

Species name – common	Giant hogweed
<i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i>	
Link to Risk Assessment and supplementary document	
4.3 (a) found, based on available scientific evidence, to be alien to the territory of the Union excluding the outermost regions;	Native to Asia (Caucasus)
4.3 (b) found, based on available scientific evidence, to be capable of establishing a viable population and spreading in the environment under current conditions and in foreseeable climate change conditions in one biogeographical region shared by more than two Member States or one marine subregion excluding their outermost regions;	<p>Refer to question 1–6, section "probability of spread"</p> <p>It is established at least in Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czech. Rep., Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Netherlands, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom, some of those member states with very dense populations (DAISIE 2009, NOBANIS, EPPO 2009)</p>
4.3 (c) based on available scientific evidence, likely to have a significant adverse impact on biodiversity or the related ecosystem services, and may also have an adverse impact on human health or the economy;	<p>Refer to the risk assessment (responses to questions 2.10 to 2.27).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity or related ecosystem services: the plant has a moderate negative impact on native vegetation and habitats. Its impact on ecosystem functions and services is more reduced. It mainly invades disturbed areas and anthropogenic sites but negative impact is also known to occur in areas of high conservation value. - Human health: cause strong photodermatitis and affect a large number of people in Europe. - Economy: lowered accessibility of invaded areas due to high risk of human injuries, but usually not a very competitive weed in intensive agricultural areas.
4.3 (d) demonstrated by a risk assessment carried out pursuant to Article 5(1) that concerted action at Union level is required to prevent their introduction, establishment or spread;	<p>Concerted action at Union level is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in order to prevent invasion into the MS where this species is not currently established and prevent further spread in the MS where this species is already present at low densities (Belgium, France, etc.). There is a potential for strong population increase in many MS. - action now will help prevent this species from becoming a wider problem across

<p>4.3 (e) likely that the inclusion on the Union list will effectively prevent, minimise or mitigate their adverse impact.</p>	<p>the EU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevention (Article 7): Restrictions on keeping, sale, transport, exchange, breeding and release of this species will prevent its wider establishment across the EU. The plant is spread by trade (ornamental planting and honey production) and unintentional spread (contaminant of soils). - Early detection and rapid eradication (Articles 14–18): giant hogweed may be easily detected in the field and destroyed by root cutting or chemical treatment in small stands. - Management (Articles 19–20): as mentioned, control of the species can be difficult once established in large populations but is still possible. Therefore minimizing seed production in large populations is necessary.
<p>4.6 due consideration to the implementation cost for Member States, the cost of inaction, the cost-effectiveness and the socio-economic aspects</p>	<p>Implementation cost:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevention: banning the trade would be of almost no cost as this is already the case in several MS. Given the ease of spread of this plant and the costs linked to its management once established, prevention would be the cheapest course of action - Early detection and rapid eradication: given the costs of management, a prompt response to newly establishing populations will be important to avoid later high management costs - Management: containment and control likely to be costly, which reinforces the need for preventive action. Management of the invaded sites but includes management targeted against other IAS.
	<p>Cost of inaction: Wide scale spread of this species will strongly increase costs and environmental impacts, as well as human health and economic impacts due to sites made inaccessible as already observed in some areas in Europe (e.g. Western Germany and the Czech Republic).</p>
	<p>Cost-effectiveness It is possible to strongly reduce population densities through early detection and rapid response as demonstrated by actions undertaken by several MS (e.g. Belgium and Slovenia). Cost of early eradication is much less important than cost of damages when widely spread.</p>
	<p>Socio-economic aspects: The plant is already known to cause negative impacts. In MS where it is widely established as in Germany, socio-economic costs are very high and exceed several millions EUR per year.</p>
<p>4.6 The Union list shall include as a priority those invasive alien species that:</p>	

EU NON-NATIVE SPECIES RISK ANALYSIS – RISK ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE V1.0 (27-04-15) *H. mantegazzianum*

<p>(a) are not yet present in the Union or are at an early stage of invasion and are most likely to have a significant adverse impact;</p>	
<p>4.6 The Union list shall include as a priority those invasive alien species that: (b) are already established in the Union and have the most significant adverse impact.</p>	<p>The plant is present in many MS and causes huge damages to biodiversity and public health. Those damages are likely to increase a lot if no coordinated action is undertaken to avoid increase of population densities.</p>