

<i>Hydrilla verticillata</i>	167
<i>Hydrocleys nymphoides</i>	169
<i>Hypericum androsaemum</i>	170
<i>Ipomoea indica</i>	172
<i>Iris pseudacorus</i>	174
<i>Jasminum humile</i>	176
<i>Jasminum polyanthum</i>	177
<i>Kennedia rubicunda</i>	179
<i>Lagarosiphon major</i>	181
<i>Lantana camara</i>	183
<i>Lantana camara var aculeata</i>	184
<i>Leycesteria formosa</i>	186
<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>	188
<i>Lilium formosanum</i>	189
<i>Lonicera japonica</i>	191
<i>Ludwigia peploides subsp. montevidensis</i>	193
<i>Ludwigia peruviana</i>	195
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	196
<i>Macfadyena unguis-cati</i>	198
<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	200
<i>Menyanthes trifoliata</i>	201
<i>Miscanthus nepalensis</i>	203
<i>Myoporum insulare (plus hybrids)</i>	205
<i>Myrica faya</i>	206
<i>Myricaria germanica</i>	208
<i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>	210
<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>	211
<i>Najas guadalupensis</i>	213
<i>Najas marina</i>	215
<i>Nassella - ALL species</i>	217
<i>Nassella neesiana</i>	218
<i>Nassella tenuissima</i>	220
<i>Nassella trichotoma</i>	222
<i>Nephrolepis cordifolia</i>	223
<i>Nuphar lutea</i>	225
<i>Nymphaea mexicana</i>	227
<i>Nymphoides geminata</i>	228
<i>Nymphoides peltata</i>	230
<i>Ochna serrulata</i>	232
<i>Osmunda regalis</i>	233
<i>Panicum maximum</i>	235
<i>Passiflora caerulea</i>	237
<i>Passiflora edulis</i>	238
<i>Passiflora mixta</i>	240
<i>Passiflora tarminiana</i>	242
<i>Passiflora tripartita (all subspecies)</i>	243
<i>Pennisetum alopecuroides</i>	245
<i>Pennisetum latifolium</i>	247
<i>Pennisetum macrourum</i>	248
<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i>	250
<i>Pennisetum setaceum</i>	251

<i>Pennisetum</i> spp. (excluding <i>P. clandestinum</i> and <i>P. glaucum</i>).....	253
<i>Pennisetum villosum</i>	255
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	256
<i>Pinus contorta</i>	258
<i>Pistia stratiotes</i>	260
<i>Pittosporum undulatum</i>	261
<i>Plectranthus ciliatus</i>	263
<i>Polygala myrtifolia</i>	265
<i>Polygonum perfoliatum</i>	267
<i>Potamogeton perfoliatus</i>	269
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	270
<i>Pyracantha angustifolia</i>	272
<i>Reynoutria japonica</i>	274
<i>Reynoutria japonica x sachalinensis</i>	275
<i>Reynoutria sachalinensis</i>	277
<i>Rhamnus alaternus</i>	279
<i>Rhododendron ponticum</i>	280
<i>Ricinus communis</i>	282
<i>Sagittaria montevidensis</i>	284
<i>Sagittaria platyphylla</i>	286
<i>Sagittaria sagittifolia</i>	287
<i>Salix cinerea</i>	289
<i>Salix fragilis</i>	291
<i>Salvinia molesta</i>	292
<i>Salvinia</i> spp.	294
<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i>	296
<i>Schoenoplectus californicus</i>	298
<i>Selaginella kraussiana</i>	299
<i>Senecio angulatus</i>	301
<i>Senecio mikanioides</i>	303
<i>Solanum carolinense</i>	304
<i>Solanum marginatum</i>	306
<i>Solanum mauritianum</i>	308
<i>Sorghum halepense</i>	310
<i>Sparganium erectum</i>	312
<i>Stratiotes aloides</i>	313
<i>Thunbergia grandiflora</i>	315
<i>Toxicodendron succedaneum</i>	317
<i>Tradescantia fluminensis</i>	320
<i>Trapa natans</i>	322
<i>Trapa</i> spp.	323
<i>Tropaeolum speciosum</i>	325
<i>Tussilago farfara</i>	327
<i>Typha domingensis</i>	328
<i>Typha latifolia</i>	330
<i>Utricularia gibba</i>	332
<i>Utricularia livida</i>	333
<i>Utricularia</i> spp. (except the 3 native species).....	335
<i>Vallisneria gigantea</i>	337
<i>Vallisneria spiralis?</i> (maybe a hybrid).....	338
<i>Watsonia meriana</i>	340

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.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

*No known direct harm to human health, but may indirectly affect human well-being. *M. spicatum* impacts power generation and irrigation by clogging dam trash racks and intake pipes. Stagnant water created by *M. spicatum* mats provides good breeding grounds for mosquitoes, Mats of this plant also interfere with recreational activities such as swimming, boating, fishing and water skiing.*

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)

Not in New Zealand, retain UO status

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?

