

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP ASSESSMENT OF NATIONAL PEST PLANT ACCORD SPECIES

Contents

<i>Acanthus mollis</i>	5
<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>	6
<i>Acmena smithii</i>	8
<i>Agapanthus praecox</i>	10
<i>Agave americana</i>	12
<i>Ageratina altissima</i>	14
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	16
<i>Akebia quinata</i>	17
<i>Albizia julibrissin</i>	19
<i>Alocasia brisbanensis</i>	21
<i>Alternanthera philoxeroides</i>	23
<i>Ammophila arenaria</i>	25
<i>Anredera cordifolia</i>	26
<i>Araujia sericifera</i>	28
<i>Aristea ecklonii</i>	30
<i>Arum italicum</i>	32
<i>Arundo donax</i>	34
<i>Asparagus asparagoides</i>	36
<i>Asparagus densiflorus</i>	37
<i>Asparagus scandens</i>	39
<i>Asparagus spp. (excluding officinalis)</i>	41
<i>Bartlettina sordida</i>	42
<i>Berberis darwinii</i>	44
<i>Bomarea caldasii</i>	46
<i>Bomarea multiflora</i>	47
<i>Bryonia cretica</i>	49
<i>Buddleja davidii</i>	51
<i>Buddleja madagascariensis</i>	53
<i>Caesalpinia decapetala</i>	54
<i>Calluna vulgaris</i> (excluding double flowered cultivars)	56
<i>Cardiospermum grandiflorum</i>	58
<i>Cardiospermum halicacabum</i>	60
<i>Carex divisa</i>	61
<i>Carex divulsa</i>	63
<i>Carpobrotus edulis & hybrids</i>	65
<i>Caulerpa taxifolia</i>	66
<i>Celastrus orbiculatus</i>	68
<i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i>	70
<i>Cestrum aurantiancum</i>	71
<i>Cestrum elegans</i>	73
<i>Cestrum nocturnum</i>	75
<i>Cestrum parqui</i>	76
<i>Chrysanthemoides monilifera</i>	78

<i>Clematis flammula</i>	80
<i>Clematis vitalba</i>	82
<i>Cobaea scandens</i>	83
<i>Cortaderia jubata</i>	85
<i>Cortaderia selloana</i>	87
<i>Cotoneaster simonsii</i>	88
<i>Cotyledon orbiculata</i>	90
<i>Crassula multicava</i>	92
<i>Crocoshia x crocosmiiflora</i>	94
<i>Cyathea cooperii</i>	95
<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>	97
<i>Dipogon lignosus</i>	99
<i>Drosera capensis</i>	101
<i>Dryopteris filix-mas</i>	102
<i>Eccremocarpus scaber</i>	104
<i>Egeria densa</i>	106
<i>Ehrharta villosa</i>	107
<i>Eichhornia crassipes</i>	109
<i>Eomecon chionantha</i>	111
<i>Equisetum arvense</i>	113
<i>Equisetum hyemale</i>	114
<i>Equisetum spp. (all)</i>	116
<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>	118
<i>Erica lusitanica</i>	120
<i>Erigeron karvinskianus</i>	121
<i>Euonymus japonicus</i>	123
<i>Ficus rubiginosa</i>	125
<i>Fuchsia boliviana</i>	127
<i>Galeobdolon luteum</i>	129
<i>Genista monspessulana</i>	130
<i>Gunnera manicata</i>	132
<i>Gunnera tinctoria</i>	134
<i>Gymnocoronis spilanthoides</i>	135
<i>Hedera helix subsp. helix and cultivars</i>	137
<i>Hedychium flavescens</i>	139
<i>Hedychium gardnerianum</i>	141
<i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i>	142
<i>Hieracium argillaceum group</i>	144
<i>Hieracium aurantiacum</i>	146
<i>Hieracium caespitosum</i>	147
<i>Hieracium lepidulum</i>	149
<i>Hieracium murorum</i>	151
<i>Hieracium pilosella</i>	152
<i>Hieracium pollichiae</i>	154
<i>Hieracium praealtum</i>	155
<i>Hieracium sabaudum</i>	157
<i>Hieracium spp. (all)</i>	159
<i>Hieracium Xstoloniflorum (aurantiacum x pilosella hybrid</i>	160
<i>Homalanthus populifolius</i>	162
<i>Homeria collina</i>	164
<i>Houttuynia cordata</i>	165

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

All species still only in cultivation or at their very early stage of naturalisation have potential to be widely distributed in at least northern New Zealand.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Relatively easily controlled with chemicals but often difficult to detect outlying plants before they have fruited. Grows amongst native species. Has large underground tubers difficult to kill.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

No

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

There are numerous reports of allergy to Asparagus plants in the medical literature. Some authors consider these plants as relevant sources of occupational allergy, where severe disease (anaphylaxis or asthma) is common. The berries and uncooked shoots in particular can be toxic. Contact dermatitis is often described

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

The history of the genus in N.Z. suggests they are all potentially very troublesome weeds and as several are often grown as an ornamentals there is the opportunity to prevent them establishing.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Several are used in florist displays but there are substitutes.

Include in NPPA?

No

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

A.setaceus (commonly cultivated here) is recorded as invasive in Australia. I know little about other species in cultivation (apart from officinalis) here so uncertain what effect it would have banning the whole genus (excluding A.officinalis)

Notes from TAG meeting

Do not include spp.

Bartlettina sordida

Common names

Bartlettina

Synonyms

Eupatorium sordidum

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, scattered in Auckland and Northland, also collected from Lower Hutt garden plants elsewhere.

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, established in scrub margins from seed

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Impacts appear limited, with the species currently present in disturbed areas although reported to form dense clumps which could exclude native species.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

minus 2 (Accept)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Regarded as a minor weed by ARC parks

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Uncommon garden plant (only one nursery listed - Hawkes Bay)

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

*1, as *Eupatorium sordidum**

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Attractive foliage and flowers, promoted as a desirable species on web (UK and USA).

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Frost intolerant, native distribution in montane cloud forest of Mexico. Currently in scattered in Northland/Auckland.

Potential distribution in frost-free high rainfall areas.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Relatively easy to control, manual control or cut and paint with various herbicides.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Availability for deliberate distribution could extend the distribution of this species in gardens and thus threaten new areas where it is currently absent.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Possible challenge regarding demonstrable impact although it has naturalised so therefore must be influencing the local ecology.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

A low WRA score and although naturalised, impacts not demonstrated. Not naturalised in other countries. But, appears to be actively promoted in other countries and if removed from NPPA could increase propagule sources.

