Information on measures and costs in relation to species considered for inclusion on the Union list

This technical note has been drafted by a team of experts under the supervision of IUCN within the framework of the contract No 07.0202/2016/739524/SER/ENV.D.2 "Technical and Scientific support in relation to the Implementation of Regulation 1143/2014 on Invasive Alien Species". The information and views set out in this note do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this note. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein. Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

This document shall be cited as:
van Valkenburg, J. 2017. Information on measures and related costs in relation to species considered for inclusion on the Union list: *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides*. Technical note prepared by IUCN for the European Commission.

This technical note provides information on the effectiveness of measures, alongside the required effort and resources, used to prevent the introduction, and to undertake early detection, rapid eradication, and management for the invasive alien species under review. Each table represents a separate measure.

Date of completion: 06/11/2017
Comments which could support improvement of this document are welcome. Please send your comments by e-mail to *ENV-IAS@ec.europa.eu*

Species (scientific name)	*Gymnocoronis spilanthoides* (D.Don ex Hook. & Arn.) DC.
Species (common name)	Senegal tea plant, water snowball, giant green hygro
Author(s)	Johan van Valkenburg, National Plant Protection Organization, Geertjesweg 15, P.O. Box 9102, 6700 HC Wageningen, Netherlands.
Date Completed	14/09/2017
Reviewer	Jonathan Newman, Waterland Management Ltd, Vines Farm, UK

Summary
Highlight of measures that provide the most cost-effective options to prevent the introduction, achieve early detection, rapidly eradicate and manage the species, including significant gaps in information or knowledge to identify cost-effective measures.

Gymnocoronis spilanthoides is a perennial emergent aquatic or wetland herb, which can also grow in a submerged form. The native range of the species is South America, mostly centred around Uruguay and Paraguay. In Europe it has been reported from thermal waters in Hungary and in an irrigation system in northern Italy, and according to the species risk assessment (EPPO, 2016) within Europe the species is a high risk to countries bordering the Adriatic Sea. Within its native range, *G. spilanthoides* is reported as a principal weed in Argentina. The species is problematic in Australia, New Zealand, Japan, China and Taiwan and has recently naturalised in Italy (EPPO, 2016).

As the species is found within the aquarium trade, banning its import and sale would be an effective preventative measure. In addition public awareness campaigns in countries where the species is already established, and in countries at risk targeting botanic gardens, should reduce the risk of unintentional introduction and further spread of the species. The control of the species poses challenges once it has become established. Therefore, to prevent introductions in unaffected MSs or further spread into the areas where this species is not yet present, it is important to act at the earliest stage of invasion and to prevent additional introductions and further spread in those areas in which it is already present so as to avoid costs linked to managing the species when widely established. Containment and control are likely to be costly, which reinforces the need for preventive action in the area at risk.

Early detection and rapid eradication is critical for limiting the spread of invasive aquatic plants. Early detection could be achieved by incorporating the species in a more comprehensive citizen science IAS monitoring system in combination with a general public awareness campaign. Rapid response to control small scale infestations already reported in the EU is essential.

As with most other invasive alien species, the best way to deal with the threat posed by *Gymnocoronis spilantoides* to biodiversity and society is through a combination of preventative measures, early detection and rapid response to new incursions, with permanent management only as the last option. Total eradication after extensive establishment is unlikely. It is advised that a prohibition on imports, sale, transport, exchanges, breeding and release of this species will prevent its wider establishment in more EU Member States (MSs). As the area at risk is only a small part of the EU, national measures by the MSs at risk might be an alternative option.

Physical removal of small patches may be successful through careful and thorough hand-pulling and uprooting the plants. Exclusively mechanical control options on *G. spilanthoides* have not been studied in detail yet.

The main knowledge gap is in biological control. A host-specific biological control candidate for this species should be found.

Prevention – measures for preventing the species being introduced, intentionally and unintentionally. **This table is repeated for each of the prevention measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	**Prohibition of import, sale, transport, exchange, breeding and release** of this species will prevent its wider establishment across the EU. International trade in aquarium plants is the only realistic introduction pathway identified for the species (EPPO, 2016).

Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed.	This measure has been shown to be effective in New Zealand. *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides* is listed in the National Pest Plant Accord (NPPA), a cooperative agreement between central government agencies, local government agencies and the Nursery and Garden Industry Association. Species on this list are legally prohibited from sale, propagation and distribution under provision of the Biosecurity Act. All commercial nurseries, pet and aquarium shops are regularly inspected by officers warranted under the Biosecurity Act to ensure compliance (Champion *et al.*, 2014). This measure, combined with removal from sites, has resulted in the species being eradicated from most known sites (Champion & Clayton, 2003).
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results.	As the species at present has an extremely limited distribution in the wild in the EU, the measure is likely to have results quickly if combined with rapid eradication of the known infestations. In general, considerable effort is needed to train staff, develop identification tools for border control and communicate the measures to stakeholders and the general public.
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	This is difficult to estimate and will vary between MS's. No published data are available.
Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	None known.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Banning the trade would have an impact on the trade of aquarium plants. In the UK alone in 2015 c. 75,000 plants were sold valuing over GBP 100,000 (OATA pers. comm., 2016). Import data for the Netherlands amounted to less than 1,000 units in 2006 (Brunel, 2009). In addition to that the majority of plants in trade are produced within the EU (pers. comm. van Valkenburg). Alternative species are available. The area at risk for invasion in the EU at present is limited to the countries bordering the Adriatic sea. With projected climate change areas in the Atlantic zone of Portugal, Spain and France would become potentially suitable (EPPO, 2016).
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	None known.

Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**High** Published information from New Zealand points to the feasibility if combined with concerted rapid response actions.

Prevention – measures for preventing the species being introduced, intentionally and unintentionally. **This table is repeated for each of the prevention measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	**Public awareness campaigns** in countries where the species is already established, and in countries that are at a high risk, those bordering the Adriatic Sea, could help prevent unintentional introductions, and spread of the species. The species, once established, can spread through the transport of seeds or stem fragments of less than cm length to new areas via human activities or downstream through flooding events (EPPO, 2016). Key target groups of awareness campaigns would be recreational users of waterways (boating, fishing etc.), and aquarium enthusiasts and botanic gardens in those countries at risk where the species is not yet established in the wild. In reality the campaigns would incorporate other aquatic invasive species that are introduced and spread along the same pathways.
Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed.	It is important to note that these preventative measures should be implemented by all countries that are at risk, as the species could spread from one country to another (EPPO, 2016). An example of public awareness campaigns within the EU is the LIFE ASAP (Alien Species Awareness Programme) project http://www.lifeasap.eu/it) which began in 2016 and is running until 2020, and aims to limit the spread and impact of IAS in Italy through public awareness and participation. In the UK, there are also the *Be Plant Wise* campaign (http://www.nonnativespecies.org/beplantwise/index.cfm) which aims to raise awareness among gardeners, pond owners and retailers of the damage caused by invasive aquatic plants and to encourage the public to dispose of these plants correctly; and the *Check Clean Dry* campaign (http://www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandry/index.cfm) that aims to stop the spread of invasive plants and animal in British water through awareness raising with key stakeholder groups. There is limited evidence regarding awareness campaigns effectiveness for invasive species,

	however in a study focusing on the Broads wetlands in the UK (Burchnall, 2013), the Check Clean Dry campaign led to a 9% increase in the numbers of general public following the recommended biosecurity procedures, and 14% increase in high risk user compliance. Another UK study (Anderson *et al.*, 2014) found that anglers and canoeists who had heard of the Check Clean Dry campaign exhibited biosecurity hazard scores that were 40% lower than those who had not.
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results.	Awareness campaigns would need to be run in the long term.
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	Resources required to run an awareness campaign could vary greatly on the stakeholders to be engaged with. For example, websites, printed material, staff costs, publicity events and stakeholder engagement meetings may all be needed. The costs of running the UK Check Clean Dry campaign is currently around £50,000/year (Booy, O. GB Non-native Species Secretariat, pers. comm.).
Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	Public awareness campaigns would incorporate other aquatic invasive species that are introduced and spread along the same pathways.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Public awareness campaigns should be acceptable to all stakeholder groups.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	No information
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**High**. Public awareness campaigns have been successfully run on invasive species across the EU and around the world.

