**Submission form** (please attach to your posting per a tool or a method you suggest the Forum to discuss)

Date of posting	7 June 2019		
Registered Email	tim.adriaens@inbo.be		
Address			
Relevant	A method for cost benefit/effectiveness analysis		
topic/session	A method or a tool for identification/minimizing risk of e-commerce		
	A method, a tool or a strategy considering climate change and others		
	A risk analysis on potential consequence of socio-economic and		
	cultural values		
	Use of existing databases (if relevant to the sessions above, click		
	above, too)		
Stage of introduction	Pre-border (incl. maritime/international water channel)		
_	At the border		
	Established IAS in post border areas		
	Spread of IAS		
	Socio-economic cultural impact		
what decision has	The Belgian risk analysis framework includes ecological impact assessment		
the use of this	(ISEIA) and full risk assessment (Harmonia+) tools, as well as a risk		
method been used	management protocol based on the Booy et al. (2017) framework for		
to support?	eradication which was extended to evaluate management options for limiting		
	the spread of IAS. Also, a method was developed to prioritize pathways based		
	on species impact and frequency of species in pathway. These tools are used		
	to support decision making, for instance:		
	- Identification of species to be included in early warning systems and		
	prioritisation of species for surveillance.		
	<ul> <li>Listing of species in national and EU law.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Drafting species lists to include in codes of conduct with the</li> </ul>		
	horticultural supply chain.		
	- Prioritization of pathways as required by EU law in support of drafting		
	pathway action plans for Belgium.		
	- Evaluation of management options (eradication, spread limitation,		
	control) for IAS.		
	The decision support tools developed are designed to promote consensus		
	building. For example, ISEIA scorings were accompanied by discussions in		
	expert panels to reach consensus around scores and consequent species		
	listing (laret list, watch list, black list). Likewise, assessments with the Harmonia+ risk assessment protocol, which is one of the few protocols in		
	Europe with a mathematical backbone, are facilitated by e-infrastructure that		
	allows for consensus building based on individual assessor scores. The		
	protocol is accessible as an online questionnaire, for which registered users		
	have possibilities of modifying or weighting scores and sharing assessments.		
	The protocol conforms with the EU standards for IAS risk assessments. It is		
	being improved to include marine species and species distribution models		

	hin the framework of a dedicated project ( <u>TrIAS</u> ).	
	This project will also provide a tool (a software pipeline) to automatically feed IAS indicators and select emerging IAS (candidates for risk assessment) from available alien species checklists and distribution data. This will facilitate (post-border) risk assessment and moves toward a more integrated (data- driven + expert elicitation) risk assessment procedure in support of IAS policy.	
	Full cost-benefit analysis is rare in Belgium (e.g. <u>Reyns et al. 2018</u> )	
URL to download/review	A number of publications illustrate the tools and their application in Belgium:	
the information	<ul> <li>Pathway prioritisation: report attached</li> </ul>	
	- Horizon scanning: Gallardo et al. 2015, Zieritz et al. 2016	
	- Impact assessment and risk assessment: Branquart et al. 2009,	
	Vanderhoeven et al. 2015, D'hondt et al. 2015	
	- Risk management and prioritisation: report in preparation, adapted	
	after Booy et al 2017, more information on this link	
If a file attached	🗆 Yes 🖾 No	
If the file not	Contact author	
attached		

Explanation on the tool/method or	Highlight its usefulness and	Lessons learned from
information shared	applicability	applying the tool/method
The ecological impact assessment	ISEIA is a well-established protocol	It is essential to
protocol ISEIA scores potential	and is widely applied in horizon	incorporate an evaluation
ecological impact by scoring four	scanning, prioritization and risk	of risk management
criteria that match the post-	assessment exercises. In Belgium it	options into risk analysis
establishment phases of the	has catalogued 101 species in alert	approaches. There is much
invasion process: 1) spread	lists, watch lists and black lists of	added value in involving
potential 2) colonization of natural	alien species based on their	managers, policy makers
habitats 3) adverse ecological	potential impact and these lists	and scientists together in
impacts on native species	have been used for various	decision making on IAS
(hybridisation, predation,	preventive policies (e.g. code of	management. Beyond
competition, pathogen	conduct on ornamental	providing a correct
transmission) and 4) on	plant species), to target	evidence base for decisions
ecosystems (succession, food	surveillance and to select species	on management of IAS in
webs, nutrient cycling).	for full risk assessment.	Belgium, this approach also
		stimulates co-production
Harmonia+ is a full risk assessment	The risk management protocol was	and co-ownership of
methodology that covers	effectively used to promote	management objectives.
environmental,	discussion between experts and	
animal/human/plant health and	the managerial community in an	Quality control remains an
infrastructure impact domains. The	exercise to determine	important aspect when
protocol provides quantitative	management options for IAS of	performing risk
output on invasion stage-specific	Union Concern in Belgium.	assessments or risk

and general risks, converting answers into summary statistics. This includes a formal way of dealing with confidence. The integrated Pandora protocol allows for integrated risk assessments of pathogens and their alien hosts.

The Booy et al. (2017) based risk management protocol provides a structured evaluation of the feasibility of eradicating or limiting the spread of a species. The feasibility scores relate to strategies specifically designed for the Belgian situation. They do not translate directly in a management decision, but are used to foster discussion between managers and scientists to draft management recommendations for policy. The aim of this participatory approach was to have the different perspectives correctly represented.

The pathway prioritisation framework was developed in response to EU IAS Regulation requirements. It consists of a formula which ranks pathways based on species impact (ISEIA score + score for establishment potential) and on an expert assessment of the frequency of introduction via the pathway. Expert review is an important part of the prioritisation process. management assessments (cf. <u>Vanderhoeven et al.</u> 2017).

The risk assessment and risk management tools require input from the expert community. In practice, it remains a challenge to involve enough experts to perform assessments without remuneration, as is illustrated by the relative scarcity with which the tools are being used in Belgium.

Decision makers also had to be convinced that formalized, structured decision making was useful and necessary to ensure evidence-based decision making and improve uptake of decisions.

Although the tools would promote more formal consensus building, in practice this is difficult to apply probably because of lack of experts involved and time required.

Risk communication is challenging and seems an area that needs further development in Belgium.

-----