No

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

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Najas guadalupensis

Common names

Southern naiad, southern waternymph

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)

No

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)

Native to all states of USA, South and Central America. Could invade many New Zealand water bodies.

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.

Invasive species, capable of colonising recently disturbed sites (e.g. weed control for other species) and displacing 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.

14 (Reject) AWRAM (54)

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 reported as present in New Zealand aquaria but no evidence to date. The commonest Najas sp. in the overseas trade.

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 water bodies 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?)

Difficult to control, both through lack of effective methods and its aquatic habitat.

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.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

No known direct harm to human health, but may indirectly affect human well-being. Najas guadalupensis can form dense colonies in shallow water and hinder swimming, fishing, boating, and other forms of water contact recreation. It also impedes water flow in drainage and irrigation canals.

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)

Not in New Zealand, retain UO status

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?

No

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

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Najas marina

Common names

Holly leaved naiad, holly leaved waternymph, spiny naiad

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)

No

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)

Native to temperate and tropical America, Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia. Could invade many New Zealand water bodies, especially slightly saline sites.

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.

Invasive species, capable of colonising recently disturbed sites (e.g. weed control for other species) and displacing native species, especially slightly saline sites, currently not impacted by alien submerged 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.

15 (Reject)

AWRAM (57)

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 reported as present in New Zealand aquaria but no evidence to date. Sold in the overseas trade.

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 most brackish water bodies 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?)

Difficult to control, both through lack of effective methods and its aquatic habitat.

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.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

The internodes of the stem usually have conspicuous, brownish, prickly teeth which can cause mechanical injury, sometimes followed by secondary infection. It may also directly affect human well-being, as it may hinder swimming, fishing and boating,

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)

Not in New Zealand, retain UO status

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?

No

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

Nil

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

***Nassella* - ALL species**

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, p79, Vol V

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

?

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: Potential for large pastoral production losses, particularly in drought-prone pastures, due to low palatability. Environmental: Not known. 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.

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

—

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

20 suppliers in RHS PF. 3 of N. cernua, 1 each of N. lepida and N. pulchra and 15 of N. trichotoma

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?)

—
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?

Nassella spp. produce distinctive sharp seeds that causes injury to stock and downgrades wool, skins and hides. These seeds can damage pelts, ruin sheep fleeces, blind livestock, and can penetrate the skin and hives and move through to the underlying muscle and cause abscesses. The same threat is posed to humans, which could suffer mechanical injury and subsequent secondary infection.

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 = 15-24 (Reject in all cases). None of the species has spread to fully occupy its potential range in NZ and one (*N. tenuissima*) has high ornamental value in Europe with potential for being sold in NZ. Banning sale nationally of all *Nassella spp* will support current RPMSs that include these 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.

none

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

Nassella neesiana

Common names

Chilean needle grass

Synonyms

Stipa neesiana

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, p80, Vol V

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.: Waitakere Ranges, Waipawa; S.: Marlborough (near Blind River, Seddon, and Lake Grassmere).

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.
ditto

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 (16)

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

—

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?
Roadsides and pastures. 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?)

—

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?

Nassella spp. produce distinctive sharp seeds that causes injury to stock and downgrades wool, skins and hides. These seeds can damage pelts, ruin sheep fleeces, blind livestock, and can penetrate the skin and hives and move through to the underlying muscle and cause abscesses. The same threat is posed to humans, which could suffer mechanical injury and subsequent secondary infection.

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)
ditto

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 - 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

Nassella tenuissima

Common names
Mexican feather grass

Synonyms
Stipa tenuissima

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, p81, Vol V

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.: Auckland and Hamilton cities.

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.
ditto

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 (24)

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

—
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
*No suppliers in RHS PF (but 104 suppliers of *Stipa tenuissima*) Potential unknown.*

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?
A garden escape; cultivated sporadically in both Islands.

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

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?

Nassella spp. produce distinctive sharp seeds that causes injury to stock and downgrades wool, skins and hides. These seeds can damage pelts, ruin sheep fleeces, blind livestock, and can penetrate the skin and hives and move through to the underlying muscle and cause abscesses. The same threat is posed to humans, which could suffer mechanical injury and subsequent secondary infection.

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Nassella trichotoma

Common names

nassella tussock

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, p82, Vol V

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.: scattered small infestations from Kaitaia to Coromandel Peninsula, and on east coast to Hastings; S.: east coast from Marlborough to Central Otago.

