

**FINAL**  
**PROGRAMME BOARD ON NON-NATIVE SPECIES**  
**THIRTY-FIRST MEETING MINUTES**  
**(EXTRAORDINARY MEETING ON RESOURCES)**  
**CIVIL SERVICE CLUB, LONDON**  
**Thursday, 19 July 2018, 11:00**

**1. Attendance / Apologies**

*Present:*

Richard Pullen (Defra, Chair)  
Niall Moore (Non-native Species Secretariat, Secretary)  
James Lovesey (Defra, Marine)  
Kath Webster (Animal and Plant Health Agency)  
Mark Diamond (Environment Agency)  
Olaf Booy (Non-native Species Secretariat)  
Paul Rose (Joint Nature Conservation Committee)  
Sarah Webster (Defra)

*Phone:*

Nick Bialynicki-Birula (Natural Resources Wales)  
Theresa Kudelska (Natural Resources Wales)  
Stan Whitaker (Scottish Natural Heritage)  
Martin Williams (Welsh Government)

*Apologies:*

Adrian Jowitt (Natural England)  
Bill Badger (Defra, fisheries)  
Leanne Stockdale (Marine Management Organisation)  
Nicola Spence (Defra)  
Sarah Wood (NRW)  
Stewart Snape (Forestry Commission)

**2. Minutes of 30th Meeting, Feb 2018**

*Paper circulated PB July18-02*

The minutes of the previous meeting were signed off.

### 3. **Actions/matters arising**

*Paper circulated PB July18-03*

All actions were signed off as complete.

### 4. **Resourcing: general comments on all papers**

**The Board** agreed with the broad direction of the resourcing papers, but noted that some of the more detailed figures may not be correct. In particular the £200M for Animal Health may not be correct as this is the entire budget of APHA (which includes Bee Health, etc). It was agreed that the figures should remain, but that they need to be corrected / updated. **The Non-native Species Secretariat** will confirm the animal health figure with APHA finance and Defra policy. Additional figures for Cefas may need to be taken into account in the biodiversity resources paper (they are not mentioned). **James Lovesey** will provide information where necessary.

**Martin Williams** noted that the papers indicate that a step-change is needed in funding for this area to bring it closer to other biosecurity areas and fulfil obligations under the EU Regulation. He suggested this would require a proposal to Treasury for UK level funding and that the route would be SR 19 (which is at an early stage of discussion at the moment). **The Board** agreed with this approach and considered that the approach could be made by UK countries in parallel (but not together as this would be too long and onerous). **Martin** was happy to pull the business case together for Wales. **Niall** also noted that a UK approach is consistent with the suggestion that the GB Programme Board and NNRAP may expand their remit to include the whole of the UK in future as a result of conversion of the EU Regulation into UK law.

**The Board** recommended some further areas for consideration as part of the next steps / preparation of a Ministerial sub:

- It would be useful to place figures in the context of budgets held by other countries to tackle invasive species (e.g. Australia, New Zealand, US, etc.) as well as their effectiveness.
- Impact on 'natural capital' should be included. This could be done with case studies; Defra's Environmental Analysis Unit may be able to help.
- A comprehensive assessment of the future economic and social impact of invasive species would be useful but the Board recognised that this would not be feasible to commission and carry out in the short term. However, the Board agreed that in order to make a strong business case under SR 19 there is a need to provide an estimate of the scale of costs of invasives to the economy.

<b>ACTION 1: Mark Diamond</b> to send review of spend in Victoria State (Australia) to <b>Niall</b> .
---

**ACTION 2: NNSS** to gather information on non-native species budgets of other countries and their effectiveness.

**ACTION 3: NNSS** to chase up and correct APHA figure on Animal Health spend in biosecurity resourcing paper.

**ACTION 4: James** to provide additional figures for Cefas spending for the biodiversity paper (as necessary).

## 5. Resourcing: discussion of the summary paper (paper 9)

**Niall** introduced this paper, setting out the case and thanking Michael Sigsworth in particular for initial suggestions for improving the original paper.