Early detection - Measures to run an effective surveillance system for achieving an early detection of a new occurrence (cf. Article 16 of the IAS Regulation). This section assumes that the species is not currently present in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the early detection measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the surveillance method	The early detection of invasive alien aquatic plant species is a key factor in the successful eradication of new infestations (Genovesi *et al.*, 2010; Hussner *et al.*, 2017). Early detection in combination with a rapid response is a proactive approach, focussed on the successful management of alien species prior to their establishment. After the early detection of a species, well-coordinated rapid management measurements are required, which must take into account the specific biology and habitat characteristics to achieve the total eradication of the target species (Hussner *et al.*, 2017). **Citizen science in combination with a national coordinating body** may well be a suitable approach. Citizen scientists have surveyed for and monitored a broad range of taxa, and also contributed data on weather and habitats reflecting an increase in engagement with a diverse range of observational science. Citizen science has taken many varied approaches from citizen-led (co-created) projects with local community groups to, more commonly, scientist-led mass participation initiatives that are open to all sectors of society. Citizen science provides an indispensable means of combining environmental research with environmental education and wildlife recording (Roy *et al.*, 2012). The problem of early detection by citizen science in the case of *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides* is that it is difficult to identify the species accurately because of the absence of striking morphological features when not in flower.
Effectiveness of the surveillance e.g. has the surveillance previously worked, failed	Delaney *et al.* (2008) successfully used the data collected by citizen scientists to create a large-scale standardized database of the distribution and abundance of native and invasive crabs along the rocky intertidal zone in Massachusetts, USA. An assessment of the accuracy of data collected by citizen scientists showed that, depending on experience, between 80 and 95% accuracy in identification was achieved (Delaney *et al.*, 2008). In the case of *G. spilanthoides* this percentage may be lower in the absence of flowers. However, confusion with a similar looking species *Alternanthera philoxeroides* still results in a sighting of an IAS.
Effort required e.g. required intensity of surveillance (in time and space) to be sufficiently rapid to allow rapid eradication	Roy *et al.* (2012) state that "Environmental monitoring relies on long-term support in terms of volunteer liaison, data handling, quality assurance, publication and statistical support for measuring trends, requiring the involvement of a professional scientific organisation. The use of volunteers in Citizen science is critical for the success and is supported at a European-level through the SEBI (Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators) "public awareness indicator" which reported that over two-thirds of EU citizens report personally making efforts to help preserve nature. The Pan-European SEBI initiative was launched in 2005. SEBI aims to develop a European set of

	biodiversity indicators to assess and inform European and global biodiversity targets. SEBI links the global framework, set by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), with regional and national indicator initiatives. Many of the headline indicators rely entirely on the availability of monitoring data and particularly datasets on biodiversity developed by volunteer naturalists (Levrel *et al.*, 2010)."
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	Integration of accurate citizen science requires a coordinating scientific or government body. Normally the work would be funded by research grant funding, or by direct funding of scientific organisations by MS Governments. Annual costs for running citizen science projects in 2007 – 2008 were estimated at between €80,000 and €170,000 (Roy *et al.*, 2012)
Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the method on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	Positive side effects include a potential greater awareness of environmental problems by the public. The active involvement of volunteers is also likely to provide feedback on potential new non-native species.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Generally, this technique is accepted by stakeholders, and involvement with research and the scientific community tends to increase acceptance of public funding of such bodies.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	No information available.
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**High** Citizen science has been shown to provide significant leverage in observation power, accurate data (depending on experience and training in taxonomic identification) and should be encouraged as a valuable tool in the early detection of any invasive alien species in the EU.

Rapid eradication - Measures to achieve rapid eradication after an early detection of a new occurrence (cf. Article 17). This section assumes that the species is not currently present in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the eradication measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	**Physical removal** of small patches may be successful through careful and thorough hand-pulling in combination with excavation. Great care should be taken with such methods since they cause fragmentation of the plant and therefore increase potential spread (EPPO, 2016).

Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed	Any such measure requires follow-up monitoring and possible control measures. In New Zealand *G. spilanthoides* is listed as an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993 and the rapid response actions required under this act have resulted in the species being eradicated from most know sites (Champion & Clayton, 2003).
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to achieve rapid eradication	As a rule if no further plants are detected after a 5 year period an infestation is considered as eradicated (pers. comm. van Valkenburg). Viable seed is produced in Italy (Ardenghi *et al.*, 2016) which further stresses the need for follow-up monitoring. Experimental findings in Australia hint to the seeds being potentially very persistent. However, reports on seed production for Australia appear to be contradictory and vegetative parts are the principal mode of dispersal (Panetta, 2009: van Oosterhout, 2010).
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	No published information could be found for *G. spilanthoides*. Information on management cost of an early infestation of *Ludwigia peploides*, a species with a similar behaviour, in a nature restoration project in the Netherlands is available. Management of this infestation, that was detected probably 3-4 years after establishment, has cost almost € 70,000 and over 2,700 hours (staff & volunteers) in the initial 4 years of action before serious reduction of the infestations was achieved (Van Valkenburg, 2016).
Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	Environmental impact is limited when the infestation is small. Hand-pulling control is mostly selective and therefore non-target plants will be not damaged. Mechanical control including excavation will affect non-target organisms. Extensive excavation works will affect natural succession processes in nature restoration projects.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Mechanical control of aquatic and riparian weeds is generally accepted by stakeholders, unless considerable damage is seen to be done without any effort to reinstate the area.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	Once removed, it is very likely that regrowth from fragments will occur, despite careful biosecurity arrangements. Therefore, additional monitoring of the managed site will be required on a regular basis after removal. Early detection and rapid eradication: given the costs of management, a prompt response to newly establishing populations will be important to avoid later management costs.
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**High** The published information on the reduction of infested sites in New Zealand for the species, and the more detailed info on a species that behaves similarly provide a high level of confidence.

Management - Measures to achieve management (cf. Article 19). This section assumes that the species is already established in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	Some general recommendations on **physical removal** can be found in Champion & Clayton (2002). The feasibility of physical removal is largely dependent on the extent of the infestation, and for plants that principally reproduce via clonal fragments on the frequency of their fragmentation. The eradication of invasive alien aquatic plants should take into account the biological characteristics of the species (EPPO, 2014).
Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed	Physical methods that include the use of heavy machinery combined with chemicals has been found to be effective in Australia. Infestations are sprayed with herbicide to reduce the risk of spreading plant parts. Then 7-10 days later all silt and plant material up to a depth of 1 m is removed by heavy machinery. Depending on local weather conditions, all plant material is dead after about a month and the silt and soil can be reused (Australian Government, 2017). As an alternative of spreading plant material to dry out as applied in Australia, plant material could be buried on site and covered by 1 meter of soil as applied in management of *Ludwigia peploides* in the Netherlands (EPPO, 2014; Plant Protection Service *et al.*, 2011; Van Valkenburg, 2016). In Japan, extensive infestations on the southern shore of Lake Biwa were detected in the 2007 and 2008. Repeated weed-cutting by a concerted volunteer group supported by government had halted the spread of the species and resulted in halving the size of individual infestations every year by 2010 (Kaneko, 2012).
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results	Any such measure requires follow-up monitoring and possible additional control measures. As a rule if no further plants are detected after a 5 year period an infestation is considered as eradicated (pers. comm. van Valkenburg).
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	No published information could be found for *G. spilanthoides,*
Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	Environmental impact is limited when the infestation is small. Hand-pulling control is mostly selective and therefore non-target plants will be not damaged. Mechanical control including excavation will affect non- target organisms. Extensive excavation works will affect natural succession processes in nature restoration projects.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare	Mechanical control of aquatic and riparian weeds is generally accepted by stakeholders, unless considerable damage is seen to be done without any effort to reinstate the area.

	considerations, public perception, etc.	
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects		
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**Medium** Published information either refers to combined management actions, is not sufficiently detailed or relates to a similar species only.	