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.

ditto

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 (15-16)

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

—

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

15 suppliers in RHS Plant Finder. Potential estimated to include vast tracts of pasture land in Canterbury, Otago, Hawkes Bay and Wellington regions (Kriticos DJ, Lamoureaux S, Bourdôt GW, Pettit W. 2004. Nassella tussock: current and potential distribution in New Zealand. New Zealand Plant Protection 57: 81-88.)

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

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

Widespread but occupying 50% of its potential range (Kriticos DJ, Lamoureaux S, Bourdôt GW, Pettit W. 2004. Nassella tussock: current and potential distribution in New Zealand. New Zealand Plant Protection 57: 81-88.) . Grasslands and scrub to 300 m.

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?

Nassella spp. produce distinctive sharp seeds that causes injury to stock and downgrades wool, skins and hides. These seeds can damage pelts, ruin sheep fleeces, blind livestock, and can penetrate the skin and hives and move through to the underlying muscle and cause abscesses. The same threat is posed to humans, which could suffer mechanical injury and subsequent secondary infection.

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Nephrolepis cordifolia

Common names

Tuber ladder 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. North Island, more common in north and less so in southern part of North Island (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. Establishes from garden plant escapes into a variety of habitats such as banks, among rocks, and along tracks. Often establishes in already disturbed habitats.

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

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.

Yes, although banned in Auckland occasionally still sold in the nursery trade.

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

1

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

18

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

24

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

33

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?

Will continue to establish naturalised populations from cultivated plants, therefore need to restrict its distribution from nurseries.

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?)

spraying and handweeding.

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?

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)

Impact on native and naturalised ecosystems. (May be difficult to control??)

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

Nuphar lutea

Common names

Yellow water lily, spatterdock, cow lily, brandybottle

Synonyms

Nuphar luteum, Nymphaea lutea

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, restricted to one Hawkes Bay lake and adjacent dam, two cultivated Nuphar sites, but the species is possibly different

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, invasive in Horseshoe Lake, with viable seed set.

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.

At the one field site tis species displaced all other aquatic species from the shoreline to 2 m deep.

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.

12 (Reject)

AWRAM (43)

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. *The taxonomy of Nuphar is complex, with either one species or several recognised (N. American plants belonging to 8 spp. none of which are N. lutea (um)). Some plants are/were offered for sale.*

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.)

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

Few known occurrences. Could be problematic in most nutrient-rich water bodies in lowland 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?)

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.

Nearly eradicated at field site (HBRC)

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 deliberate human planting and subsequent movement by water. NPPA inclusion would prevent spread to new catchments.

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 waterlily-type 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

Another entity that needs looking into for future

Nymphaea mexicana

Common names

Mexican waterlily, banana waterlily

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, scattered North Island localities

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, 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.

Invasive in shallow water bodies, including slow flowing water. Smothers other plants and could disrupt irrigation/drainage/ recreational activities.

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.

14 (Reject) AWRAM (47)

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.

Waterlilies (genus Nymphaea) have been hybridised for over 100 years with a complex mixture present in New Zealand. Yellow flowered species with vertical rhizomes and long spreading stolons are very invasive and are the prodigy of (or reverted to) N. mexicana.

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.)
Gradings?: Widespread, common, Nth Island, Sth Island, Regions? Habitats?
Few known occurrences. Could be problematic in marginal areas (< 2m) of most water bodies 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?)
Difficult to control, both through lack of effective methods and its aquatic habitat. Seeds occasionally produced which may have long viability.

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.
Weed-led control in Waitakere Wetland (WCC/ARC) and Forest Lake (HCC)

Any known impact on human health?
No known direct harm to human health, but may indirectly affect human well-being as it can block waterways.

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 deliberate human planting and subsequent movement by water. NPPA inclusion would prevent spread to new catchments.

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.
*Probable confusion with other yellow flowered *Nymphaea* cvs which aren't as invasive (but probably have *N. mexicana* in their parentage).*

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
Identification training requirements

Nymphoides geminata

Common names
Marshwort, Entire marshwort

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, scattered North and South Island localities

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, 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.

Invasive in shallow water bodies, including slow flowing water. Smothers other plants and could disrupt irrigation/drainage/ recreational activities.

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.

9 (18 PAW) (Reject) AWRAM (46)

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 up to 1980's but gazetted as a Class B noxious plant in 1988, banning sale.

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.)

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

Most sites now eradicated. Could be problematic in marginal areas (< 2m) of most water bodies 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?)

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.

Eradicated from most (possibly all) field sites.

Any known impact on human health?

No known direct harm to human health, but may indirectly affect human well-being as it can impede drainage, block waterways and degrade water quality.

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 deliberate human planting and subsequent movement by water. NPPA inclusion would prevent spread to new catchments.

