



This document was declassified on 20 June 2013 visit
<http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-3149>

CO-ORDINATING FUTURE WORK ON NON-NATIVE SPECIES

This paper was provided to the Joint Committee for discussion. Please refer to the minutes of the meeting for Committee's position on the paper.

To view other Joint Committee papers and minutes visit
<http://www.jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2671>

To find out more about JNCC visit <http://www.jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1729>

JOINT NATURE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

CO-ORDINATING FUTURE WORK ON NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Paper by Dr Ian McLean

1. Background

- 1.1 The Defra *Review of Non-native Species Policy* (published March 2003) included eight Key Recommendations to improve measures to limit the ecological and economic impact of non-native species in Great Britain (these Key Recommendations are listed in Annex 1 to this paper). These Key Recommendations were supported by a suite of more detailed Sub-recommendations that identified more specific tasks for action that will enable the strategy to deliver the objectives of the *Review*.
- 1.2 The Working Group that prepared the *Review of Non-native Species Policy* under the chairmanship of Defra proposed a strategy to tackle the problems caused by non-native species that was based upon the three-stage hierarchical approach proposed by the CBD Guiding Principles, namely:
 - i. The first stage is to give priority to measures to prevent introductions of invasive non-native species;
 - ii. The second stage concerns detection of newly-introduced invasive non-native species and, where appropriate, rapid action to prevent their establishment;
 - iii. The third stage concerns longer-term mitigation measures, such as containment or control, for established non-native species.
- 1.3 The Working Group also emphasised that a precautionary approach is required that assists in balancing the rights of individuals and organisations with the need to reduce the risks of adverse effects to the environment or other interests.
- 1.4 Although the Working Group produced a report containing eight Key Recommendations, together with the supporting Sub-recommendations, as an integral and mutually supporting range of measures, the first Key Recommendation is particularly crucial because if this is not implemented successfully, then all the other Key Recommendations and supporting Sub-recommendations will be compromised. The first Key Recommendation states “*The Government should designate or create a single lead co-ordinating organisation to undertake the role of co-ordinating and ensuring consistency of application of non-native species policies across Government*”.
- 1.5 During discussions between Defra and others prior to June 2003, it became clear that JNCC was being considered as the favoured organisation to be

nominated for the lead co-ordinating role. This was communicated to the Joint Committee at its June meeting (in JNCC 03 N05) and since then JNCC staff have discussed the implications of this suggestion with Defra, devolved administrations, country agencies and others. The Ministerial response to the *Review* (due to be published in late September 2003) will state that JNCC is being considered for the lead co-ordinating role. The Chief Executives at their meeting on 10 September 2003 also discussed the implications of JNCC taking on this role, both for the work of the support unit and the work of the country agencies.

- 1.6 This paper summarises the options for implementing Key Recommendation 1, with or without JNCC taking on this role, and presents a brief analysis intended to help the Joint Committee form a view on the preferred option for JNCC and the country agencies. This preferred option should be practical in terms of its implementation and be the one most likely to lead to a reduction in the problems caused by non-native species for biodiversity conservation and other sectors.
- 1.7 Other countries have adopted different organisational solutions to the problem of dealing with non-native species. In New Zealand the role has been taken on by a separate biosecurity agency, which launched its new strategy in August 2003. In the United States an Invasive Species Council co-ordinates the work of Federal and State organisations. Elsewhere, many countries have several organisations responsible for different functions (as in Britain at present), with a similar lack of effective co-ordination of prevention, surveillance and management issues.
- 1.8 A separate initiative to review arrangement for dealing with non-native species within the island of Ireland is now underway (Ian McLean from JNCC is one member of the Steering Group for this project, to help share experience from the Defra *Review*).

2. Options for implementing Key Recommendation 1

- 2.1 At the time of writing, Defra has not developed any Terms of Reference (ToR) for the co-ordinating body. However, no assessment can be made regarding the options for implementing Key Recommendation 1 without some understanding of the main functions of such a body. On the basis of available information, JNCC staff have formulated draft ToR to help with further discussions and with evaluating options. The draft generic ToR are as follows:
 - i. The co-ordinating body will be responsible for developing guidelines, codes of conduct and other measures (to be endorsed by Government) for preventing the establishment of invasive non-native species (animals, plants and micro-organisms), for surveillance to detect the arrival and establishment of such species and for their eradication and control under a range of conditions and circumstances to be agreed.
 - ii. Ensure that these guidelines are understood and adopted by those other organisations responsible for delivering work on non-native species,