Notes from TAG meeting

Sufficient information available to include on Accord, but it would be useful to gather further information for the future

Berberis darwinii

Common names

Darwin's barberry

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, found everywhere in NZ from Northland to Stewart Island.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Grows in bush margins and openings in bush where it can displace natives and restrict regeneration.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Doc weediness score 26, mul's wra 26 ('reject')

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

OK

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Planted in gardens

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

I think it's quite attractive. Was put up for classification as noxious under old legislation but not seen as agricultural threat

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Already widespread in NZ, but could increase its prevalence in many areas.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Short-lived seedbank. After physical damage and grazing resprouts from all parts. Frill, drill or cut stump + herbicide probably kills it.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

no

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

The fruit are suggested as being edible. However, some authors describe that the sap/thorns of Berberis can cause dermatitis, and these plants can cause minor toxicity if ingested

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Invades margins of native bush and displaces natives. Although reasonably attractive as a garden plant doesn't seem to be traded any more. Seeds spread by birds and possums.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Almost entirely bush margin and open spaces within bush. Might not be a really serious threat to conservation. Promoted and used by forestry companies.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Bomarea caldasii

Common names

Synonyms

several collections initially identified as B. multiflora

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, 1 record Flora III. Herbarium records since Flora III (1980) indicate it is now more common and widespread.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals).

Yes. Although only naturalised for a short period it is becoming more common and has the potential to cause serious impacts.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 25

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

poses a real threat to forest margins etc. should be rejected

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

2

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

4

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

2

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

has the potential to become more widespread and common.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

—

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Bomareae spp. appear to be a natural source of the compound alpha-methylene-gamma-butyrolactone, which causes plant contact dermatitis (Guin & Franks 2001)

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

may warrant inclusion to prevent its further cultivation and hence naturalisation

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

not well established in the wild as yet

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Bomarea multiflora

Common names

Bomarea, Climbing alstromeria

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

few collections as most in CHR have been identified as B. caldesii

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Possibly although as it may not be as commonly cultivated as B. caldesii it may not have a ready source of seed/offshoots.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 25

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

poses a real threat to forest margins etc should be rejected

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

2

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

4

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

2

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

has the potential to become more widespread and common.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

—

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

Bomareae spp. appear to be a natural source of the compound alpha-methylene-gamma-butyrolactone, which causes plant contact dermatitis (Guin & Franks 2001)

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

may warrant inclusion to prevent its further cultivation and hence naturalisation

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

not well established in the wild as yet

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Are any wild records of this species or have they all been confirmed as B.caldasii? Can the two species be distinguished when not in flower?

Notes from TAG meeting

Difficulty with ability to distinguish when not in flower.

Bryonia cretica

Common names

White bryony

Synonyms

Bryonia dioica

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, but of very limited distribution

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

Hard to know, but suspect could spread

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Climbing vine, huge tubers each of which has to be found and killed. Yes, it has potential to cause damage and be hard to kill.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Doc weediness score 26, my score 'reject (17)'

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Several unknown characters keeps score fairly low.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

*Naturalised in California. Related *B. alba* naturalised further north in USA.*

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Only found in Makino SR (Wanganui) and Aria (Te Kuiti). Suspect could spread further.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Tubers, once found, are cut open and stuffed full of picloram. Seems to work well, but finding individuals can be hard.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

yes

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

Some suggestion that the sap may cause skin irritation, and if ingested it is purgative.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Climber (to 6m) and capable of growing in bush. Seeds spread by birds. Very little of it and chance of eradication. We don't want more of it planted.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

May not have potential to be a serious problem, but we don't know.

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Buddleja davidii

Common names

Buddleja, butterfly bush, summer lilac

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, p448, Vol IV

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Fully naturalised. N.: abundant; S.: common in the northern half, less common further south; St.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Dense infestations of Buddleia compete with indigenous vegetation of rivers and impede the growth and reproduction of other species of trees and shrubs. Monospecific stands of Buddleia impede access to rivers. Seedlings, which have superficial rooting, are easily carried away in floods and may form blockages, causing erosion of banks.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Accept (-4)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

15

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

24

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

42

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

34

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

No suppliers in RHS Plant Finder (although 151 suppliers of other B species).

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Widely spread from Timaru in SI to North of Auckland - 8 map references. Riverbanks, roadsides and disturbed sites, particularly around forested areas, waste places in and around settled areas. Buddleia or butterfly bush is abundantly naturalised to the point of being a nuisance in some areas. It has spread deep into the Urewera and other remoter parts of the North Id, and tolerates a wide range of soil conditions, even growing on the almost raw lava of Rangitoto Id. Potential unknown.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Well controlled by glyphosate and by metsulfuron-methyl. Biological: Researchers in New Zealand are currently studying the possibility of biological control with the coleopter Cleopus japonicus.

Integrated management: Management methods such as digging it out are applicable only to minor infestations at the initial stage of invasion. Cutting inflorescences before they bear fruit is a preventative technique, which makes it possible to limit the production of the seeds. Disturbances caused by uprooting young Buddleia shrubs actually assist its development. After uprooting, planting alternative species is recommended. It is necessary to remove uprooted plants which can grow as cuttings. When it is cut, Buddleia grows back from the stump very vigorously. Cutting must be carried out at the base of the seedling and be accompanied by an immediate white-washing of the stump with a systemic weedkiller.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

None

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

WRA score = -4 (accept). Already widely spread in NZ (especially on DOC land), perhaps nearly fully occupying its potential range? While the genus has a history of cultivation and sale in NZ, preventing sale now will have little impact on future spread in NZ. The species is also well controlled by herbicides. No proposal has been submitted for the inclusion of this species.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Buddleja madagascariensis

Common names

Madagascar buddleja, butterfly bush, smoke bush, orange buddleia

Synonyms

Buddleia madagascariensis

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, p450, Vol IV

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Fully naturalised. N.: Waipapa (near Kerikeri), Bream Bay (near Whangarei), Thames; S.: port area, Nelson. Sand dunes, coastal cliffs.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Economic: Pastoral production loss, particularly on poorer acid soils. Environmental: Alters succession back to natives. Social: Not known. Health: Not known. Cultural: Not known.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

2

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

24

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

42

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

34

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
No suppliers in RHS Plant Finder (although 151 suppliers of other B species)