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 waterlily-type 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

Nymphoides peltata

Common names

Fringed water lily

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, one field site in Auckland now eradicated, but maintained in cultivation (NIWA secure facilities).

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, invasive at the one known field site.

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.

Invasive in shallow water bodies, including slow flowing water. Smothers other plants and could disrupt irrigation/drainage/ recreational activities.

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.

19 (17 PAW) (Reject) AWRAM (58)

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 up to 1980's but gazetted as a Class B noxious plant in 1988, banning sale.

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.)

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

Not known from New Zealand. Could be problematic in marginal areas (< 2m) of most water bodies 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?)

Difficult to control, both through lack of effective methods and its aquatic habitat. Seeds produced which have long viability.

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.

Eradicated from one known field site.

Any known impact on human health?

No known direct harm to human health, but may indirectly affect human well-being as it can impede drainage, block waterways and degrade water quality.

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)

Initially spread by deliberate human planting. However seed are adapted for spread by ducks so important to prevent initial spread. NPPA inclusion would prevent this.

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 waterlily-type 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

Ochna serrulata

Common names

mickey mouse plant

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. Prefers semi shade of the understorey of forests where it forms a dense monoculture that prevents regeneration of native species. It tolerates wet soil but also withstands droughts. (NZ Plant Conservatio Network website.)

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, it can compete with native plants in forested habitats.

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)

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

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.)

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

Spreading rapidly since the first collections were made in the mid-1990's. Spreading from cultivated plants and already established naturalised populations.

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 have a major impact on native forsts.

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 - 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

Osmunda regalis

Common names

Royal 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, recorded as naturalised in 1890, spreading in Waikato/BOP and scattered elsewhere in North 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, invasive in many 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.

Its dense growth habit is a threat to indigenous species including endangered biota and habitat quality

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.

5 (Evaluate)

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 but should have been banned after added to NPPA.

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

—

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?

Locally abundant in Waikato/BOP, sparse or absent elsewhere. Could be a major weed of peatlands throughout New Zealand, especially after disturbance events such as fire.

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 currently being evaluated. Re-invasion of treated areas from spores is likely.

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 on Great Barrier Island and Northland.

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)

Some spread by human activities with subsequent spread, primarily by wind dispersed spores (viable for one week) occurring where the plant is well naturalised. NPPA inclusion reduces long-distance spread to regions not yet invaded (e.g. South Island).

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, native ferns (tree ferns etc.) provide good substitute plants. Present in New Zealand as a naturalised plant for over 100 years, present in Waikato at least since 1950's.

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

Panicum maximum

Common names

Guinea grass, green panic, buffalo 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, p560, Vol V

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.

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.

Shade tolerant and could threaten forestry.

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.

Panicum maximum var. jacq Reject (6); var trichoglume Reject (16)

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

—

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

No suppliers in RHS PF, but 27 of other species of Panicum Potential unknown.

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?)

—

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)

WRA = 6-16 (Reject). Currently very limited in distribution in NZ, spreading slowly in Auckland about 100 m in seven years despite being a prolific seeder and being dispersed by birds and wind. No ornamental value evident, although other species in the genus are sold in Europe.

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

Passiflora caerulea

Common names

blue passionflower

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, scattered throughout and forming populations in some localities. Flora IV and herbarium records.

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. Vigorous and rampant vine that smothers vegetation it climbs on, including native forest and naturalised plant 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.

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)

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

47

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

26

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

31

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?

Occurs throughout NZ and is likely to continue to 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?)

—

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?

Toxic if eaten, and may cause skin irritation.

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)

Continues to be a major conservation and ecological weed and should be on NPPA to limit its 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

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

Passiflora edulus

Common names

edible passionfruit

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. *scattered throughout, but apparently not forming large populations (Flora IV and herbarium records).*

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. *Vigorous and rampant vine that smothers vegetation it climbs on, including native forest and naturalised plant 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.

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)

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

22

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

47

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

26

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

31

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?

Limited spread and abundance at present, although it does occur from Kermadec Islands south to Taranaki and Gisborne.

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

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?

Edible fruit, 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)

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.

Usually only a few plants (sometimes only 1) at each site and does not appear to be as much on a threat as the other species.

Include in NPPA?

No

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

Widely but locally established as only a few plants, not forming large naturalised populations

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Passiflora mixta

Common names

Northern banana passionfruit

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. Limited distribution Waitakeres and Marlborough (Heenan & Sykes 2003, NZJB 41, p. 217-221).

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. Vigorous and rampant vine that smothers vegetation it climbs on, including native forest and naturalised plant 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.

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)

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

47

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

26

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

31

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?

Not common and does not appear to be actively spreading.

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

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?

Edible fruit, 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)

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 distribution and does not appear to be as much on a threat as the other species.