- including Government Departments and Agencies, and for giving advice on their implementation as required.
- iii. Using an agreed advisory process where necessary, take decisions or make recommendation to Ministers on critical decisions, concerning the importation, release, eradication or control of invasive non-native species.
 - iv. Identify appropriate agencies that will deliver specific agreed activities in relation to the programme for managing non-native species issues.
 - v. Agree with the nominated agencies (via MoU or another mechanism) programmes of work to deliver these responsibilities and activities and ensure that the necessary monitoring reports on action taken are sent regularly to the co-ordinating body.
 - vi. Review and report upon the information received from the nominated agencies, using an annual reporting mechanism to assess the degree of success achieved with the different measures taken and use this reporting to follow up upon, and to drive forward, the necessary actions from all organisations involved.
- 2.2 The draft ToR have been further elaborated with respect to the key issues for the co-ordinating body under the three main headings of the CBD Guiding Principles. This more detailed treatment of the ToR, plus two case examples to show how the co-ordinating body might operate in practice, are given at Annex 2. This annex should help by testing the ToR against real examples, while Annex 3 considers how resources and responsibilities might be dealt with when planning the establishment of the co-ordinating body.
- 2.3 The Working Group did not make any specific statement within the *Review* as to the preferred organisational mechanism for improving co-ordination of non-native species work. The options of creating a new agency, assigning the duties to an existing organisation or developing another solution were not explored within the *Review*. The *Review* strongly recommended (p.2) that even though environment policy is a devolved function, the lead co-ordinating organisation should have a Great Britain-wide remit. While recognising that expertise already exists within a range of organisations, the *Review* stated that the challenge is to marshal and develop that expertise, target resources and to tackle effectively the related areas of animal and wildlife diseases, illegal imports of animal products and food, and the trade in endangered species.
- 2.4 The lead co-ordinating role could be taken on by ACRE (the Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment), which currently deals with assessing GMOs for release (as well as assessing non-native animals for release, for biocontrol purposes, for example). This would extend the role of the Committee (currently separate arrangements apply to Scotland) and would require an increase in the Defra staff supporting the Committee.
- 2.5 The lead co-ordinating role could be taken on by CSL (Central Science Laboratory, York), which participated in the Defra *Review*, currently deals

with some direct management of non-native species (notably Ruddy Duck), has secure premises (see 3.4 below), and works under contract to Defra and others on invasive species in Britain and abroad. The role would extend CSL work into the policy arena where currently JNCC have been active.

- 2.6 The lead co-ordinating role could be taken on by the JNCC, with the staff either based at Peterborough, or at CSL York (see 3.4 below). JNCC has experience of co-ordinating work across Great Britain in the joint work with country agencies (so in a sense is pre-adapted to the co-ordination role), but has experience of dealing with non-native species issues limited to developing the agencies' translocations policy and participating in the Defra *Review*. The role would extend JNCC activities into co-ordinating operational matters. Were JNCC to take on the role, a clear process that engaged all relevant sectoral interests would need to be instituted to give legitimacy to its decisions.
- 2.7 When implementing the lead co-ordination model, organisations could work together via Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), with their respective duties defined to ensure that a properly co-ordinated programme of work would be brought into being. The MoU would need to be reviewed and revised in the light of experience to ensure that they continue to work well.
- 2.8 Alternatively, organisations could work together via Ministerial instructions, which would need to be sufficiently detailed and comprehensive to make clear the respective duties involved. Such instructions would need to be reviewed and revised in the light of experience to ensure that they worked well.
- 2.9 To achieve the degree of stakeholder involvement with all the sectors concerned (including the vital commercial sector), the co-ordinating role would need to involve some kind of committee or forum structure to enable wide participation in developing and agreeing solutions and their implementation. Such stakeholder involvement would need to be carefully distinguished from the decision-taking aspects, which might best be carried out by a small group directly responsible to Ministers for Defra and devolved administrations.

