




Developing a framework of minimum standards for the risk assessment of alien species

Helen E. Roy¹  | Wolfgang Rabitsch² | Riccardo Scaler³ | Alan Stewart⁴ | Belinda Gallardo⁵ | Piero Genovesi⁶ | Franz Essl^{2,7} | Tim Adriaens⁸ | Sven Bacher^{9,10}  | Olaf Booy^{11,12} | Etienne Branquart¹³ | Sarah Brunel¹⁴ | Gordon Howard Copp^{15,16} | Hannah Dean¹ | Bram D'hondt^{13,17} | Melanie Josefsson¹⁸ | Marc Kenis¹⁹ | Marianne Kettunen²⁰ | Merike Linnamagi²¹ | Frances Lucy²² | Angeliki Martinou²³ | Niall Moore¹¹ | Wolfgang Nentwig²⁴  | Ana Nieto²⁵ | Jan Pergl²⁶ | Jodey Peyton¹ | Alain Roques²⁷ | Stefan Schindler² | Karsten Schönrogge¹ | Wojciech Solarz²⁸ | Paul D. Stebbing²⁹ | Teodora Trichkova³⁰ | Sonia Vanderhoeven¹³ | Johan van Valkenburg³¹ | Argyro Zenetos³²

¹Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, UK; ²Environment Agency Austria, Vienna, Austria; ³IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group, Rome, Italy; ⁴University of Sussex, Brighton, UK; ⁵Pyrenean Institute of Ecology, Spanish National Research Council, Zaragoza, Spain; ⁶Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA), Rome, Italy; ⁷Division of Conservation Biology, Vegetation and Landscape Ecology, Faculty Centre of Biodiversity, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ⁸Research Institute for Nature and Forest, Brussels, Belgium; ⁹Department of Biology, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland; ¹⁰Department of Botany and Zoology, Centre for Invasion Biology, Stellenbosch University, Matieland, South Africa; ¹¹National Wildlife Management Centre, Animal and Plant Health Agency, Sand Hutton, York, UK; ¹²Centre for Wildlife Management, School of Biology, Newcastle University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK; ¹³Belgian Biodiversity Platform, Belgian Science Policy Office, Brussels, Belgium; ¹⁴European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), Paris, France; ¹⁵Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, Lowestoft, UK; ¹⁶School of Conservation Sciences, Bournemouth University, Dorset, UK; ¹⁷Agency for Nature and Forests, Brussels, Belgium; ¹⁸Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Stockholm, Sweden; ¹⁹CABI, Delemont, Switzerland; ²⁰Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP), C/O Finnish Environment Institute, Helsinki, Finland; ²¹Estonian Ministry of Environment, Tallinn, Estonia; ²²Department of Environmental Science, School of Science, Institute of Technology, Sligo, Co. Sligo, Ireland; ²³Joint Services Health Unit, RAF Akrotiri, Akrotiri, Cyprus; ²⁴Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; ²⁵IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) 64, Brussels, Belgium; ²⁶Institute of Botany, The Czech Academy of Sciences, Průhonice, Czech Republic; ²⁷Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), Orléans, France; ²⁸Institute of Nature Conservation, Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków, Poland; ²⁹Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, Weymouth, Dorset, UK; ³⁰Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria; ³¹Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, National Reference Centre (NRC), Wageningen, the Netherlands and ³²Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Inland Waters, Hellenic Centre for Marine Research, Anavyssos, Greece

Correspondence

Helen E. Roy
Email: hele@ceh.ac.uk

Funding information

Directorate-General for the Environment,
Grant/Award Number: ENV.B.2/
ETU/2013/0026

Handling Editor: Ralph Mac Nally

Abstract

1. Biological invasions are a threat to biodiversity, society and the economy. There is an urgent need to provide evidence-based assessments of the risks posed by invasive alien species (IAS) to prioritize action. Risk assessments underpin IAS policies in many ways: informing legislation; providing justification of restrictions in trade or consumer activities; prioritizing surveillance and rapid response. There are benefits to ensuring consistency in content of IAS risk assessments globally, and this can be achieved by providing a framework of minimum standards as a checklist for quality assurance.
2. From a review of existing risk assessment protocols, and with reference to the requirements of the EU Regulation on IAS (1143/2014) and international

agreements including the World Trade Organisation, Convention on Biological Diversity and International Plant Protection Convention, coupled with consensus methods, we identified and agreed upon 14 minimum standards (attributes) a risk-assessment scheme should include.

3. The agreed minimum standards were as follows: (1) basic species description; (2) likelihood of invasion; (3) distribution, spread and impacts; (4) assessment of introduction pathways; (5) assessment of impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems; (6) Assessment of impact on ecosystem services; (7) assessment of socio-economic impacts; (8) consideration of status (threatened or protected) of species or habitat under threat; (9) assessment of effects of future climate change; (10) completion possible even when there is a lack of information; (11) documents information sources; (12) provides a summary in a consistent and interpretable form; (13) includes uncertainty; (14) includes quality assurance. In deriving these minimum standards, gaps in knowledge required for completing risk assessments and the scope of existing risk assessment protocols were revealed, most notably in relation to assessing benefits, socio-economic impacts and impacts on ecosystem services but also inclusion of consideration of climate change.
4. *Policy implications.* We provide a checklist of components that should be within invasive alien species risk assessments and recommendations to develop risk assessments to meet these proposed minimum standards. Although inspired by implementation of the European Union Regulation on invasive alien species, and as such developed specifically within a European context, the derived framework and minimum standards could be applied globally.