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

*Mistaken ID. Majority of plants now called *P. tarminiana**

Passiflora tarminiana

Common names

Northern banana passionfruit

Synonyms

*Most of *Passiflora mixta* in FI NZ vol IV*

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, particularly the North Island (Heenan & Sykes 2003, NZJB 41, p. 217-221).

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. Vigorous and rampant vine that smothers vegetation it climbs on, including native forest and naturalised plant 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.

reject 21

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

47

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

26

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

31

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?
Occurs throughout NZ and is likely to continue to 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?)
—

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?
Edible fruit, 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)
Continues to be a major conservation and ecological weed and should be on NPPA to limit its 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

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

Passiflora tripartita(all subspecies)

Common names
Banana passionfruit

Synonyms
Passiflora mollissima

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, particularly the South Island (Heenan & Sykes 2003, NZJB 41, p. 217-221).*

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. *Vigorous and rampant vine that smothers vegetation it climbs on, including native forest and naturalised plant 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.

reject 21

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

47

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

26

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

31

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.)

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

Occurs throughout NZ and is likely to continue to 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?)

—

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?

Edible fruit, 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)

Continues to be a major conservation and ecological weed and should be on NPPA to limit its 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

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

Pennisetum alopecuroides

Common names

Chinese pennisetum

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, p573, Vol V

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.: Takatu near Warkworth, and lower Wanganui R.; S.: Nelson, Marlborough.

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.

ditto

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.
Nil

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only
25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only
5

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
181 suppliers in RHS PF. Potential unknown.

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?
Tracks, creek beds, coastal sand, wet low lying ground near swamps.

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.

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)
ditto

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 - 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

Pennisetum latifolium

Common names

Uruguay pennisetum

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, p575, Vol V

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

N.: North Auckland (south of Kerikeri), Auckland City, scattered in South Auckland, one record from Wanganui.

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.

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)

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

5

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 PF. Potential unknown.

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?

Garden escape; waste land, roadsides, pasture, damp 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?)
Well controlled by glyphosate.

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Pennisetum macrourum

Common names

African feather 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, p576, Vol V

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.: scattered throughout; S.: near Westport and to the east from Marlborough to North and Central Otago.

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.
diito. And was used in ornamental plantings 30-50 years ago and has often escaped and spread vigorously.

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 (24)

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only
25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only
5

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
26 suppliers in RHS PF. Potential unknown.

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?
Roadsides, grassy areas, lowland and hill country pasture, creek edges, swampy soil, sandy soil.

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.

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)
ditto

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 - 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

Pennisetum purpureum

Common names
Elephant 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, p577, Vol V

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.: North Auckland (Lake Tangonge, Ahipara, Waiharara).

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.

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.
Nil

Gaddum "The Plant Finder" (trade version 2001) - listing to species and cultivar level
1

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

5

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
last listed in RHS PF in 1999 Potential unknown.

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?

Escape from cultivation; on 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?)

Well controlled by glyphosate.

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?

The mature leaves are described as razor sharp capable of causing mechanical injury (FAO 2005).

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Pennisetum setaceum

Common names

Fountain 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, p578, Vol V

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.: North Auckland (Kaitaia, Warkworth), Auckland City, South Auckland (Pokeno, Thames, Hamilton), Wanganui; S.: Nelson (Richmond).

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.

*Formerly grown in gardens under the name *Pennisetum ruppellii* Steud., a synonym of *P. setaceum*.*

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 (18)

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

3

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

5

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

38 suppliers in RHS PF. Potential unknown.

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?

Waste land, occasional near ornamental plantings.

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.

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Pennisetum spp. (excluding P. clandestinum and P. glaucum)

Common names

(excluding kikuyu grass and pearl millet)

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)

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

?

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: Unpalatable, reduced pasture production, impaired drainage. Environmental: Replace native herbs and grasses within native grassland, dunes and wetlands. 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.

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
6

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only
8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only
25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only
5

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
Most of the species are highly ornamental with potential for sale in nursery trade.

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?)
Well controlled by glyphosate.

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?
*No known harm for most plants in the genus, exception being the sharp leaves of *P. purpureum*.*

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 = 10-24 (Reject). All species appear to be very limited in their current distributions and given the high ornamental value of some of them, sales are likely to continue in the NZ nursery trade, potentially adding to the spread of these 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.

none

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

*Exclude *P. clandestinum* & *P. glaucum**

Pennisetum villosum

Common names

Feathertop

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, p578, Vol V

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.: scattered throughout, except Wellington Province; S.: Marlborough (Blenheim, Tuamarina, lower Clarence Valley), Canterbury (Christchurch), Fiordland (Te Anau).

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.