The Board agreed that alerts and rapid response were the highest priorities. They also considered that preventing entry (border prevention) was also a priority. Members of the Board suggested an inspectorate may be required to support this. **Niall** noted that this issue had been parked for the moment until a full pathway analysis had been completed. **Sarah Webster** noted that there was already some work underway at the border; however, the Board agreed that this was a broader issue which could include post border as well as border work. It was noted that it may be more efficient to expand the remit of an existing inspectorate(s). The Board agreed that the key driver was to ensure effective enforcement and was open-minded about how this is best achieved. The Board requested **NNSS**, with help from **Sarah, Kath Webster** and **Martin**, to explore this issue further.

The Board agreed to the high priority given to communication. They asked whether general awareness raising was more important than targeted behaviour change, but agreed that targeted work was the highest priority. They stressed that additional campaigns may be needed to tackle pathways other than those tackled by *Check, Clean, Dry* and *Be Plant Wise*. They also noted that the inspectorates can be a good vehicle for messaging. They highlighted that some of the key explanation about why communication is a priority should be brought out more clearly in subsequent papers. These should make clear the economic / environmental / natural capital benefits of prioritising these actions. The Board highlighted that there is considerable benefit in biosecurity regimes working together to raise awareness and encourage behaviour change.

The Board broadly agreed with the medium priority given to long term management. However, this was the item where the Board felt that setting a priority was more difficult, because this issue is often politically driven. **The Board** also acknowledged that the additional funding set out here was low, compared to the scale of the problem. **Niall** agreed that the figures here were low and explained that this was designed to provide a small additional resource to help facilitate more coordinated and strategic support for long term management, rather than fund action on the ground. The intention is to recognised

that long term management requires partnership approaches with the majority of work done locally by landowners and interested stakeholders; however, government can help with the coordination and strategic direction of this work. The Board agreed with this and highlighted the need for improved methods to prioritise strategic long term management actions.

**ACTION 5: NNSS**, assisted by **Martin, Sarah and Kath (Simon Hewitt)**, to explore the need for, potential roles, working and costs of a non-native species inspectorate – by September 7.

## 6. Chair's summary

**The Board** agreed that paper 9 is an excellent basis for developing a paper to go to Ministers and a proposal for funding under SR19. They agreed that the sub should go to the Ministers in September. Preparation for SR19 bid will be done in parallel and finalised following feedback from Ministers. The SR19 bid would include more narrative about why certain actions will be effective and what the implications will be (this could include considering various scenarios).

The chair summarised key points to consider:

- The need for resources should be placed in the broader context of costs of invasive species to the economy, environment, etc.
- We should be clear that prioritisation is not straightforward, but the evidence is clear where the highest priorities are (link to CBD and other drivers).
- A key action is to develop options for a non-native species inspectorate, or integrating with existing inspectorates, which should include the devolved administrations.
- The need for core government funding vs another sources needs to be made clear. One suggestion is to make clear that funding is required in perpetuity (however, certain things could be done on a fixed term basis and we can leverage funds)
- A clear case needs to be made about the effectiveness of work that can be done with additional funding and the evidence that underpins this.

**ACTION 6: NNSS** to produce a draft submission for Ministers – by September 7. [**NNSS** will initially map out what needs to be done and by whom to help with this work and circulate this with the draft minutes – by July 27.]

**ACTION 7: NNSS** to collate relevant information and to produce a first draft of a business case for additional funding under SR 19 for **Officials** to take forward - by September 21.

## **7. AOB**

**Mark** raised the recent court judgement relating to Japanese Knotweed and Network Rail. **The Board** agreed that the implications of this decision will be discussed at their next meeting.

## **8. Date and location of future meetings**

**NNSS** will circulate dates for a meeting before Christmas, after the submission has gone to Ministers.