3. Analysis of the issues

- 3.1 Defra has apparently ruled out creating a new "biosecurity agency" on the grounds of cost and because this would not fit easily with devolution of Government responsibilities for the environment. It is important to acknowledge that improving co-ordination of non-native species work will, nevertheless, cost significant resources in order to bring together the current activities of the Departments and Agencies involved and to deliver better on the ground action, information sharing and reporting roles. There is a considerable difference between co-ordinating policies and co-ordinating the implementation of policies (the latter being more difficult and more expensive). For work on non-native species to be delivered better in Britain, a strategic approach that integrates policy development, decision taking and co-ordination effective action is essential. This is a major step up from the current arrangements and it will be a challenging task to gain support for this

approach. It seems doubtful at present that there is either the recognition of the need for a strategic approach to dealing with non-native species, or the will and intention to seek the necessary resources to achieve this. The set-up and running costs for the new arrangements should be clearly defined (these will be different according to the body nominated for the co-ordinating role). It should be noted that the real costs of the current (ineffective) arrangements are hidden because they are dispersed over so many organisations and within separate budgets. A strategic approach would make the costs more transparent and accountable.

- 3.2 Defra has asked what the costs of JNCC taking on the role of the lead co-ordinating organisation would be, a question that cannot be answered without the required functions and duties of the role being defined. It is essential that any work to be carried out by JNCC (or another body) should be thoroughly scoped and costed in advance to avoid the risk of an embarrassing failure to deliver improved co-ordination of non-native species work. Because the co-ordination work is novel (for Britain) and complex, the planning and scoping work is a significant task in itself. Initial thoughts on an approach to costing the work are given in Annex 2 (section 7). Were the JNCC to take on this role, it would be an additional burden and the full cost would need to be borne directly by Government.
- 3.3 Annex 2 also provides an expanded draft set of Terms of Reference for the G.B. Co-ordinating Organisation for Non-native Species Policy. These ToR set out the main functions under the three CBD and Defra *Review* themes, with a short description of the nature of the activities, how they could be organised and discharged, the implications for JNCC in a co-ordinating role and the challenges and impediments to success. In Annex 3 (section 2) the principal responsibilities for the key players are also defined as a preliminary view of the way these could be allocated to fit with the ToR of the Co-ordinating Organisation for Non-native Species Policy.
- 3.4 There are important issues of security of premises and staff for any organisation taking on the lead co-ordinating role, due to the prominence of the role in dealing with some problem species that attract attention from animal rights groups and others. At present the only organisation that has sufficient security in place is CSL, York; this suggests that either for CSL to take on the role (or for the staff taking on the role to be based at CSL, York) is likely to be the most cost-effective solution in terms of set-up expenditure.
- 3.5 There are significant issues regarding the links between Britain and international activities regarding non-native species, within both the Overseas Territories and the European Union, as well as improving information sharing to achieve higher standards for prevention and control. At present little effort is being given in Britain to ensuring that these aspects are dealt with properly.
- 3.6 The question of new legislation needed to underpin the co-ordinating role and better implementation for on the ground measures has not been tackled as yet. The timing of such legislation will affect the efficiency of operation of any new arrangements in dealing with non-native species. The problems of co-

ordinating non-native species work with the related fields of animal and human health might also be addressed by new legislation.

4. The approach to present to Defra and devolved administrations

- 4.1 There are high risks and uncertainties in establishing improved co-ordination of non-native species work. The possible role of JNCC as the lead body requires more work to ascertain the costs and benefits to the statutory conservation agencies. Taking on the role could skew the overall balance of JNCC work strongly in one direction (non-native species issues are often high profile and controversial as the eradication of Ruddy Duck and dealing with Mink on the Hebrides have shown). This would inevitably lead to changes from the current strategic direction being developed by the Committee and so requires very careful evaluation. Thus, the response of JNCC to Defra and devolved administrations should be cautious at this stage and should consider all the implications before any decisions are taken.
- 4.2 In the first instance, Defra and devolved administrations should be asked to define their requirements for improved co-ordination so that the nature and extent of the work can be defined and scoped properly. JNCC should continue to assist Defra with this process via the provision of advice on the best options and the means and costs of implementing these. JNCC with the country agencies should then assess the implications of taking on the new role and determine the resources required to do the work via an explicit protocol and to an agreed standard.

Key Recommendations from the Defra Review of Non-native Species Policy working group report

Key Recommendation 1: The Government should designate or create a single lead co-ordinating organisation to undertake the role of co-ordinating and ensuring consistency of application of non-native species policies across Government.

Key Recommendation 2: Develop comprehensive risk assessment procedures to assess the risks posed by non-native species and identifying and prioritising areas for other prevention action.

Key Recommendation 3: Develop codes of conduct to help prevent introductions for all relevant sectors in a participative fashion involving all relevant stakeholders.