*Garden escape often known in horticulture as *P. longistylum*, not persisting vigorously*

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)

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

8

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

25

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

5

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
36 suppliers in RHS PF. Potential unknown.

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?
Roadsides, pasture, coastal waste land, shingle banks, gravel bars, grassy street berms, lawns.

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.

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)

ditto

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 - 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

Phragmites australis

Common names

Phragmites

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, but only in Hawke's bay at present

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, has potential to block waterways, including saline systems, and have severe impacts on native biodiversity

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.

Was planted in Christchurch Botanical garden and has been promulgated as a sewerage treatment 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

One individual as been trying to have the species used in sewerage treatment plants at several localities in N.Z.

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 but the species known wide range overseas suggests the capacity to be widespread 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?)

Very difficult indeed to kill with herbicides and all other methods impartial.

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)

Prevent its use as an ornamental or as a sewerage treatment plant so as to minimize impacts on water ways and biodiversity.

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.

Has potential as a sewerage plant, but plenty of other species 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

Pinus contorta

Common names

Lodgepole pine

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 high 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.

Totally smothers the landscape of shorter native species in the montane and low alpine zones. Imposes visual pollution on natural landscapes. Impedes training of troops in tussock land

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)

Although it is "reject", the low score belies its potential impacts

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

Widely planted as a forestry tree. Also planted in mountain "revegetation" areas.

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

2

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

67

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

81

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

57

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 potential to cover all the bare areas in New Zealand mountains, especially in areas of intermediate rainfall

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?)

Intensive sheep grazing controls seedlings. Heavy doses of chemicals from helicopters will kill adult trees, with follow up. Seedlings can be pulled but adults require cutting and preferably direct poisoning as well.

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.

Controlled by volunteer groups on Mt Ruapehu and by New Zealand army in central North Island.

Any known impact on human health?

Pinus contorta may cause contact dermatitis, allergic bronchial asthma or rhinitis in some individuals

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)

Need to prevent plantations of the species being grown in the high-country

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.

A valuable timber tree, but there are plenty of alternatives.

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

Pistia stratiotes

Common names

Water lettuce

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, eradicated from known field sites, but maintained in cultivation (NIWA secure facilities).

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, two field populations known.

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)

Unlikely to grow outside of Northland and thermally heated waters.

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 in tropical/subtropical conditions. In New Zealand this plant has the potential to completely displace other vegetation, impacting on water quality, drainage and recreational activities in suitable sites.

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.

15 (20 P&C) (Reject) AWRAM (42)

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.

Despite being banned from sale and distribution since 1979 this plant may still be distributed by hobbyists, new sites rarely reported.

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.)

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

Not known from New Zealand. Could be a problem in frost-free warm coastal Northland or thermally heated waters.

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 plants, but some methods are not always acceptable in aquatic situations.

National eradication i.e. DOC, MAF

eradicated

RPMS YES/NO refer to master document
—

NPPA YES/NO

Yes

Notifiable organism

notifiable

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?

Sap may cause contact dermatitis or eye irritation. Sap contains oxalate crystals that can lead to pain and irritation of the mouth, lips and tongue. In severe cases, swelling of the throat may cause breathing difficulties.

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)

Eradicated from New Zealand field sites, retain NO status.

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.

Retain on NPPA as it is NO

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Pittosporum undulatum

Common names

Australian cheesewood, Victorian box, mock orange, sweet pittosporum, New Zealand daphne, Victorian laurel, orange pittosporum, wild coffee, Australiese kasuur, soet pittosporum

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. Rapidly becoming far more common in northern New Zealand since it was first recorded near Kaitaia (Flora IV). See Heenan et al. (2002, NZJB 40 p. 159-160) for an updated 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)

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. This species could be a major environmental disaster if it becomes widely established in forests. A very bad weed in other overseas countries. See information from ARC accompanying application to go on NPPA.

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 26

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.

Sold by garden centres.

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

3

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

256

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

210

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

41

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?

Has the potential to be very common and abundant in lowland parts of 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?)

difficult once established since it produces abundant seed

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?

Chemicals known as saponins are found in this plant. These are toxic to humans but are poorly absorbed by the body, therefore causing few 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)

Potentially a very aggressive invasive species that could become well established in native forest ecosystems.

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 - 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

Plectranthus ciliatus

Common names

Plectranthus, Blue spur 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 - Flora IV: Nth Is - locally abundant, Sth Is - around Karamea (Shady areas in and around forest margins, plantations, hedges). UO Declaration (DoC): Naturalised range continues to expand. 25 voucher specimens of naturalised material in Auckland Herbarium - oldest record 1950 (AK 36203).