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Nelson to Northland - 3 map references plotted. The limited spread of B. madagascariensis from cultivation suggests that frs and seeds may not be formed in N.Z., and in fact the small purplish black berries are rarely seen anywhere in cultivation. Potential unknown.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Well controlled by glyphosate and by metsulfuron-methyl. "Katie Cassel of the Kokee Natural History Museum (Kokee Museum) reported good control of stems <3 inches diameter with triclopyr ester at 20% in crop oil applied to basal bark and to larger stems that were frilled." (Motooka et al., 2002)

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

WRA = 14 (Reject). Limited current distribution but with assumed wide potential dist. It's weedy overseas. The genus is in the plant trade oversea (ornamental) and species in the genus as currently being in NZ.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

none

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Need more definitive information on the reason for the apparent inability of this species to produce fruit in NZ. Reported to seed freely in Hawaii. What might be reasons for lack of seeding? Lack of pollinators, self-incompatability and insufficient genetic material in NZ, climate unsuitability, allee effects

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Caesalpinia decapetala

Common names

Mysore thorn

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

debatable

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes, but only on the Kermadec Islands, not mainland NZ (FI of NZ vol IV)

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

On Raoul Island it forms dense, spiny, scrambling thickets which prevent the recruitment of other plant species. It is considered the worst weed on Raoul Island (there is a major control programme there)

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

quite a few questions were unanswered as these is limited information in the UO declaration and I don't know a lot about this species

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
no listings for this species in catalogues checked although the genus is listed, search on Google showed no websites from NZ referring to this species as a desirable plant

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

3

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

3

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

*Several *Caesalpinia* species cultivated as ornamentals although probably only in the north since they are more subtropical, this species not reported from mainland NZ*

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Potential distribution uncertain. Uncertain how well it would grow in mainland NZ, although some overseas website have records of this species growing well in temperate areas such as Italy

<http://www.mediterraneangardensociety.org/plants/Caesalpinia.decapetala.html>

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

The control programme on Raoul Island has taken many years, with the seedback being particularly troublesome, but I don't know how the difficulty of control of this species compares to others.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

No

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Major control programme on Raoul Island (DOC)

Any known impact on human health?

As a robust and evergreen shrub that forms impenetrable thickets it causes mechanical injuries due to its numerous thorns. Its presence would certainly affect human activities, both as a health hazard and nuisance.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Certainly a serious weed where it occurs on Raoul Island, should ensure that it doesn't arrive on mainland NZ and get spread.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

How to classify a species present only on an offshore island?

Include in NPPA?

No

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

TAG considers absent from NZ (excl Raoul). Retain UO status

Calluna vulgaris(excluding double flowered cultivars)

Common names

Heather, ling

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, notably in National Park but also in other 'moorland' areas.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)
n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes, plant found in scrub and forest margin, shrubland, tall and short tussockland, replacing native vegetation, probably permanently.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Doc weediness score 26, mul's score 'reject (20)'

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

ok

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Cultivars planted in gardes. Deliberately spread in Tongariro and elsewhere.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Still available in garden shops.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Grows well in Tongariro NP and other similar environments and could become more widespread.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Overall sprays not terribly effective. Individual plants can be killed with herbicides, but that is labour-intensive.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

Ingestions of these plants, especially in large amounts, are expected to cause serious effects to major body organs such as the liver, heart or kidneys.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Weedy elsewhere (naturalised along Atlantic coast of North America, between Quebec and New Jersey, and in Tasmania). Could establish much more widely in cool, acid soils. We don't need any more. Hard to control, too.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Popular and quite common garden plant. Already quite widespread. Would banning it make any difference?

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Exclude double flowered cultivars where male and female parts are petaloid. Steering Group would like a good summary of the issue to inform decision making. RA group to complete.

Cardiospermum grandiflorum

Common names

Balloon vine

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, 'casual' in Auckland City, Mt Albert. Auckland, Riverhead, Coatesville Road. Auckland, Dairy Flat, Rosenheath

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Regarded as 'casual' so far.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

Very invasive and widespread on Rarotonga, Cook Islands. Invasive in Australia. Some potential here, but probably only in warmer areas.

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

In subtropical South Africa invades forest margins, watercourses, urban open spaces. Regarded there as a 'transformer'.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

No DOC score, my wra 17 'reject'.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Many unknowns, especially climate. Subtropical status makes it unlikely problem except in Northland and perhaps coastal areas.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Unlikely to become a widespread problem, most likely limited to warmer parts of country

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

South Africans looking at biological control. In Brisbane rain forest recommendation is treat cut vines with glyphosate or spray recovering veg after cutting. So labour-intensive problem.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Weed elsewhere (Hawaii, South Africa, etc,) and could become problem here in warm zone. Hard to control. Not really naturalised, yet.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

May not have potential to naturalise and become a serious problem, but we don't know.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cardiospermum halicacabum

Common names

Balloon vine

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Not yet naturalised, but widely cultivated

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

Common in Fiji in natural environments and as a sugar cane weed. Also in other Pacific Islands, and in many states in the eastern half of the USA.

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

In subtropical South Africa invades forest margins, woodland, grassland, river banks, kloofs, floodplains, rocky sites. Not regarded there as weedy. Considered 'invasive' in 4 US states.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

No DOC score, Pacific Island score (similar to ours) 12 , my wra score 17 'reject'

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Many unknowns, especially climate suitability. Subtropical status makes it unlikely problem except in Northland and perhaps coastal areas.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
Vol IV says 'widely cultivated'. Available from several overseas websites. Apparently has some herbal properties.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Not really naturalised, unlikely to become a widespread problem, most likely limited to warmer parts of country

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
*Probably similar to *Cardiospermum grandiflorum*.*

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Leaves are irritant and known to cause dermatitis

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Considered invasive in 4 US states, yet promoted on www as 'a good candidate for covering trellises', and as 'a perfectly wonderful plant'. Could become problem here in warm zone. Hard to control. Not really naturalised here, yet. Precautionary principle says do it anyway.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

May not have potential to naturalise and become a serious problem, but we don't know.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Carex divisa

Common names

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, very scattered from Northland (Kerikeri) to Otago (Maniototo Plain)

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, sward forming in saline soils

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Forms dense stands apparently displacing other salt marsh vegetation.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

11 (Reject)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

No record of species being sold or distributed as an ornamental plant. First collected in 1871, possibly a contaminant (Waitemata Harbour)

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

234

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

158

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

50

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Not sold in New Zealand or overseas, few desirable features

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Currently very scattered in coastal areas. Any coastal habitat with saline soils. Appears to be poorly dispersed.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Control with glyphosate recommended, rarely controlled.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

No

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

The leaves of some Carex sp. have fine sawing and cutting edges, made harder by the presence of silica in the superficial cells, can cause mechanical injury.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Ecological weed may threaten a range of endangered spp. (including Carex litorosa) and alter salt marsh ecological processes.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not sold, propagated or deliberately distributed.

