

Non-Native Species Risk Analysis Panel (NNRAP)

Thirteenth Meeting
3rd December 2009

Minutes

1. Attendance and apologies

Present: John Mumford - Imperial College London (Chairman)
Matt Hartley - Defra
Richard Baker - Fera
Kenny Black - SAMS
Gordon Copp – CEFAS
Mark Rees – Sheffield University
Olaf Booy - Non-native Species Secretariat (Secretary)
Emilie Mazaubert – Cemagref (France) [visiting]

Apologies: Niall Moore – Non-native Species Secretariat

2. Review of risk assessments

2.1 First drafts, peer review not yet completed (RA for detailed consideration)

- None

2.2 First drafts with peer reviews (RA and PR for detailed consideration)

Chinese Water Deer (*Hydropotes inermis*)

General:	Should it be hyperthermia or hypothermia throughout the risk assessment? References to conservation elsewhere in the world are not relevant to the risk assessment. These can be included briefly but should be reduced.
Establishment:	1.20 – Response should be unlikely (based on comment – question misunderstood) 1.24 – Woburn Park is included as ‘under protected conditions’ 1.31 – Should this be unlikely? While escapes from zoos / collections may happen it seems unlikely that this would

	maintain transient populations in the wild.
Spread:	2.2 – The fact that it is illegal to release this species into the wild should be included.
Impact:	2.19 – Disease risk to be taken into account
Summaries:	The summary score for spread is low with low uncertainty, while the answers to spread questions 2.1 – 2.4 are all medium with medium uncertainty. These two areas need to be reconciled. Consider reducing overall risk (based on answers throughout the assessment).
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments and peer review.

Manilla Clam (*Venerupis philippinarum*)

General:	More information is required about the potential risk to the native species along the south coast of Great Britain, particularly in relation to any experiences from Poole Harbour or Southampton. Report from ICES 2008 [attached] to be considered in relation to impacts on native species. Is there further relevant literature on this species, particularly in relation to Poole Harbour?
Entry:	1.9 – Where are the commercial hatcheries / farms in Great Britain?
Impact:	2.15 – Should uncertainty be lower?
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments and peer review.

Muntjac Deer (*Muntiacus reevesi*)

General:	Does Muntjac replace Roe deer or add to the overall deer populations? If the latter consider this an additional risk, if the former, then it may not represent such a risk.
----------	---

	A native species can be considered a risk, since the presence of native species is integral to the baseline case against which new risks are assessed. The point is about the extent to which Muntjac replaces Roe deer or adds to the overall deer populations. If the latter it would be additional risk, if the former, then it may not represent such a risk.).
Impact:	2.6 / 2.7 –The impact of Muntjac on coppiced woodland suggests this might be a higher risk 2.12 – More detail required. Summarise some of the impacts described from the cited papers, etc. 2.14 – Consider increasing the response (i.e. it may be a higher risk)
Summaries:	Consider reducing overall risk (based on answers throughout the assessment).
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments and peer review.

Sika Deer (*Cervus nippon*)

Impact:	2.11 – 2.12 – As hybridisation with Red Deer is taken into account at question 2.19, this should not be considered under environmental risk. Re-answer this question based on the above. 2.17 – Comment on whether Sika are harder to shoot than Red (more elusive).
Summaries:	Impact summary should be low uncertainty
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments and peer review.

2.3 Peer Reviews of RAs previously presented to the Panel

- Rhododendron – Peer reviewer should not have responded N/A to whether the references were fit for purpose. Rhododendron is better described as a reservoir for Phytophthora (not vector).
- No other comments.

2.4 Amended drafts following Panel and Reviewers' comments (to agree that they are now "fit for purpose")

Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis*)

To be reviewed again by panel?	No – signed off without change.
--------------------------------	---------------------------------

Edible Frog (*Rana esculenta*)

General:	The previous NNRAP comments have not been dealt with systematically. NNSS to resend comments and request specific responses.
Impact:	2.12 - Environmental score should be revised downward.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments.

Few-flowered Leek (*Allium paradoxum*)

General:	<p>The NNRAP felt the risk assessment did not appear to take into account the risks to GB as a whole (and focussed on my local areas). Reconsider on this basis.</p> <p>The NNRAP felt that the risk scores given may be disproportionate to the actual risks posed by this species in GB. They advise the risk assessor to consider other risk assessments undertaken for invasive non-native species (found at http://www.nonnativespecies.org/04_Risk_Assessments.cfm) and to consider whether the risk scores given are proportionate in relation to these.</p> <p>Statements such as 'we have a duty to control this plant' are not appropriate to risk assessment. Remove.</p> <p>What does E83 etc refer to?</p>
Impact:	2.11 – More evidence is required to support this response. If little evidence is unavailable uncertainty should be high.
Summaries:	Impacts. There appears to be little evidence to support a response of 'massive', this needs much more justification (and should be reduced). If there is little published evidence to

	support the response then uncertainty should be high.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments.

In addition:

- NNSS to analyse the risk assessor's use of uncertainty and advise the assessor where this should be better applied.

Himalayan Balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*)

General:	Risk assessor to revise the risk assessment based on the additional peer reviewer comments.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments.

In addition:

- NNSS to give Peer Reviewers sight of each other's comments and the ability to revisit their comments.
- The NNRAP advise that Peer Reviewers should consider the impact scores in relation to other assessments.
- Once Peer Reviewers have agreed, NNSS to send comments to risk assessor.

Japanese Skeleton Shrimp (*Caprella mutica*)

Impact:	2.19 – Is there any information about this species as a vector of white spot?
To be reviewed again by panel?	No – signed off following minor modifications above.

Marsh Frog (*Rana ridibunda*)

General	Risk assessor to answer questions from previous NNRAP comments
Impact:	2.5 – Is there any impact on fish / fisheries
To be reviewed again by panel?	No – signed off following modifications above.

Shallon (*Gaultheria shallon*)

Impact:	Much more detail required. Scientific literature needs to be cited to justify the answer. If none available, uncertainty should be high.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes – to be reviewed by the NNRAP following modifications based on the above comments.

In addition:

- As with Few-flowered Leek the risk assessor must ensure the responses are relevant to a GB-wide assessment and that the answers are proportionate.
- NNSS to advise the risk assessor on the need to consider other risk assessments in relation to the responses.

3. AOB

JM outlined the need for brief text outlining the risk analysis process and the use of / approach to undertaking risk assessments. This was generally approved. JM to draft some text with the Secretariat.

KB reported that the test of the new NAPRA scheme was generally good. JM following up on some issues related to help text links and printing reports.

OB noted the possible use of the NNRAP in the aquaculture risk assessment process.

JM / RB / GC / OB discussed that the carp impacts section should be revisited and that this would be taken forward before the next NNRAP.

4. Date and location of next meeting

NNRAP 14 – March 11, 2010 York

NNRAP 15 – June 10, Oban [DATE TO BE CONFIRMED]