KEYWORDS

biodiversity impacts, biological invasions, consensus methods, European union, invasive alien species, legislation, management, prioritization, risk assessment, socio-economic impacts

1 | INTRODUCTION

Invasive alien species (IAS) are considered one of the greatest threats to biodiversity through their interactions with other drivers of change (Bellard, Cassey, & Blackburn, 2016; Early et al., 2016; Seebens et al., 2017; Tittensor et al., 2014). Several international agreements (including those within the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Plant Protection Convention) recognize the negative impacts of IAS (Turbelin, Malamud, & Francis, 2016) and reflect the growing concerns of policy-makers, scientists, stakeholders and society. As the number of IAS arriving in new regions escalates (Seebens et al., 2017), there is an increasing need for robust analysis of risks to inform prioritization of management. Risk analysis is a broad term encompassing both risk assessment (technical and objective process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to identify potential IAS and determine the level of invasion risk associated with a species or pathway) and risk management (Benke, Steel, & Weiss, 2011; Genovesi, Scalera, Brunel, Roy, & Solarz, 2010; Heikkilä, 2011). There can be considerable confusion with respect to the definitions and delimitations of the terms in use to describe risk analysis

and associated processes such as risk assessment (Roy et al., 2014); however, broadly risk assessment can be defined as “the evaluation of entry, exposure and consequence” (Vanderhoeven et al., 2017). The inclusion of entry or introduction within a risk assessment framework ensures relevance to pre- and post-border management (McGeoch et al., 2016).

Risk assessment is essential for underpinning many components of IAS policy, for example EU Regulation No 1143/2014, and decision-making including prevention (to inform legislation and justify restrictions, such as on trade and/or consumer activities), early detection (warning) and rapid response (prioritizing action and guiding surveillance) and long-term control (prioritizing species for control and monitoring) (Beninde, Fischer, Hochkirch, & Zink, 2015; Genovesi, Carboneras, Vilà, & Walton, 2015; Tollington et al., 2015). Additionally, risk assessments are required to justify measures that may affect trade without infringing the rules and disciplines of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) (Shine et al., 2010) and for communicating with other sectors such as those with conservation remits (Pergl et al., 2016). Therefore, there is a need for a framework to ensure risk assessments generate consistent and comparable outcomes to enable

information exchange (Brunel et al., 2010) and prioritization of IAS at multiple scales ensuring strategic and effective responses globally (McGeoch et al., 2016).

At both international and regional levels, as well as among countries, there is huge variation in how the risks posed by alien species are assessed and this in part depends on the context and objectives of the risk assessment. The available risk assessment schemes vary widely in approach, objective, implementation, environments and taxa covered (Verbrugge, Leuven, & van der Velde, 2010), and the majority are based on qualitative methods, even though the need to develop quantitative approaches has been recognized (Essl et al., 2011; Genovesi et al., 2010; Leung et al., 2012). Major hurdles preventing the use of a robust quantitative risk assessment method are the lack of data (Kulhanek, Ricciardi, & Leung, 2011), high taxonomic, geographic and impact specificity of available methods (Gallardo et al., 2016) and challenges in interpretation and communication (Biosecurity New Zealand, 2006).

Here we provide guidelines which, to our knowledge, are the first to include comprehensive standards that risk assessments of alien species across a wide range of taxonomic groups should fulfil within an environmental context. From a review of existing risk assessments coupled with consensus methods, we derived a set of minimum standards which a risk assessment protocol should include. The process of deriving the minimum standards revealed gaps in the scope of existing protocols and so we provide recommendations for further developing these to meet the proposed minimum standards.

2 | SELECTION OF RISK-ASSESSMENT METHODS TO DERIVE THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF MINIMUM STANDARDS

To identify the most relevant risk assessment protocols, we followed a sequential step-wise process:

1. A literature search for IAS risk assessment schemes used worldwide, and their applications was performed using the Internet and scientific literature databases (Thomson Reuters Web of Science, Google Scholar), which were investigated through combinations of relevant keywords: risk analysis, risk assessment, invasive alien species, non-native, biological invasions, black list, pathways, uncertainty, biosecurity.
2. The lists of references in these publications were cross-checked for additional relevant publications.
3. The publications were filtered by examination of the abstracts and “material and methods” sections, resulting in 70 papers providing original risk assessment methods and their applications being retained for further consideration. This involved the collation of risk and impact assessment protocols from which to derive criteria for the development of minimum standards.
4. The list of 70 publications was further reduced by elimination of those in which an existing risk assessment scheme was not modified but simply applied to a different geographic region (e.g.

countries or other regions) or specified taxonomic group or groups. Some schemes were excluded because of their high specificity to a geographic region or taxonomic group. The selection process identified 33 publications (supporting information Table S1) representing 29 different risk assessment schemes (noting that some risk assessments were reported in multiple publications but within the context of specific taxonomic groups or environments).

