GB STRATEGY REVIEW OF ACTIONS FROM THE ORIGINAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (MITIGATION AND CONTROL SECTION)
Assessment of status and information on progress made provided by NNSS October 2013

Satisfactory Progress	🟩
Partial progress	🟧
Little / no progress	🟥

BROAD (CHAPTER) HEADINGS	KEY ACTION	PRIORITY	TASK	STATUS	PROGRESS MADE
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.1 **Agree, with the Risk Analysis Panel and key stakeholders, a set of guiding principles for assessing and identifying what action or range of actions is feasible in terms of containment, control or eradication**	LOW	Draft and agree set of guiding principles (see also 7.10, 7.11, 8.3).	Moderate progress	Risk management is a key component of risk analysis along with risk assessment. A risk management tool has been drafted for GB and is being trialled on a number of non-native species. This will help to identify and assess the range of actions that could be used to contain, control or eradicate a non-native species.
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.2 **Use the risk analyses to identify priority invasive species and priority impacted habitats for mitigation and control action at GB and/or national levels, including consideration of the feasibility of eradication programmes**	MEDIUM	GB Programme Board to periodically assess/re-asses priority invasives for mitigation/control at GB/National level.	Satisfactory progress	Risk analysis comprises risk assessment and risk management. Currently risk assessment is used by the GB Programme Board to help prioritise action. A key component that is currently being developed to support this process is risk management (see 8.1 above). In addition, the country working groups of Scotland and Wales are working on identifying priorities at the country level.
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.3 **Designate lead bodies or working groups to draft management plans for the priority invasive species and impacted habitats, taking into account scope for integration with any relevant Invasive Species Action Plans (ISAPs) already created for prevention of introduction purposes**	MEDIUM	Develop priority management plans linked as necessary to ISAPs (see 6.7).	Moderate progress	3 ISAPs have been completed, including 2 rapid response and 1 contingency plan species. 11 others are in draft, including: 7 long term management, 1 rapid response and 3 contingency species.

BROAD (CHAPTER) HEADINGS		KEY ACTION	PRIORITY	TASK	STATUS	PROGRESS MADE
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.4	**Develop and resource key GB level action programmes that are cost-effective, evidence-based and proportionate to the threat level**	MEDIUM	GB Programme Board to consider scope for affordable action programmes and agree/approve as appropriate.	Satisfactory progress	GB Programme Board regularly reviews priorities and provides recommendations based on evidence, including risk assessments.
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.5	**Establish mechanisms to embrace individual initiatives as contributions to coherent programmes of action on the high level priorities**	MEDIUM	Implement research/management project database (8.7). Identify scope for supporting local fora and initiatives. Incorporate into GB level action Programmes (see 8.4).	Satisfactory progress	Good progress has been made through engagement with local action groups to communicate GB level priorities, work that is underway and ways in which local initiatives can help to support strategic objectives (e.g. through the annual Local Action Group workshops). Many LAGs contribute considerably to strategic goals, particularly in relation to raising awareness and promoting biosecurity, also sometimes to delivering eradication work.

ISAPs should be used as a key mechanisms for communication and to encourage engagement from stakeholders. To date there have been relatively few individual initiatives included within these, but further development of long term management ISAPs (e.g. for Floating Pennywort) provides an opportunity for this.

The Projects Database to record individual initiatives around GB has been enhanced and now includes over 150 projects. However, this appears to be underutilised and further work is required to make this a more useful and comprehensive resource.

More could be done to embrace individual initiatives as part of a contribution to a coherent strategic programme. A key and recurring issue is how this support is funded. |

BROAD (CHAPTER) HEADINGS		KEY ACTION	PRIORITY	TASK	STATUS	PROGRESS MADE
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.6	**Acknowledge priorities at different scales (GB, national, regional and local), and encourage effective partnerships**	**MEDIUM**	Enable flexibility, develop strategic framework - not rigid structure. Work with country specific groups. Implement 8.7, scope for supporting local fora and initiatives.	Satisfactory progress	Different scales have been embraced, for example at the GB level through the GB Programme Board, at the national level by country working groups and at the local level by the support of Local Action Groups. Range of priorities can be reflected in ISAPs.
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.7	**Draw together a database of projects to facilitate better information sharing and to make the best of opportunities for partnership working and other resource synergies**	**MEDIUM**	Develop and establish research / management projects database.	Satisfactory progress	A projects database was established in 2008 and enhanced in 2010. 150 projects recorded in the database to date. The impression is the database is underpopulated and not widely used.
MITIGATION, CONTROL AND ERADICATION	8.8	**Look for further ways to support individuals in tackling the problems caused by invasive non-native species**	**MEDIUM**	Consider scope for support, e.g. agri-environment or other land management grant/support schemes, research projects, trials, local projects and initiatives.	Moderate progress	Considerable support has been made available through the development of central resources and by facilitating the sharing of experience and good practice. Examples include the development of the Local Action Group toolkit and annual Local Action Group workshop. Other materials have been developed and are hosted on the NNSS website. Workshops have been run to attempt to identify different funding opportunities. In some cases novel sources of funding have been identified and utilised by individual initiatives, e.g. European funding sources.

Note - the section below forms part of the previous Chapter (7), but involves Rapid Response so has been included here

| EARLY DETECTION, SURVEILLANCE, | 7.10 | **Identify appropriate means of securing adequate resources** | **HIGH** | a) Audit responsibilities. | Satisfactory progress | Complete. |

BROAD (CHAPTER) HEADINGS		KEY ACTION	PRIORITY	TASK	STATUS	PROGRESS MADE
MONITORING AND RAPID RESPONSE		and capacity to carry out rapid responses to contingencies	HIGH	b) Dialogue with key bodies - Scoping resources and processes (linked to 7.11).	Satisfactory progress	Taken forward by the Rapid Response Working Group.
EARLY DETECTION, SURVEILLANCE, MONITORING AND RAPID RESPONSE	7.11	Establish a means for clearly designating lead agencies for rapid responses to different taxa and in different circumstances	HIGH	Develop rapid response protocol.	Satisfactory progress	Rapid response Working Group established and rapid response report / protocol drawn up in 2010. The Rapid Response Working Group report includes a decision tree for identifying a coordinating body to deliver rapid responses.
EARLY DETECTION, SURVEILLANCE, MONITORING AND RAPID RESPONSE	7.12	Develop a general contingency plan to include a risk assessment, mechanisms for flow of information and a protocol for rapid approval of emergency action	HIGH	(Linked to 7.11).	Moderate progress	The Rapid Response Working Group report includes a decision tree for identifying a coordinating body to deliver rapid responses, but they decided that a general contingency plan was not appropriate.