Include in NPPA?

No

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Carex divulsa

Common names**Synonyms**

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, common in many parts of the North island, also as far south as Canterbury in the South Island

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, forms dense tufts in grassland and waste areas, often in shaded places

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Usually in modified habitats, apparently palatable, but may displace more desirable forage species.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

10 (Reject)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Was sold in the past (possibly still) and planted (probably mistaken for a native species)

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

234

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

158

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

50

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Possibly sold in New Zealand, but several overseas web sites offering the cultivar 'Golden Fountains' of this species.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Appears to be rapidly increasing its naturalised range.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Control with glyphosate recommended, rarely controlled.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

The leaves of some Carex sp. have fine sawing and cutting edges, made harder by the presence of silica in the superficial cells, can cause mechanical injury.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Possibly a minor agricultural/ecological weed/ weed of rough pasture

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not commonly sold, propagated or deliberately distributed in New Zealand.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Carpobrotus edulis & hybrids

Common names

iceplant

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes. *North and South Islands. Flora IV.*

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes. *Ecological and conservation impacts on coastal dune systems in particular.*

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 19

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
genus listed in NZ nursery register.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

89

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

*hybrids with *Disphyma australe* may have some appeal since they have different leaves and flowers.*

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

This is already very widespread but has the potential to continue to increase its distribution and abundance.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

—

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Non-toxic

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Should be included so as it is not deliberately propagated and spread, beyond what it is doing naturally through seeds and rooted pieces of stem.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Limited deliberate cultivation and propagation.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Note - hybrid is not common. Remove hybrids

Caulerpa taxifolia

Common names

Green seaweed, killer algae

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Probably no, plant was found in aquarium at Auckland Zoo but has since been eradicated

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

No

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

The temperature range for the invasive Mediterranean strain is 7 C - 32.5 C, while the maximum salinity is 38 ppt. It could occur in any marine area within this range.

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Extremely invasive and smothers other algal species, seagrasses and sessile invertebrate communities.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

8.5 (Reject)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

None - possible contamination with imports of 'living rock' for marine aquaria

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Not known from New Zealand. Could be problematic in many marine habitats in New Zealand

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Extremely difficult requiring diver operated suction dredging, smothering or injecting chlorine under PVC tarpaulins

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

No

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

*Although the toxin caulerpenyne is in an important secondary metabolite produced by *Caleurpa*, it seems that the concentrations required to result in cellular toxicity means that the risks of cutaneous and/or food intoxication to humans can be considered minimal (Parent-Massien et al 1996)*

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Huge potential threat to marine habitats.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

none

Include in NPPA?

No

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

No longer present in New Zealand. Recommend increasing UO status to Notifiable Organism.

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Celastrus orbiculatus

Common names

Climbing spindle berry, Oriental bittersweet

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes, spreading vegetatively and by seed. (Fl of NZ vol IV). DOC bioweb database.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Strangling vine, considered likely to displace native species and damage native forest canopy. In USA considered a pest of forestry as vines grow tightly around trees causing growth distortions

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (17)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

recognised invasive weed in NZ and USA so good information available on invasive properties.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Genus listed in Nursery Register for 91/92, uncertain whether this species.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

1

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
I have spoken directly to people who report having bought it although I have never personally seen it for sale.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Widespread in the North Island, more limited in the South, quite localised overall. Climatic tolerances indicates it is likely to grow in most parts of NZ. A long way from reaching all potential environments

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Vigilant is registered for control as a stump treatment and other herbicides are effective applied in this way, but large sites can be difficult to treat using this method. More difficult than something like old man's beard but not as difficult as Maderia vine.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led in about 5 conservancies (most areas where it is known). In 8 RMPs, 7 of which are eradication or control to low levels.

Any known impact on human health?

Berries appear to be toxic to humans.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

A serious weed which is at relatively low levels and is subject to significant control programmes by government agencies. Likely to be sold if allowed.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Can't see any reason for exclusion. Species is already banned so shouldn't have any commercial impact.

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Ceratophyllum demersum

Common names

Hornwort, coontail

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, widespread throughout North Island, abundant in Waikato and Manawatu catchments. South Island sites near Motueka.

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, submerged species invasive throughout New Zealand range

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Extremely invasive, disrupts hydro-electric power generation, drainage, irrigation and recreational activities. Displaces other vegetation from much of submerged range (to 12+ m).

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

17 (22 P&C) (Reject) AWRAM (67)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Was sold in New Zealand until 1982 (Noxious Plant Act 1978). Possibly still spread by hobbyists.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
Commonly referred to in international aquarium literature as an oxygenator plant for ponds/aquaria.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Widespread in many North Island areas, absent from most of South Island. Could be problematic in many currently unimpacted water bodies in New Zealand. Grows under ice to subtropical waters in native range

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Difficult to control, both through lack of effective methods and its aquatic habitat.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led - South Island

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Only spread by human activities, either deliberate or accidental (e.g. contaminated nets, boats and drainage machinery). NPPA inclusion reduces long-distance spread.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

None, less invasive submerged plants available

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cestrum aurantiancum

Common names

Orange cestrum

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes (*Fl.NZ vol IV*) Auckland to Poverty Bay and Taranaki. Seed spread limited, mostly by suckers.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Not a lot of detail in proposal and I have never seen this species in the wild. In proposal reported as invading pastures and becoming a danger to livestock (plant is toxic) and could harm natural ecosystem by forming dense undergrowth. Considered invasive and banned (category 1) in South Africa <http://www.plantzafrica.com/miscell/aliens1.htm>

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (12)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Limited information, mostly gets the score based on toxicity and the fact that it is reported as a weed.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

not listed in Gaddum but other members of the genus sold.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Google search showed no NZ websites either selling or promoting as a desirable plant

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

n/a

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Uncertain, Environment Bay of Plenty is undertaking control trials.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

No

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

one of the "Cestrum spp." listed in the Environment BOP strategy.

Any known impact on human health?

All *Cestrum* spp. are toxic to some extent if ingested, but no specific information is available for *C.aurantiancum*.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Uncertain - very limited information

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Uncertain about the level of impact from this species and no records of this species being sold.