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: *creeping, mat forming herb that produces long vigorous runners that spread rapidly to form dense clumps/mats in the forest understorey. These mats suppress regeneration and all other ground cover and regenerating species - similar impacts as Tradescantia (UO Declaration, DoC). It favours damp shaded habitats, especially disturbed forest, shrublands, streamsides and river systems, fernlands and wetlands. Can be drought tolerant as water is stored in the stems, and able to withstand and regrow after frost. Rooting freely from nodes along the stem - new plants can establish from small fragments.*

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, self compatibility or whether a persistent seed bank is formed.

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)

Other species in the genus also known to be invasive, e.g. P. ecklonii, P. grandis in NZ, P. amboinicus in Virgin Islands (PIER database). Quite a lot of information on impacts etc in NZ.

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. Flora IV - was introduced for cultivation, as a trailing pot plant and ornamental plant. Widely grown in gardens (UO Declaration DoC).*

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

NZ: Garden dumping - e.g. natural areas in the Waitakere Ranges, and Bay of Plenty.

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?

Locally common throughout the NI and in northern/warmer parts of the SI. Hasn't be allowed to be formally sold for over 10 years - with garden dumping the main cause of more recent human-mediated spread. Significant potential become much more widely naturalised.

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 (hand pull or rake and dispose of plants; cover with weed mat and leave for 3-6 months); Chemical Control (Spray whole plant with either Escort or Glyphosate and penetrant, or Grazon; weed wipe plant with either of these herbicides). 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: DoC weed-led control being undertaken, e.g. sites in the Bay of Plenty, Rotorua area, and Nelson/Marlborough. Was a National Surveillance Plant Pest and included on the current NPPA list.

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 *Reject* (21). Well recognised as an environmental weed. NPPA status should be retained.

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 - high 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

Polygala myrtifolia

Common names

Sweet pea shrub, sweet pea bush, myrtle-leaf milkwort

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 - common from Auckland City northwards, also est. in Tauranga, New Plymouth, Napier, and on W coast of N Wellington, Sth Is, Nelson City (mostly in coastal habitats, occasionally in scrubland). 51 voucher specimens of naturalised material in Auckland Herbarium - oldest record 1949 (AK26224).

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: ability to invade and alter the ecology of coastal areas and forest margins on the mainland and on offshore islands. Alters ecological pathways. Establishes on coastal cliffs/bluffs and shrublands inhibiting the regeneration of native species in these areas (GW). Drought tolerant.

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) NB Unsure re palatability and toxicity.

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 abit of information available re impacts, habitats invaded, ecology etc from NZ and Australia. Viable seed for at least 3 years. <http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/coasts/pdfs/no34.pdf>

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. Cultivar 'grandiflora' still available.

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

NZ: Because cv 'grandiflora' still sold, species could wrongly be thought of as OK and distributed by gardeners.

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-free northern, coastal and island sites - in the NI and warmer SI regions. Could potentially establish over a far greater area than current distribution.

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 (for small infestations, hand pulling of seedlings/saplings, larger infestations can be cut with a scrub cutter and regrowth treated with a herbicide); Chemical Control (cut and paint stumps, or spray whole plants/cut over areas - range of herbicides effective, e.g. glyphosate, metsulfuron etc). Biological Control: None currently available - but investigations in OZ for potential agents.

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.

NZ: ARC and Landcare/beachcare groups in the Auckland Region undertaking site-led control of this plant. Was a National Surveillance Plant Pest. Overseas: Also recognised as an environmental weed in Australia, e.g. Victoria - where it is becoming an increasing environmental problem. In OZ - biocontrols are being investigated.

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 (22). Was on the 'National Surveillance Pest Plant list and still included as a pest plant in a number of RPMS (e.g. Northland, Auckland, Waikato). Significant environmental weed in a number of habitats, particularly coastal areas. Recommend NPPA status.

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 - high priority

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

Because of its inclusion in the National Surveillance Pest Plant list (NSPPL) - is not widely sold (most material offered for sale is 'grandiflora' cv). P. myrtifolia 'grandiflora' said to be a sterile cv - was not included on the NSPPL and exempt in RPMS where P. myrtifolia listed as a pest plant. NB At the least should be an Unwanted Organism.

Notes from TAG meeting

Exclude Polygala grandifolia

Polygonum perfoliatum

Common names

Devil's tail tearthumb, mile-a-minute, thunder god's vine

Synonyms

Persicaria perfoliata, Ampelygonum perfoliatum

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)

Possibly no, one garden site in Auckland targeted for eradication

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

Possibly, regrowth from seed after initial plant was removed. The plant is an annual.

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)

Well established as a naturalised plant in northeastern USA and Canada. Native to Asia (including India, China, Japan, Malaysia).

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.

Capable of smothering indigenous shrubs and untilled nursery and horticultural crops.