Key Recommendation 4: Develop a targeted education and awareness strategy involving all relevant sectors.

Key Recommendation 5: Revise and update existing legislation to improve handling of invasive non-native species issues.

Key Recommendation 6: Establish adequate monitoring and surveillance arrangements for non-native species in Great Britain.

Key Recommendation 7: Policies should be established with respect to management and control of invasive non-native species currently present or newly arrived in the wild, and operational capacity be developed to implement these policies.

Key recommendation 8: Stakeholders should be fully consulted and engaged in development of invasive non-native species policies and action through a mechanism such as a consultative forum.

Elaboration of the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the proposed G.B. Co-ordinating Organisation for Non-native Species work

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The elaborated ToR in this annex set out the main functions under the three CBD and Defra Review themes, with a short description of the nature of the activities, how they could be organised and discharged, and the implications for JNCC in taking on a co-ordinating role and the main challenges to achieving success.
- 1.2 Under a delegated model for policy-making on non-native species and for delivering the key practical tasks (prevention measures, surveillance activities and management or eradication of problem species) it is essential to define where the responsibilities lie and to allocate accountabilities for making the necessary decisions. It is envisaged in this paper that in Britain the co-ordinating body will be responsible for ensuring that the various functions are carried out to the required standard, and for reporting on how well the different activities are delivered (as summarised in section 2.1 of the main paper). The separate organisations responsible for different functions will retain their full internal management systems and will maintain full control over how they carry out their work on non-native species. It will be up to the co-ordinating body to report on the delivery of the different functions, and thereby make clear how well the new arrangements work prior to identifying those improvements necessary to achieve success.

2. Organisations involved and their working arrangements

- 2.1 Examples of organisations that will deliver specific functions under the delegated model include Customs & Excise for import surveillance, Plant Health Division for plant diseases, Forestry Commission for tree planting and forest management, the Environment Agency for surveillance and control of aquatic and riverside invasive non-native species, the statutory conservation agencies for surveillance of SSSIs for control of invasive species within NNRs. and the National Biodiversity Network for surveillance and reporting of new and established non-native species. The co-ordinating body would be responsible for facilitating links with international organisations and other countries to share information and best practice, but with other organisations also directly involved where required (for example, Plant Health Division for surveillance and prevention of plant diseases).
- 2.2 In turn there is need to ensure that other sectors play their part in preventing the establishment of further non-native species and in tackling the existing problems. The Working Group envisaged in the *Defra Review* that this would be achieved principally by Codes of Conduct drawn up and agreed between Government (the co-ordinating body) and representatives of the various commercial and other interests involved (e.g. the horticultural trade, shipping and air transport carriers). Such Codes of Conduct would need to have a legal

basis to ensure compliance and could be reviewed and revised more quickly and cheaply than primary legislation itself.

- 2.3 At the level of individual problem species, it is envisaged that management plans will be drawn up for the most significant species (as already planned for 100 plants under the 2003 consultation for developing the UK response to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (*Plant Diversity Challenge*)). A similar initiative will be required for problem animal species.

3. **Elaborated ToR for prevention measures**

- 3.1 **ToR for the co-ordinating body:** identifying the organisations responsible for carrying out the different prevention activities and agreeing their work programmes for this activity; conduct risk assessments to produce agreed priority lists of invasive species for exclusion from Britain; ensure that these lists are incorporated into appropriate legislation and are disseminated and understood by all organisations responsible for non-native species work; ensure that procedures are in place to detect the arrival of species on the priority lists; draw up and agree Codes of Conduct with all relevant sectors in line with the Defra *Review* recommendations; publicise the prevention issues widely to get public support for the policy and its implementation; annual reporting of actions under this heading.
- 3.2 **Other key organisations involved and their roles:** Customs & Excise (detection and compliance), Ports Authorities (detection and publicity); Plant Health Division (detection and international compliance); veterinary services (detection and international compliance); transport and trading firms and their co-ordinating bodies (involvement via Codes of Conduct).
- 3.3 **Main challenges:** achieving consistent action amongst the many organisations involved; ensuring good participation by the public and all sectors so that detection rates are high; obtaining accurate information for reporting; exchanging information with international bodies and other countries.

