

IAS WG – Working Session II

Surveillance of invasive aliens species of Union Concern

First Draft discussion

IAS Working Group meeting. June 8th, Brussels

Structure of the document:

- Preamble
- Scope
- Definitions
- Crosscutting considerations when establishing surveillance systems
- Tiered approach to IAS surveillance
 - Tier 1 – Mandatory public authority surveillance programmes
 - Tier 2 – Public authority regulated systems
 - Tier 3 – Voluntary stakeholder group surveillance
 - Tier 4 – Citizen Science surveillance
 - Systematic surveillance
 - Ad hoc reporting
- **Challenges**
- Provision of support infrastructure and digital/IT tools
- Standards and guidelines
- Surveillance considerations for 37 IAS species of Union concern

What is covered:

Report aims at providing principles, approach options and standards concerning the surveillance of IAS of Union concern.

Crosscutting considerations when establishing surveillance systems are included such as when to implement sentinel surveillance. This section outlines some guiding principles with others incorporated into the chapter on tiered approaches to IAS surveillance.

4 level tiered approach to IAS surveillance is recommended

Tier 1: Mandatory public authority surveillance programmes.

Focus on systematic surveillance of high risk areas of entry, invasion hotspots and at high biodiversity conservation areas at risk of invasion.

Tier 2: Public authority regulated systems.

Focus on regulated systems coordinated/overseen by official authorities where conditions to report sightings may be incorporated e.g. hunting/fishing licence.

Tier 3: Voluntary stakeholder group surveillance

Focus on engagement with stakeholder groups to adopt surveillance through for example Codes of practice or quality assurance schemes.

Tier 4: Citizen science surveillance – both systematic and ad hoc systems.

What is covered:

Report aims at providing principles, approach options and standards concerning the surveillance of IAS of Union concern.

Challenges and provision of **support infrastructure and digital tools** to support effective surveillance systems are **outlined**.

Standards and guidelines for use of terminology and exchange of biodiversity data are noted.

Recommendation to consider adopting the IUCN GRIIS terminology is given.

**This section could be strengthened by further elaborating on the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and recommending more specific guidelines to be followed.*

Surveillance of the 37 IAS of Union concern: examples of key stakeholders for surveillance or of surveillance systems that could be used are given. This section could be enhanced by input from the wider IAS Working Group. Noting Melanie Josefssons contribution already greatly enhanced it.

What is not covered/gaps:

Previous slide notes some gaps.

Additionally, guidelines are needed on how existing surveillance and monitoring systems can provide useful information for the 37 IAS of Union concern. This would include advice in determining if existing programme methodologies are fit for purpose.

However, this exercise may be best placed occurring at the Member state or sub-state level. Opinion from the IAS WG would be appreciated on this.

Comments received and how they will be addressed:

Tracked change comments/edits received from Sweden via Melanie Josefsson

- Most of the edits greatly enhance and improve clarity of the existing points being made. Sweden's experience in surveillance and monitoring of IAS provides greater level of detail and understanding of proposed approaches.
- Additional information also provided including for example, the need to consider monitoring and reporting requirements under regional agreements such as HELCOM and OSPAR.
- Tracked change edits will be accepted

General comments received from Kelly Martinou

- Strong commentary regarding need to refer in report to 'national authorities should be prepared to allocate sufficient resources to surveillance and monitoring including training of personnel'. This point will be made explicit in the report.
- Comments relating to need for codes of practice to survey and manage mosquitoes thus promoting better control/management of them are not going to be addressed in the report as they are not (as Kelly also noted) IAS of Union concern.