevance to improving the methodology:
• There is the issue of widely distributed species and how ‘entry’ applies to them.

Actions agreed at the meeting

ACTION 1 – Secretariat to send MR the list of Programme Board members.
**ACTION 2** – Secretariat to finalise flow diagrams for both normal and fast-track procedures and finalise procedure manuals for both and circulate to NNRAP.

**ACTION 3** – RB to circulate the EPPO emergency scheme.

**ACTION 4** – JA to alter the flow diagrams to show the term ‘risk analysis’ and not ‘risk assessment’ where appropriate.

**ACTION 5** – Secretariat to send RPS peer review report and GB Framework Strategy to MR.

**ACTION 6** – Secretariat to send template for commenting on risk assessments to MR.

**ACTION 7** – Secretariat to circulate form of words for the ‘sign off’.

**ACTION 8** – NNRAP to comment on draft front-end summary document.

**ACTION 9** – Secretariat to alter the current Excel template along the following lines:
- Include a map of current distribution in a cover sheet for all RAs.
- Extra question needed between Q20 and 21 in Section A.
- Correct issues with free text in lines 64 – 66 and 84.
- Alter the graphical summary sheet.
- Self-format cell size to include all text.
- Check the validity of the underlying calculations – some seem amiss.
- Add wording prompting risk assessors to justify their choice of main pathway.

4. **Future priority Risk Assessments/Horizon Scanning**
   There is currently a backlog of risk assessments that have been commissioned and need completion. This was circulated at the meeting.

5. **Development of the methodology**
   NM informed the panel that he hoped that a call for tenders for a project to implement the recommendations of the RA Peer Review Project will be made before autumn.

6. **AOB**
   Nothing was raised under AOB.

7. **Date and location of next meeting**: Both to be decided.