4. **Elaborated ToR for surveillance, detection of problems and instigation of rapid remedial action**

- 4.1 **ToR for the co-ordinating body:** identifying the organisations responsible for carrying out the different surveillance activities and agreeing their work programmes for this activity; ensure that a clear decision-taking and action process (based on agreed principles) is ready if and when species are detected; ensuring that well-informed and rapid decision-taking happens when required; calling in and co-ordinating those responsible for on the ground assessment eradication activities; auditing eradication and control measures and reporting upon their effectiveness; annual reporting of actions under this heading.
- 4.2 **Other key organisations involved and their roles:** the other key organisations overlap with those listed under 3.2 (above); in addition the statutory conservation agencies and the environment agencies together with CSL York and local authorities have roles in surveillance and taking remedial action; the NBN and its contributing organisations have a role in obtaining

information about the changing status of non-native species and making this available via the Internet.

- 4.3 **Main challenges:** ensuring that rapid but accountable decisions are made on eradicating (where necessary) newly established invasive non-native species; having rapid access to practical knowledge and skills for eradicating invasive species; assessing the effectiveness of eradication measures on the ground; producing annual reports based upon sound information to be received from many organisations.

5. **Elaborated ToR for management and control of long-established invasive species**

- 5.1 **ToR for the co-ordinating body:** identifying the organisations responsible for carrying out the different management and control activities and agreeing the policies to direct their work programmes towards agreed priorities for this activity; checking on the management and control actions carried out under this heading; assessing the effectiveness of alternative measures for management and control; disseminating guidelines and best practice on approved control measures; co-ordinating the production of plans to tackle long-established invasive species; annual reporting of actions under this heading.
- 5.2 **Other key organisations involved and their roles:** the principal organisations responsible for tackling long-established invasive species are the environment agencies, the statutory conservation agencies, the Forestry Commission, local authorities and CSL York. In addition many individual land owners take control measures against invasive species on their land, so achieving synergy between their efforts and the organisations listed here will require improved local arrangements.
- 5.3 **Main challenges:** agreeing the priorities for taking action against long-established invasive species (consensus will be hard to achieve); promoting a consistent approach for dealing with long-established invasive species; achieving co-ordinated action against these species (many of which are widely dispersed); communicating with the numerous dispersed organisations and individuals involved with management and control; obtaining accurate information on what is happening on the ground; assessing the effectiveness of alternative control measures.

6. **Case examples**

6.1 **Preventing the arrival of a novel non-native invasive species.**

- i. **Animal: American Bullfrog.** Those species identified by the Risk Assessment process to pose threats of becoming invasive will be added to a list of priority species for exclusion from Britain; American Bullfrog is a strong candidate for being such a priority species. This list will be shared internationally (to seek international co-operation for exclusion from Britain), will be on the agreed agenda for prevention measures with appropriate organisations delivering non-native species work and will be publicised widely to get public attention and support.

The co-ordinating body will be responsible for the production and regular review/revision of the list of species for exclusion, for promulgating it throughout the relevant bodies (Customs & Excise, animal importers, the pet trade, those who keep non-native amphibians in captivity etc.) and for assessing the effectiveness of exclusion measures. This should involve some inspection of the procedures on the ground (which might be carried out directly or commissioned from another body). The line of action to be taken if and when any individuals or colonies are discovered has to be clear and agreed in advance amongst all organisations involved with delivering the policy for invasive non-native species. The level of authority required to take decisions has to be clear (when decisions will be taken by staff of the co-ordinating body, by its governing Board or by Ministers has to be explicit and agreed for different circumstances). For American Bullfrog the process hitherto has been at operational level, but this might need endorsement at Board level in future to secure the necessary resources for successful eradication of larger populations.

- ii. The **principal challenges to JNCC** as the co-ordinating body would be to conduct the initial Risk Assessment process and get its results disseminated and agreed with all the operational organisations. While assessing the effectiveness of prevention measure for one species should be reasonably tractable, doing this for the top fifty or hundred species would be a considerable challenge. Ensuring that surveillance measures will result in the detection of new colonies of species such as American Bullfrog, and then taking the necessary rapid action to prevent colonies turning into larger populations, will require excellent planning and delivery. This involves the full chain of activities from detection, through rapid decision-taking and on to the on the ground eradication (which will need experienced teams, from organisations like the Environment Agency and Central Science Laboratory). Securing resources to take rapid action when required shows the need for a contingency fund to draw upon in times of need, which is not a funding arrangement that is popular with the Treasury.