Include in NPPA?

No - needs more information. Will be considered for next review round of Accord

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Cestrums were considered potentially serious back in the days when plants were only noxious if they were likely to affect farmed livestock.

Notes from TAG meeting

Need more info from proposer

Cestrum elegans

Common names

Red cestrum

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes (Fl.NZ vol IV). Reported in Fl NZ vol IV as commonly cultivated and occasionally escapes.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Not a lot of detail in proposal and I have never seen this species in the wild. In proposal reported as invading pastures and becoming a danger to livestock (plant is toxic) and could harm natural ecosystem by forming dense undergrowth. Considered invasive and banned (category 1) in South Africa <http://www.plantzafrica.com/miscell/aliens1.htm>

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Limited information, mostly gets the score based on toxicity and the fact that it is reported as a weed.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Listed in Gaddum. Other members of the genus also sold.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

1

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Current distribution patchy but widespread (sites near Auckland, Waikato, Taranaki, Marlborough, Karamea (Fl.NZ vol IV) and presumably Bay of Plenty and Gisborne since they have listed the species in their RPMSs). Probably more widespread in cultivation and likely to naturalise in other areas.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Uncertain, Environment Bay of Plenty is undertaking control trials.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

no

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Listed as total control plant is Gisborne and is one of the "Cestrum spp." listed in the Environment BOP strategy.

Any known impact on human health?

All Cestrum spp. are toxic to some extent if ingested, but no specific information is available for C. elegans.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Currently sold and being controlled by councils in some areas.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Uncertain about the level of impact from this species.

Include in NPPA?

No - needs more information. Will be considered for next review round of Accord

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Cestrums were considered potentially serious back in the days when plants were only noxious if they were likely to affect farmed livestock.

Notes from TAG meeting

Need more info from proposer

Cestrum nocturnum

Common names

Queen of the night, night cestrum

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes (Fl.NZ vol IV). Naturalised in northern areas (Tauranga north)

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Not a lot of detail in proposal and I have never seen this species in the wild. In proposal reported as invading pastures and becoming a danger to livestock (plant is toxic) and could harm natural ecosystem by forming dense undergrowth.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Limited information, mostly gets the score based on toxicity and the fact that it is reported as a weed.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Listed in Gaddum. Other members of the genus also sold.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

4

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Current distribution patchy but widespread. Uncertain

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Uncertain, Environment Bay of Plenty is undertaking control trials.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document
No

NPPA YES/NO
No

Notifiable organism
No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.
Research organism for ARC and is one of the "Cestrum spp." listed in the Environment BOP strategy.

Any known impact on human health?
C. nocturnum is known to be highly toxic, and if any plant parts are eaten raw in large quantities it can be lethal. Regularly causes death of livestock, including goats, sheep and cattle. It is believed to be as toxic to humans. In addition, its fragrance is said to cause nose/throat irritation, headache nausea and dizziness.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)
Currently sold and being controlled by councils in some areas.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.
Uncertain about the level of impact from this species.

Include in NPPA?
No - needs more information. Will be considered for next review round of Accord

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.
Cestrums were considered potentially serious back in the days when plants were only noxious if they were likely to affect farmed livestock.

Notes from TAG meeting
Need more info from proposer

Cestrum parqui

Common names

Green cestrum

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, but not much naturalised

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, Kaitaia, Waioka Gorge, Auckland

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes, poisonous to livestock. Weedy in Texas and Queensland. Frost tolerant, but prefers warm, wet conditions.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

DOC weed score 28, P&C's wra score 21 'reject'. Pacific Islands score 11.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Probably reasonable.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Vol IV says 'not often cultivated now'.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Very limited distribution now, but could probably become widely distributed in warmer districts. Its frost tolerance suggests it could survive in cooler places.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Hard to control because it regrows after physical damage. Individual plants can be killed with herbicides, but this is labour intensive.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

C. parqui is also known to be highly toxic, and it is often lethal to horses, and livestock, including goats, sheep, cattle, pigs and poultry. It is also known to be as toxic to humans, causing also dermal poisoning. All parts of the plant are poisonous though the small black flesh fruit are considered most toxic. Ingestion of the plant by humans can cause fever, loss of appetite, intense abdominal pain and blood-stained scouring.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Poisonous to stock, flowers (in daytime) and crushed foliage stink. Potential to become more widespread. Currently of very limited distribution. Suckers. Spread by birds.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not much of it, mainly problem to farmers, may not be very invasive.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Chrysanthemoides monilifera

Common names

Boneseed

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, widespread in coastal areas as far south as Dunedin.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes. Can replace native vegetation and suppress new native seedlings.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

DOC weed score 28, Mul's wra score 16 'reject'. Pacific Islands score 11.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Good

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Promoted on a few internet sites

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Could probably become much more prevalent

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Relatively easy, by treating individual bushes, or by spraying seedlings or larger bushes with herbicide. But labour intensive.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Species of limited distribution which could become more widespread. Can be regarded as attractive and could be distributed for that reason. Better to include it than have it sold again.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not terribly damaging to environment, grows where other things aren't growing.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Clematis flammula

Common names

Clematis, plume clematis, fragrant clematis, virgin's bower, fragrant virgin's bower, sweet-scented virgin's bower

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes. North (North Auckland; Wellington) and South (Nelson/Canterbury) Islands. Flora IV; Wellington herbarium record and Bioweb).

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes. Unsure to what extent.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 22

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

should be rejected. Probably never will be as invasive as C. vitalba but nevertheless does score highly and should be rejected.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Sold in nurserys.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

4

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

98

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

101

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

69

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Attractive cultivated plant.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

First collected in 1960's and has become more common since then. Very likely to become much more widespread and abundant.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Probably similar to C. vitalba.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

All plants in this genus are acrid and irritant, and their ingestion, especially in large amounts, are expected to cause serious effects to major body organs such as the liver, heart or kidneys. All parts of Clematis spp. are said to be toxic not only to humans but also to livestock and other animals. These plants are irritant when touched and may cause dermatitis in some people.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Potentially could become very widespread and common. In the early stages on naturalisation and probably should be on NPPA before it becomes a more serious problem.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not particularly prevalent in native ecosystems yet as most records are from among populations of naturalised plants and cultivated plants (eg hedge rows).

