

## Non-Native Species Risk Analysis Panel (NNRAP)

### Fifteenth Meeting

27 May 2010

### Minutes

#### 1. Attendance and apologies

Present: John Mumford - Imperial College London (Chairman)  
Gordon Copp – CEFAS  
Richard Baker - Fera  
Kenny Black - SAMS  
Mark Rees – Sheffield University  
Olaf Booy - Non-native Species Secretariat (Secretary)  
Niall Moore – Non-native Species Secretariat

Apologies: Matt Hartley - Defra

#### 2. Review of risk assessments

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

#### ***Ambrosia artemisiifolia* (Common Ragweed)**

General:	<p>Has the EFSA document that evaluates the PRAs been looked at for this risk assessment? (Note that EFSA does not take into account human health impacts). A new document will be available within the next month.</p> <p>Is one of the main negative impacts of this species that is significantly extends the 'pollen season'? If so, this should be taken into account.</p>
Establishment:	<p>33. Does the species persist in GB (without being constantly replenished)?</p> <p>41. Should the score be 'very likely' based on the comment?</p> <p>42. Use this information to discuss likelihood of establishment in the other parts of the risk assessment.</p> <p>44. 1<sup>st</sup> section of the answer is more relevant to human spread (more to separate section).</p>

Spread:	51. Is slowly correct given the rate of spread given by Preston? (also check BSBI maps)  52 and 55. Same as 51.
Impact:	56. Are there not figures for the cost of impact on human health (e.g. in USA / Canada)?  63. Should this be more than minimal given the potential risk?  65. Ziska and Caulfield (200) is an incomplete reference  68. EPPO has produced guidelines. Risk assessor to review these. If they're not available they can be provided.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

**ACTION 1 - RB** to let **OB** know when new EFSA document is available.

***Branta leucopsis* (Barnacle Goose)**

No comments – requirement for this RA to be re-assessed.

***Cabomba caroliniana* (Carolina Fanwort)**

General:	More detail from the EPPO PRA should be used to develop the assessment.  The risk assessment area is GB not UK.  Is there more evidence from the Netherlands on the environmental impact of this species there? Is there more information from the EUPHRESKO project?  Why are there references to <i>H. ranunculoides</i> ?  Uncertainty scores do not appear consistent throughout. Uncertainty for entry, establishment and spread summary scores is low. This doesn't seem to reflect the uncertainty scores in the rest of the document.  Referencing needs to be consistent (cited names is preferred).
Establishment:	1.24. Protected conditions would include garden centres and

	aquaria. This question should be completed.  1.29. Should uncertainty be 'medium'?
Spread:	2.15. Are there any species native to GB that are in the same genus as this one?
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

Climate change should be taken into account separately using additional questions. NNSS to guide the risk assessor on this and inform them to only take into account existing conditions within the assessment.

Suggested Peer Reviewer – Johan Valkenburg

<b>ACTION 2 - NNSS</b> to guide risk assessor in relation to climate change.
--

### ***Egeria densa* (Large-flowered Waterweed)**

The NNRAP decided this species needed to be peer reviewed before they could provide more detailed comments. The NNSS will ask the risk assessor to respond to the peer review and following comments before it is next sent to the NNRAP:

- The RAA is GB not UK
- All questions need to be answered
- Climate change should be dealt with separately (as per workshop notes)
- Need to reconcile why the conclusion for uncertainty is high but all other summaries are low.
- Is spread underestimated?

### ***Glis glis* (Edible Dormouse)**

Entry:	Move spread elements from entry section into spread section (NNSS to advise more on how to do this).
Establishment:	37. Reconsider NA given the close association with beech (without beech would this species be able to establish?)  45. As the species uses bird nest boxes presumably it can compete with native birds for nest space. Does it predate eggs or chicks?  48. Is confusing. NNSS to help address. Roger Trout should be consulted.
Impact:	63. What about damage to trees?