6.2 **Management of a long-established non-native species that is beyond eradication, but can be locally suppressed.**

- i. **Plant: Japanese Knotweed.** An agreed Japanese Knotweed plan to be developed under the auspices of the UK response to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (*Plant Diversity Challenge*). This plan will include guidance for targeting control actions (based upon the damage caused to economic and biodiversity interests), with agreed priorities for control in defined zones or particular situations. Guidelines for deploying approved methods of control will be prepared (probably using appropriate external contractors) and a means of recording the changing status of the plant and reporting this regularly will be agreed between the co-ordinating body and those on the ground (Environment Agency, country conservation agencies, local authorities, NGOs etc.) responsible for control operations. The co-ordinating body will be responsible for the production and regular

review/revision of the Japanese Knotweed plan and for auditing the success of different approaches used and the effectiveness of control measures in different areas.

- ii. The **principal challenges to JNCC** as the co-ordinating body would be to agree the guidelines with a wide range of operational organisations, to collect and analyse the data on deployment of control measures and the degree of success that they achieve and to discover the degree to which the operational organisations discharge their obligations. These co-ordinating and overview functions are akin to some of the roles in relation to delivering the reporting functions for the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, and JNCC experience has been that this role is challenging to deliver because of the difficulties in achieving consistency and compliance with a wide range of different organisations. The “the many delivering bodies working to one co-ordinator” model works best when the activities are clearly defined and sufficiently resourced, which is unlikely to be the case for co-ordinating management of non-native species, at least initially. Thus, there is a significant risk of failure in delivering this function unless there are sufficient resources and planning put into delivering these responsibilities.

Establishing a G.B. Co-ordinating Organisation for Non-native Species work

1. Planning the resources required to build an effective co-ordinating organisation

This is an initial outline of the main areas that require investigation and costing to discover the resources required to deliver the co-ordinating functions, at JNCC or elsewhere.

- 1.1 Set-up costs: these will be greatly affected by the location of the co-ordinating body. While the annual cost per unit area of office space will vary to some extent according to location, the major cost variable here is providing sufficient level of security to staff and premises to counter any direct action by groups opposed to control of non-native species. The only known location with sufficient security already in place is CSL York, which suggests that should JNCC take on the co-ordinating role it would be wise to consider basing the staff at CSL York. Other JNCC premises would also need a security review in case they face increased risks in the light of being associated with work on controlling non-native species.
- 1.2 Running costs: the main cost will be staff salaries and premises. The level of these costs will be determined by the size of the unit to take on the co-ordinating functions, and that should be calculated when the work under the major headings has been quantified. Co-ordinating operational work will be more expensive than co-ordinating policy development. Other running costs include information systems (links to NBN and running an active website), travel and subsistence, Board and liaison meetings, an annual Convention for the Non-native Species Forum, and the production of an annual report.
- 1.3 The need to link with prevention measures against animal and human diseases (and bio-terrorism) via protocols to be agreed. No work has been done on these aspects as yet.

2. Allocating responsibilities

- 2.1 Ministerial responsibilities will reside with the Defra, Welsh Assembly Government and Scottish Executive Ministers. There will be the requirement for a rapid consultation procedure to be brought into play when urgent joint action is required (to approve the rapid eradication of a novel invasive non-native species, for example). Ministers will be accountable to their respective Parliament or Assembly for the satisfactory operation of the new arrangements and for taking decisions on the most contentious, high profile and costly decisions (to be defined).
- 2.2 The Managing Director/Chief Executive of the co-ordinating organisation will be responsible for the financial and operational working of the organisation and the conduct of the decision-taking and consultative processes. The conduct of audit and reporting functions will also be included in the portfolio of responsibilities at this level.

- 2.3 A Unit Head will be responsible for delivering the agreed work programme for the Unit and for reporting on progress with achieving the targets. There would be the usual responsibilities for ensuring the effective management of the Unit and the expenditure of resources towards the agreed work programme.
- 2.4 The process established to enable the co-ordinating body to consider all relevant aspects of an issue (see paragraph 2.6 of the main paper in relation to JNCC) will be responsible for guiding and advising the Managing Director/Chief Executive of the co-ordinating organisation and the Unit Head on the targets for the prevention, surveillance and eradication/control of invasive non-native species and for the delivery of the necessary work programmes.
- 2.5 The Non-native Species Forum will have a wide membership of stakeholders from the different sectors (biodiversity conservation, commerce, transport, welfare etc.) be will be responsible for bringing together views from a wide range of those affected by or concerned with invasive non-native species and for reviewing the effectiveness of the overall strategy for dealing with these issues.