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Clematis vitalba

Common names

Old man's beard

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes. North and South Islands. Flora IV.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes. Significant conservation impact by smothering native plants in natural ecosystems and also smothering other exotic plants in gardens and naturalised habitats. Vey aggressive growth and produces copius ammounts of seed.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 22

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

shoule be rejected.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Genus sold in NZ. Listed in n ursery catalogues in the past.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

98

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

101

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

69

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

could be mistaken for other species of Clematis and unintentionally grown.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Already widespread and has the potential to continue to expand its range and adunadance.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Can be controlled by chemicals and physical removal of plants.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

All plants in this genus are acrid and irritant, and their ingestion, especially in large amounts, are expected to cause serious effects to major body organs such as the liver, heart or kidneys. All parts of Clematis spp. are said to be toxic not only to humans but also to livestock and other animals. These plants are irritant when touched and may cause dermatitis in some people.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

An aggressive and difficult to control plant that can cause considerable damage.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

None.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cobaea scandens

Common names

Cathedral bells

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes, spreading vegetatively and by seed. (FI of NZ vol IV). DOC bioweb database.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)
n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Smothering vine, smothers forest canopy and understorey.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (12)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. *no listings, has been banned from sale since national surveillance list (1998?). search on Google showed no websites from NZ referring to this species as a desirable plant*

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Listed in NZ published and distributed gardening books such as Nicholls (1995) "should not be viewed as a potential weeds as it is very easily killed by frost". Bryant 1994

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Currently naturalised in northern NZ as well as coastal Wellington, Nelson/ Tasman and SI West Coast. Likely to be confined to lowland areas but established in Upper Takaka so not confined to frost-free areas. A long way from reaching all potential habitats

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Not reported to be as resistant to herbicides as some other vines, but reported to come back vigourously from seedbank. Fragments easily and the fragments grow readily, so physical control is of little help.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

7 RPMSs, 5 of which are eradication or control to low levels. DoC weed-led on SI West Coast

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Invasive but attractive plant previously promoted and cultivated (ie prior to ban on sale), subject to significant control programmes by govt agencies. Likely to be sold again if allowed.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Can't see any reason for exclusion. Species is already banned so shouldn't have any commercial impact.

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cortaderia jubata

Common names

Purple pampas grass

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, widespread in NI and in coastal areas as far south as Dunedin.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals).

Yes, forms huge clumps largely unpalatable to livestock.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

DOC weed score 27, MB's wra score 29 'reject.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Good

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
Planted on farms as shelter belt or as 'emergency' fodder for cattle.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Could probably become even more prevalent

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Fairly easy with herbicides, but can be labour intensive.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Leaves supposedly irritant. Leaf edges also cause mechanical injury, as they are somewhat sharp and can cause serious cuts.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Aggressive invader, can be hard to control, could invade new areas, displaces other species.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Attractive, useful as shelter, occurs in very many places. Declaring it now won't help.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Quite widespread, wind dispersed.

Cortaderia selloana

Common names

Pampas grass

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, widespread in NI and in north and west SI

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

yes, forms huge clumps largely unpalatable to livestock.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

DOC weed score 31, DC's score 31 'reject.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Good

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

planted on farms as shelter belt or as 'emergency' fodder for cattle.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Could probably become even more prevalent

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Fairly easy with herbicides, but can be labour intensive.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Leaves said be irritant, and having a high harm potential to humans. Leaf edges also cause mechanical injury, as they are somewhat sharp and can cause serious cuts.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Aggressive invader, can be hard to control, could invade new areas, displaces other species.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Attractive, useful as shelter, occurs in very many places. Declaring it now won't help.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cotoneaster simonsii

Common names

Khasia berry

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, widespread in central North Island and South Island, particularly foothills country.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)
n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.
Forms dense thickets that compete with native vegetation. Capable of growing in quite harsh environments with relatively few other woody weeds.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.
reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)
Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Older bushes commonly seen planted in old homesteads, school grounds and the like.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
68

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only
64

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only
69

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
Not widely sold or distributed in NAZI. now; out of fashion.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Wide environmental tolerance indicates potential for wide distribution, but as it is spread mainly by birds its spread is rather slow.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Can be killed with a range of brush killer herbicides or cut and paste.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document
Yes

NPPA YES/NO
No

Notifiable organism
No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.
DoC weed-led

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm, but information on this genus is suggested to be incomplete. Nonetheless, it seems that ingestions of small amounts would not be expected to cause problems.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Although not widely sold it would be useful to prevent further loci establishing.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Not widely sold, and now spread mostly by other means, but otherwise plenty of substitutes

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cotyledon orbiculata

Common names

African pig's ear, stonecrop

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, p570, Vol IV

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Fully naturalised. N.: Anawhata (Auckland), Whakatane (Bay of Plenty), Paekakariki and around Wellington Harbour; S.: Marlborough coast, N. Canterbury coast, Port Hills and other localities on Banks Peninsula, Otago Peninsula.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Health: Many members (if not all) of the Crassulaceae contain cardiac glycosides. Tylecodon, Cotyledon, Adromischus and Kalanchoe have particularly high concentrations. Bowiea volubilis is another. In the case of the Crassulaceae, the pharmacologically active part of the molecules are known as bufadienolides and in the Crassulaceae can have an accumulative effect (i.e. if eaten once may not be fatal, but after several times will be fatal). Cotyledon, orbiculata, Cotyledon, ,,,,"Dispersal: Vegetative, Wind. Life Form: Succulent herb, subshrub or shrub. Environment: Serious threat to one or more vegetation formations - displacing natives and altering successional trajectories . The leaves were used to treat corns and fever blisters (1). The warmed leaf juice is used as drops for earache. It may also be applied in the form of a hot poultice to treat boils, earache, inflammation or warts. Health: Internal use is dangerous and potentially lethal, and the toxicity is affected by the moisture content of the leaves.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Reject (11)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

10

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

16

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

10 suppliers in RHS Plant Finder. 4 x C.o + 4 x C.o var oblonga + 2 x C.o var orbiculata. Cotyledon orbiculata (Haw.) is widespread in south of Nambia and South- Africa, specially on the hills and mountains. Seen here near Helmeringhausen in Namibia on October 2, 1996. It has varied forms of leaves and as you can see it flowers in October. Indigenous evergreen shrub and a wonderful rock garden plant in warm regions. It likes very dry and hot places.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Widely distributed from Otago to Auckland - 2 map refs plotted. Coastal slopes and beaches, often on steep banks, rocky outcrops, cliff faces and bare ledges, sometimes in low scrub and dry depleted grassland, sometimes forming large populations. Potential unknown. Was planted around baches on the Nelson Boulder Bank and has spread significantly in that very harsh habitat (no soil, just stones and lichen).