Management - Measures to achieve management (cf. Article 19). This section assumes that the species is already established in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	**Herbicide control** is permitted as a single or combined management option in Australia and New Zealand (EPPO, 2016). The herbicide is applied to the emergent plants. None of the active ingredients are currently approved for use in or near water in the EU, and EU/national/local legislation on the use of plant protection products and biocides needs to be respected
Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed	Glyphosate does not provide lasting effect as a non-selective herbicide. It creates gaps in the vegetation ideal for germination of *G. spilanthoides* and abscission of stem fragments and leaves creates additional propagules resulting in further spread (Australian Government, 2017). The selective broad-leaf herbicide metsulfuron-methyl does provide good control and has been permitted for use in Australia and New Zealand where the majority of field sites of *G. spilanthoides* have been eradicated using this herbicide (EPPO, 2016).
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results	Not applicable as the method is not approved
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	Not applicable as the method is not approved
Side effects (incl. potential)	Not applicable as the method is not approved

i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Not applicable as the method is not approved
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	Not applicable as the method is not approved
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**Low** None of the active ingredients is currently approved for use in or near water in the EU.

Management - Measures to achieve management (cf. Article 19). This section assumes that the species is already established in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure	**Biocontrol.** Neither in New Zealand nor Australia any work has been initiated as the species was either considered not sufficiently problematic or other measures were adequate (Froude, 2002; Paynter *et al*. 2009).
Effectiveness of measure e.g. has the measure previously worked, failed	No realistic answer can be given here in the absence of any information on *G. spilantoides*.
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results	For classic biological control in general, the initial period of host-specificity testing would take approximately 3 years, after which the agent could be released
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	Usually significant effort is required before release of a biological control agent. The cost of this effort is estimated to be in the region of €350,000 (Paynter *et al.* 2015) .

Side effects (incl. potential) i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment, non-targeted species, etc.	
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.	Socio-economic impacts are rare and often supportive if the problem and solution is explained fully. Careful management of biological programmes is usually necessary, despite the adverse impact of the target weed.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	No realistic answer can be given here in the absence of any information.
Level of confidence [2] See guidance section	**Low** Work on potential biocontrol agents for *G. spilanthoides* has not been initiated so far.

Bibliography [3]

See guidance section

Anderson, L.G., White, P.C., Stebbing, P.D., Stentiford, G.D. & Dunn, A.M. (2014). Biosecurity and vector behaviour: Evaluating the potential threat posed by anglers and canoeists as pathways for the spread of invasive non-native species and pathogens. *PLOS ONE,* 9(4) https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092788

Ardenghi, N.M.G., Barcher,i G., Ballerini, C., Cauzzi, P. & Guzzon, F. (2016). *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides* (Asteraceae, Eupatorieae), a new naturalized and potentially invasive aquatic alien in S Europe. *Willdenowia,* 46(2), 265-273.

Australian Government. (2017). Weeds in Australia: *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides*. http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/biodiversity/invasive/weeds/weeddetails.pl?taxon_id=12850 [accessed on 11 July 2017]

Brunel, S. (2009). Pathway analysis: aquatic plants imported in 10 EPPO countries. *EPPO Bulletin,* 39, 201–213.

Burchnall, W. 2013. Wetland Biosecurity Officer project report. The Broads Authority. http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/405344/Biosecurity_officer__6_month_update.pdf

Champion, P.D. & Clayton, J.S. (2002). Lake Managers' Handbook Alien Invaders. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington (NZ).

Champion, P.D. & Clayton, J.S. (2003). The evaluation and management of aquatic weeds in New Zealand. pp. 429-434 In: Child, L., Brock, J.H., Brundu, G., Prach, K., Pysek, P., Wade. P.M. & Williamson, M. (eds.). *Plant Invasions: Ecological Threats and Management Solutions*. Backhuys Publishing, Leiden, the Netherlands.

Champion, P.D., de Winton, M.D. & Clayton, J.S. (2014). A risk assessment based proactive management strategy for aquatic weeds in New Zealand. *Management of Biological Invasions*, 5(3), 233–240.

Delaney, D.G., Sperling, C.D., Adams, C.S. & Leung, B. (2008). Marine invasive species: validation of citizen science and implications for national monitoring networks. *Biological Invasions*, 10, 117-128.