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.

6 (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.

Probably not deliberately introduced to New Zealand.

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

14

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

23

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

20

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
Introduced to North America as an ornamental plant, no longer traded.

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 known from New Zealand. Could be a problem in disturbed areas over much of 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?)
Vines are relatively easy to control. Regrowth from seed needs follow-ups.

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.

Nil

Any known impact on human health?

Leaves of Polygonum spp. are described as being irritant.

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)

Eradicated from New Zealand field sites, retain UO status.

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.

Retain UO status.

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Potamogeton perfoliatus

Common names

Clasped pondweed

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, three sites found (one pond, two commercial outlets) all eradicated, but maintained in cultivation (NIWA secure facilities).

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, expanded to completely fill the pond site (Near Queenstown).

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)

Almost cosmopolitan in distribution in temperate regions (including North America, Europe and Australia).

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.

A weed in Europe and Australia, smothering other submerged vegetation and obstructing human activities. Potentially able to hybridise with indigenous pondweeds.

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.

12 (Reject)

AWRAM (55)

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.

After discovery in the pond site, plants were traced back to two commercial outlets (Queenstown and Christchurch).

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

Widely traded as an aquarium plant internationally.

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 most water bodies 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?)

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

–

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)

Eradicated from New Zealand field sites, retain UO status

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.

If eliminated from all potential propagule sources then same status as sp. not recorded from New Zealand.

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Prunus serotina

Common names

Rum cherry

Synonyms

Black cherry, wild cherry, wild black cherry, chocke cherry

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 only one record in FI NZ vol IV, reported wild in last 2 years in central North Island (EW proposal)

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)

Also widely naturalised (and considered invasive) in Europe, especially Germany

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 Europe reported to replace native canopy species in plantation forests. Dense stands of seedlings reported in NZ from more open areas although considered unlikely to invade dense lowland forest. Reported to be poisonous to livestock but uncertain how much poisoning actually occurs.

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.

Uncertain

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

not listed

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 some NZ-distributed gardening books eg Bryant 1999. Used for furniture making overseas.

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 restricted in the wild but probably widespread in cultivation (although not necessarily common). Wide native range and naturalised range overseas suggests it could grow in many more areas than it currently does.

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 Prunus species are frequently somewhat troublesome, resprouting after stump treatment for example and often needing retreating.

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.

Uncertain, may be some control in Tongariro/ Taupo Conservancy where this species was identified as a concern last year.

Any known impact on human health?

*Ingestion of leaves, seeds or bark of *P. serotina* lead to the production of hydrocyanic acid in the digestive tract. There have been claims of children dying after ingesting an excessive number of seeds, found in the berries. Cyanide poisoning interferes with respiration and blood circulation; death is often swift. Cattle (and horses) are frequently poisoned by eating wilted *P. serotina* leaves.*

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)

Newly naturalising species, recognised invasive overseas, can spread by birds but spread to new areas likely to be primarily by deliberate human dispersal (not likely to spread from dumped garden rubbish etc).

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 be some objections if sold although doesn't appear to be a popular species.

Include in NPPA?

YES - high priority

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

I have no direct experience of this species, only know what I have read about it.

Notes from TAG meeting

Nil

Pyracantha angustifolia

Common names

Firethorn, orange firethorn, yellow firethorn

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, Northland, central North Island, and Nelson

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.

Competes with native shrubs in regeneration and especially on harsh sites such as road cuttings

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.

Commonly seen in gardens. Was widely planted in Turning township by MOW during Tongariro power scheme.

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

—

NZ Nursery register 2004/05 genus level only

43

NZ Nursery Register 1997/98 genus level only

43

NZ Nursery register 1991/92 genus level only

40

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

Bright berries still make it an attractive plant for gardeners

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 a wide climatic range in N.Z., but never very abundant except where it has been planted in mass, at Turangi. Now spreading up the Tongariro river from these plantings. And dispersing downwards in flood waters because the seeds float.

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?)

Little information, but can be killed by cutting and poisoning.

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?

Very thorny plant that causes 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)

Like many bird-dispersed Rosaceous, this is slow to spread and its current distribution is nowhere near its potential because it is still planted, this should be stopped.

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.

Planted, but 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

Reynoutria japonica

Common names

Asiatic knotweed, German sausage, Japanese knotweed, Mexican bamboo

Synonyms

Polygonum cuspidatum, Polygonum reynoutria, Fallopia japonica

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 North Island south of Auckland and north and mid South island. Locally abundant in Westland.

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, 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.

Aggressive coloniser of disturbed areas, rough pasture and riparian zones.

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.

16 (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.

Variety 'Compacta' widely grown in New Zealand, listed in Gaddum

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

Possibly listed under botanical synonyms

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

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