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Control methods unknown to GWB.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

There have been at least 4 bufadienolides isolated from Cotyledon orbiculata, two of which proved to have a mildly cumulative effect in an animal organism. It seems that there has been no recorded incidents of this plant causing harm

to humans but there have been cases in California where sheep have died when fed *Cotyledon orbiculata*, and all *Cotyledons* should be considered poisonous. Ingestion is therefore dangerous and potentially lethal, and the toxicity is affected by the moisture content of the leaves. In South Africa, the disease caused by eating these plants, called cotyledonosis, has poisoned sheep and goats but rarely other animals. Ranchers in South Africa found that the meat of animals killed by cotyledonosis also remains toxic.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

WRA = 11 (Reject). Highly ornamental. Currently being sold through the NZ trade. Limited current distribution in NZ. Control measured not known to GWB. Proposal for inclusion submitted by ARC.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

none

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Crassula multicava

Common names

pitted crassula, fairy crassula

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes. coastal areas of North and South Islands (Flora IV).

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

First collected in 1959 and therefore is almost certainly expanding its range and abundance in NZ.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 15

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Genus sold in NZ.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

2

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

14

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

An attractive plant that would be sold for its horticultural merits.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Could become much more aggressive and common in NZ.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

—

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Could become a bad weed of coastal cliff habitats throughout NZ.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

None.

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Crocoshmia x crocosmiiflora

Common names

Montbretia, Crocosmia

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, throughout NZ, esp NI and W Coast.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Strong ground-covering colonies that probably prevent establishment of natives

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

DOC weed score 21, my wra score 22 'reject.'

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Good

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Vol 3 says once popular in gardens and cemeteries. Commonly promoted on overseas websites.

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Probably spreading along roadsides

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Probably easy with herbicides

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

No

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Nasty weed, still spreading, could restrict establishment of natives. Declared weed in NSW, regarded as environmental weed in NSW, Queensland, Vic, WA.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Dash of bright colour, very common everywhere, adding to nppa won't do much.

Include in NPPA?

No

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Very common plant, adding to list won't help, very little deliberate distribution these days.

Notes from TAG meeting

Widespread

Cyathea cooperii

Common names

Lacy tree fern, Australian tree fern

Synonyms

Sphaeropteris cooperi

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes (Heenan et al 1998). Spreading from spores

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Displacing native ferns in Hawaii and may do so here. Possibly hybridisation with native ferns (ARC proposal). Invades caopy gaps in upland forest in Mauritius

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (10)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
4 nurseries in Gaddun 2001. Genus widely sold but native species of Cyathea are more commonly sold. Available for sale on internet http://www.graysonline.co.nz/catalogue.asp?SALE_ID=20134&SALE_TYPE=LIVE

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

4

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

32

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Currently mostly in Northland and Auckland, uncertain how far south it would grow (DOC suggests may invade NI and norther South Island in sheltered areas). In Australia ranges from NE Queensland to SE New South Wales.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Uncertain, but easily confused with native Cyathea species so a cryptic weed - ie infestations are difficult to detect.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Known invasive overseas (Hawaii, Mauritius, South Africa), just beginning to naturalise here and considered likely to have similar impacts. Deliberate sale is probably the main means of spread at this stage because it is newly naturalised. Native alternatives are readily available.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Currently sold so likely to be objections from sellers (although related native species are readily available). No known current control on this species so slightly lower priority. Uncertainty over the area where it is likely to establish in the wild (just Auckland and north or further south).

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Cytisus scoparius

Common names

Wild broom

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, widespread throughout

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Well established history as an agricultural and environmental weed

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject (23)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Reflects its true weedy nature

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Originally sold as a stock food, now colored cultivars only are seen for sale. Most of these breach the local regulations though

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

49

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Widely distributed, but still large areas, particularly in the montane zone, where it could spread.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Well controlled by herbicides but resprouts from persistent seed bank.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

Yes

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DOC site-led in many areas

Any known impact on human health?

Foliage and seeds are described as toxic to humans, as they contain the alkaloid Cytisine among others. The alkaloid portions cause depression of the nervous system, and the glycoside causes a diuretic effect. Symptoms include incoordination and occasional excitement. Ingestion of large amounts of this shrub can cause coma and death.

Nonetheless, poisoning from this shrub is usually of a mild type. It seems that horses are most susceptible to poisoning by Scotch broom

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

So widely controlled in strategies that control needs to kept on sale

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

None

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Dipogon lignosus

Common names

Mile-a-minute

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

YES

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

YES: *Flora IV: Nth Is - scattered localities from vicinity of Auckland City northward, Gisborne City, Bulls, PNorth, Wellington City and coastal SW Wellington Province (A vigorous climber scrambling over scrub and wasteland). UO Declaration (DoC): established in the north of NZ, mostly in disturbed sites - particularly around Kaitaia, Whangarei, and Auckland. 39 voucher specimens of naturalised material in Auckland Herbarium - oldest 1950 (AK 36178).*

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

YES - *CONSERVATION VALUES: a vigorous scrambling vine that smothers ground cover species, halts regeneration of trees and shrubs, and smothers and kills taller vegetation to mid-canopy level. N-fixer so alters soil conditions where it establishes, encouraging the succession of high fertility plants to the detriment of native species that prefer low-fertility soils. Habitats at risk include coastal forest, dunelands, secondary and low forest, and lava fields (e.g. on Rangitoto Island). Wide environmental tolerance (e.g. drought, damp, wind, salt and poor soils) - in OZ grows in Tasmania so would be expected to survive in NZ in areas with similar climate.*

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

Reject (21) NB Not sure about palatability or toxicity of species, or self compatibility.

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Good information available on ISSG website. Impacts overseas, and for parts of NZ well documented. Bird dispersal via use of stems in nest building.

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Was sold in the garden industry

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

4

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

—

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

32

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

NZ: Garden dumping - e.g. Waitakere Ranges

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Naturalised in Northland, Auckland, BoP, Hawkes Bay, Taranaki, Manawatu, Wellington and Nelson/Marlborough Regions - including on a number of northern inshore/offshore islands. Potential to become more abundant in these regions.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Physical Control (Grub out young plants, slash smothering vines and grub out regrowth); Chemical Control (Spray whole infestation or Cut and treat stumps with herbicide - a number of which are suitable, e.g. Banvine, Escort, Tordon). Biological Control: None available.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

–

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

–

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

NZ: Site-led control by DoC in the Auckland area and on Rangitoto Island. Was a National Surveillance Plant Pest and included on the current NPPA list. Overseas: Recognised as an invasive species in a number of countries, e.g. parts of Australia including NSW, Victoria, Tasmania <http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/coasts/pdfs/no34.pdf>; Sth Africa; and US in California. Also naturalised in Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay. ISSG Database indicates that birds use the vine to build nests - creating another avenue of spread.