EPPO. (2014). PM 9/19 (1) Invasive alien aquatic plants. *EPPO Bulletin,* 44, 457–471.

EPPO. (2016). Pest risk analysis for *Gymnocoronis spilanthoides*. EPPO, Paris.

Froude, V.F. (2002). Biological control options for invasive weeds of New Zealand protected areas. Science for conservation 199. Wellington, Department of Conservation.

Genovesi, P., Scalera, R., Brunel, S., Roy, D. & Solarz, W. (2010). Towards an early warning and information system for invasive alien species (IAS) threatening biodiversity in Europe. EEA Technical report No 5/2010, EEA, Copenhagen, 47 p.

Hussner, A., Stiers, I., Verhofstad, M.J.J.M., Bakker, E.S., Grutters, B.M.C., Haury, J., van Valkenburg J.L.C.H., Brundu, G., Newman, J., Clayton,

J.S., Anderson, L.W.J. & Hofstra, D. (2017). Management and control methods of invasive alien aquatic plants: a review. *Aquatic Botany*, 136, 113-137.

Kaneko, Y. (2012). Invasive alien plants species in the shore areas surrounding Lake Biwa, pp. 485-490 in: Kawanabe, H., Nishino, M. & Maehata, M. (editors). Interactions between nature an People. ISBN 978-94-007-1782-4.

Levrel, H., Fontaine, B., Henry, P.-Y., Jiguet, F., Julliard, R., Kerbiriou, C. & Couvet, D. (2010). Balancing state and volunteer investment in biodiversity monitoring for the implementation of CBD indicators: A French example. *Ecological Economics*, 69, 1580-1586.

Paynter, Q., Fowler, S., Hayes, L. & Hill, R. (2015). Factors affecting the cost of weed biocontrol programs in New Zealand. *Biological Control* 80: 119–127.

Paynter, Q., Hill, R., Bellgard, S. & Dawson, M. (2009). Improving targeting of weed biocontrol projects in Australia. Final Report. Land & Water Australia.

Plant Protection Service, Aquatic Ecology and Water Quality Management Group Wageningen & Centre for Ecology and Hydrology Wallingford. (2011). *Ludwigia grandiflora* (Michx.) Greuter & Burdet. EUPHRESCODeCLAIM Final report. 63 p. http://www.q-bank.eu/Plants/Controlsheets/Ludwigia_State-of-the-Art.pdf

Roy, H.E., Pocock, M.J.O., Preston, C.D., Roy, D.B., Savage, J., Tweddle, J.C. & Robinson, L.D. (2012). Understanding Citizen Science & Environmental Monitoring. Final Report on behalf of UK-EOF. NERC Centre for Ecology & Hydrology and Natural History Museum.

Van Oosterhout, E. (2010). Senegal tea. Primefact 993. Industry & Investment NSW.

Van Valkenburg, J.L.C.H. (2016). Management of non-native aquatic plants in the Netherlands. Paper presented at Invasive weed conference, London. http://www.property-care.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/PCA-conference-Nov2016-J.Valkenburg.pdf

Notes
1. Costs information. The cost information depends on the information available.

2. Level of confidence provides an overall assessment of the confidence that can be applied to the information provided for this method.

- **High**: Information comes from published material, or current practices based on expert experience applied in one of the EU countries or third country with similar environmental, economic and social conditions.
- **Medium**: Information comes from published data or expert opinion, but it is not commonly applied, or it is applied in regions that may be too different from Europe (e.g. tropical regions) to guarantee that the results will be transposable.
- **Low**: data are not published in reliable information sources and methods are not commonly practiced or are based soley on opinion; This is for example the case of a novel situation where there is little evidence on which to base an assessment.

3. Citations and bibliography. The APA formatting style for citing references in the text and in the bibliography is used.

e.g. Peer review papers will be written as follows:

In text citation: (Author & Author, Year)

In bibliography: Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (Publication Year). Article title. *Periodical Title*, Volume(Issue), pp.-pp.

(see http://www.waikato.ac.nz/library/study/referencing/styles/apa)