	<p>64. Existing comment to be removed. Minimal social impact is too low given cost and nuisance implications to people. Consider revising.</p> <p>65. As above.</p> <p>72. Is minor too low given the harm done by this species?</p>
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

### ***Orconectes rusticus* (Rusty Crayfish)**

General:	<p>There is another risk assessment for this species that should be considered – in the Journal Risk Analysis (NNSS to send paper).</p> <p>Would it be useful to consider the other crayfish risk assessments.</p> <p>References rather short and badly referenced. Where references are given, more detail about what they contain is required.</p> <p>Could Rusty Crayfish follow a similar pathway route as the Virile Crayfish?</p> <p>Is CEFAS really likely to pick up on all crayfish coming in?</p> <p>34, 38 and 39 have been misinterpreted (the response should be the opposite to that stated).</p>
Entry:	<p>Given the high risk of this species. More detail on how this species could enter is required. How did the Virile Crayfish get in?</p> <p>26, 28 – CEFAS question to be re-addressed. Is CEFAS really likely to pick up on all crayfish coming in?</p>
Establishment:	<p>33. 'Few constraints on geographic range' - It would be useful to provide more detail on what, if any, constraints it does have.</p>
Impact:	<p>62. Is there more evidence of the impacts of this species? If not the confidence should be reconsidered.</p> <p>65. Confidence seems lower than that states.</p> <p>69. Requires a comment to justify medium confidence</p>

	score.  71. Area at risk – more detail of the geographical area at risk is required.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

***Orconectes virilis* (Virile Crayfish)**

General:	There is another risk assessment for this species that should be considered – in the Journal Risk Analysis (NNSS to send paper).  Check question 3 as this refers to rusty crayfish (possibly a typo?).  33, 39 and 40 the response should be the opposite to that given (there is a misunderstanding).
Entry:	Many answers relate to spread – these should be moved to the spread section.  How did this species enter GB originally (how likely is this to continue)?  26, 28 – CEFAS question to be re-addressed. Is CEFAS really likely to pick up on all crayfish coming in?
Spread:	51. Clarify whether natural spread should be higher  52. Relate to qu. 44. Should human induced / assisted spread be faster?  55. Change ‘anthropomorphic’ to ‘human’.
Impact:	57. Reconsider minimal impact given potential impact on fish stocks.  72. Much more justification is required to suggest that this species will only replace the other non-native crayfish.
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

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

***Alopochen aegyptiacus* (Egyptian Goose)**

General:	In GB are the numbers increasing because of movement of birds from the Netherlands?
Establishment:	Has the Egyptian Goose population been impacted by this cold winter?
Spread:	2.4. Is it true that the whole of the risk assessment area could be colonised.
Impact:	Is there aircraft bird strike risk (over and above the risk posed by other geese) [consult John Allan / Andy Baxter at Fera]  2.12. Which bird species are likely to be effected?  Should impact summary score be higher than minor?
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

Suggest the risk assessor contacts Andy Baxter for bird strike issues.

***Procambarus spp.* (Marbled Crayfish)**

General:	There is another risk assessment for this species that should be considered – in the Journal Risk Analysis (NNSS to send paper).
Impact:	Add information based on impacts in Netherlands, Italy and Germany.
Summaries:	Entry summary should be completed
To be reviewed again by panel?	Yes

2.3 Peer Reviews of RAs previously presented to the Panel

- None

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

***Hydropotes inermis* (Chinese Water Deer)**

To be reviewed again by panel?	No – this assessment has been signed off.
--------------------------------	---

***Procyon lotor* (Raccoon)**

General:	Replace references to decimation. Grammatical improvements required.
Spread:	2.3. Clarify the comment
Impact:	Make impact scores more consistent with the comments. Reduce uncertainty where appropriate.
To be reviewed again by panel?	No - signed off following modifications.

***Rapana venosa* (Rapa Whelk)**

To be reviewed again by panel?	No – this assessment has been signed off.
--------------------------------	---

**3. Recommendations of the NNRAP**

The NNRAP recommend that additional research would help reduce uncertainty or otherwise facilitate the risk analysis process:

- *Rapana venosa* – the risk of invasion of this species could be better determined with more detailed information about climate matching (particularly sea temperature mapping).

**4. AOB**

None

**5. Date and location of next meeting**

TBC

<b>ACTION 2 – ALL</b> to agree dates of next meetings.
--