Any known impact on human health?

No known harm

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

WRA score high Reject (21). Well recognised as an environmental weed in NZ. Should remain on the NPPA.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

none

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Not currently sold so no nursery industry implications.

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Drosera capensis

Common names

Cape sundew

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

Yes, sparingly naturalised (first record in 2004), common in specialist collections (carnivorous plant).

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

Yes, damp or dry clay banks at two Auckland sites

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Could pose a serious threat to native turf species in restiad bogs.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

10 (Reject)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

Nil

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.

Widespread amongst carnivorous plant enthusiasts, occasionally offered for sale. Considered weedy, spreading by seed amongst other plants.

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

1

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

4

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

4

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

1

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant

Nil

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)

Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?

Few known occurrences. Potentially a problem in wetlands with low stature vegetation.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)

Control with glyphosate and diquat ineffective, seed bank characteristics unknown.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO

No

Notifiable organism

No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.

DoC weed-led control attempted (Auckland)

Any known impact on human health?

No information on this species. However, at least three species in this genus are said to be toxic, as leaves (especially crushed leaves) are vesicant and may lead to the formation of blisters in some people.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

*Potential to displace small stature, endangered flora (e.g. *Utricularia delicatula*) in low nutrient wetland habitats.*

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Popular, easily cultivated, carnivorous plant

Include in NPPA?

YES - medium priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

*Possibly need to experimentally determine ability of *D. capensis* to invade restiad bog vegetation in New Zealand. Banning propagation, sale and distribution may educate carnivorous plant enthusiasts about the risks of planting into natural areas. Somewhat difficult situation as naturalisation of this species is considered to have resulted from deliberate attempts to establish the plant in the wild. NZ has a number of native species of *Drosera*. Would consider moderate priority reasonable*

Notes from TAG meeting

Sufficient information available to include on Accord, but it would be useful to gather further information for the future

Dryopteris filix-mas

Common names

male fern

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes (FI NZ vol IV). Spreads by spores.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)
n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.
(ARC proposal) outcompetes and replaces native fern and groundcover, affects regeneration, succession

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.
reject (14)

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)
score seems quite high given level of information

Objective evidence it has been or is deliberately distributed in NZ. Discussed in section 3.2.1 of the evaluation criteria report.
Other species in genus are sold (ARC proposal). Available online <http://www.fronds.co.nz/product.html?p=74>

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
11

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only
7

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

—

Other supporting information on its deliberate distribution or potential for deliberate distribution in NZ (i.e. garage sale, overseas, personal observations). Include comments on appeal as a cultivated plant
reportedly used in alternative medicine <http://www.anthroposophy.org.nz/weleda/info/homework/Digestion&Liver.htm>, <http://www.caprine.co.nz/wa.asp?idWebPage=3278&idDetails=152>

Known vs potential distribution in NZ (abundance in New Zealand) (Discussed in section 3.2.2 of the evaluation criteria report.)
Gradients?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Widespread and well established in both North and South Islands although not necessarily in all areas where it could establish.

Ease of control of the plant as a species (Discussed in section 3.2.3 of the evaluation criteria report. What physical/ chemical/ biological methods are available for killing the plant? How susceptible is it to control methods? How practical are the control methods in the environments the plant occurs or could occur in?)
Uncertain, not particularly conspicuous so may be cryptic. Tolerant of physical damage.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

—

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document

—

NPPA YES/NO
No

Notifiable organism
No

Other supporting information, for example DOC weed-led, control in parks and reserves etc, can be included if available.
DoC weed-led for Chatham Islands

Any known impact on human health?

It is described as being poisonous to livestock, and there is evidence in the medical literature for poisoning in cattle (MacLeod & Greig 1978). It is used as a herbal medicine against worms, but extracts from this plant are said to cause liver damage and blindness in overdose.

Reasons for inclusion in NPPA. A summary of how inclusion in the NPPA supports management objectives for the species (see section 3.2 of the evaluation criteria report)

Currently sold, this species is spreading and invading native forest. Native alternatives are readily available for ornamental but not necessarily alternative medicine uses.

Reasons against inclusion in NPPA. Reasons why this species might be excluded from the NPPA. If there are regulatory impacts the TAG members are aware of then these can be noted here, but TAG members are not required to include these in their decision as these will be addressed by the steering group.

Currently sold so likely to be objections from sellers. Uncertain how significant a weed this is, and already well established - not sure how significant human spread is compared to natural spread.

Include in NPPA?

YES - low priority

If answering D or E, please note the reason for the uncertainty here. Any other comments here.

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Eccremocarpus scaber

Common names

Chilean glory creeper, Chilean glory vine, glory vine, Chilean glory flower

Synonyms

Nil

Is the plant species present in NZ? (if no, species will not be included in NPPA, however it can be recommended for UO status if technically justified)

yes

Has the plant species formed self-sustaining populations in New Zealand? (Discussed in section 2.1 of the evaluation criteria report. State where/ evidence).

yes. North and South islands, local and scattered. Flora IV. Especially common in south Canterbury.

If no to previous question, what potential does the species have to establish self sustaining populations in NZ? (i.e. overseas range, eg species is currently established in similar climates to NZ eg SE Australia, Hawaii uplands)

n/a

Does the plant have the potential to cause adverse impacts? (Discussed in section 2.2 of the evaluation criteria report. Brief comments on the types of impacts, noting what is affected (eg conservation values, human health). Brief comment on degree of impact. Summarise information provided with species proposals.

Yes, especially in lowland/coastal sites. Mainly recorded from near cultivation and therefore often established among other naturalised and cultivated plants.

WRA result and score, for example "reject (18)". NOTE - "reject" means that the model result is a recommendation to not allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ. "Accept" means that the model result is a recommendation to allow the importation of this species if it was not present in NZ.

reject 20

Comments on WRA score (Discussed in section 3.1 of the evaluation criteria report. Note that there is no system developed specifically for the purpose of evaluating NPPA species. A high ranking as a weed in the WRA system used is indicative only)

should be rejected as seems to becoming more common.