3 | PRELIMINARY LIST OF ATTRIBUTES DERIVED FROM RISK AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROTOCOLS

The risk assessment schemes and their protocols are diverse and consequently include many attributes for consideration as potential minimum standards. We reviewed the selected risk assessments, alongside requirements documented within the EU Regulation No 1143/2014 and international agreements including WTO, Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Plant Protection Convention, to compile a preliminary list of attributes (supporting information Table S2) for subsequent evaluation through a consensus workshop.

4 | CONSENSUS WORKSHOP

Consensus methods (Sutherland, Fleishman, Mascia, Pretty, & Rudd, 2011) were employed during a 2-day workshop to distil the critical components of risk assessments that, through expert opinion and consensus, were agreed as essential to achieve overarching assessment of the risk of an IAS, regardless of the specific approach taken and with relevance across taxa, environments and geographic regions.

4.1 | The experts

The described minimum standards were derived in the context of the EU Regulation “On the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species” (European Union, 2014). Thus, they have been designed for underpinning IAS policy implementation on a continental scale, but they will arguably be informative for developing IAS policies globally. Given the EU focus of the underlying policy, 35 European experts from 17 European countries contributed to the development of the minimum standards in a transparent, collaborative and objective manner. Of these, 30 attended the consensus workshop and the remaining five were involved in the pre- and post-consultation. The experts represented a breadth of expertise across taxonomic groups (all taxa, excluding micro-organisms), environments (freshwater, marine and terrestrial), impacts (environmental, socio-economic and health) and disciplines (ecological scientists, plant health, economists, conservation practitioners, policy-makers, risk assessors).




FIGURE 1 Minimum standards mapped against the stages of invasion and management strategies. (Grey arrows = minimum standards which are relevant only to a full risk assessment; Black arrows = minimum standards which are relevant to both impact and full risk assessments) [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

TABLE 1 Screening of selected risk and impact assessment protocols against the proposed minimum standards: 1. Basic species description and brief overview; 2. Likelihood of invasion; 3. Distribution, spread and impacts; 4. Assessment of introduction pathways; 5. Assessment of impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems; 6. Assessment of impact on ecosystem services; 7. Assessment of socio-economic impacts; 8. Consideration of status (threatened or protected) of species or habitat under threat; 9. Assessment of effects of future climate change; 10. Completion possible even when there is a lack of information; 11. Documents information sources; 12. Provides a summary in a consistent and interpretable form; 13. Includes uncertainty; 14. Includes quality assurance. For details of citations, see supporting information Table S1. Note that the proposed minimum standards 2 and 4 would not be relevant for an assessment pertaining to impact only

Name	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	Number of minimum standard compliances	References
A unified classification of alien species based on the magnitude of their environmental impacts	No	No	Partly	No	✓	No	No	✓	No	Partly	No	✓	✓	Partly	4	Blackburn et al. (2014)
Australian freshwater fish model	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	No	Partly	No	No	Partly	No	✓	✓	Partly	3	Bomford (2006) and Bomford and Glover (2004)
Australian reptile and amphibian model	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	No	Partly	No	No	Partly	No	✓	✓	Partly	3	Bomford et al. (2005)
Australian and New Zealand Bird and mammal risk assessment	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	No	Partly	No	No	Partly	No	✓	✓	Partly	3	Bomford (2008)
Invasive species environmental impact assessment protocol (ISEIA)	No	No	✓	No	✓	No	No	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	7	Branquart (2009)
EPPO prioritization process for invasive alien plants	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	No	✓	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7	EPPO (2011)
EPPO decision-support scheme for quarantine pests	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12	EPPO (2011)
Trinational risk assessment for aquatic alien invasive species (CEC)	✓	Partly	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	11	CEC (2009)
Fish invasiveness screening KIT (FISK) (with uncertainty and predictive power improvements)	Partly	Partly	Partly	No	Partly	No	No	No	No	✓	✓	Partly	✓	✓	4	Copp et al. (2005) and Copp et al. (2009)
European non-native species in aquaculture risk assessment scheme (ENSARS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	13	Copp et al. (2008)

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Name	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	Number of minimum standard compliances	References
Harmonia ⁺ and Pandora ⁺ : risk screening tools for potentially invasive organisms	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	11	D'hondt et al. (2015)
EFSA PLH scheme for PRA	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	Partly	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10	EFSA Panel on Plant Health (2011)
GABLIIS	✓	No	Partly	✓	✓	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Partly	9	Essi et al. (2011)
Full risk assessment scheme for non-native species in Great Britain (GB NNRA)	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	12	Baker et al. (2008)
Alien species in Norway – with the Norwegian Black List 2012	Partly	No	✓	✓	✓	No	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	10	Gederaas et al. (2013), Sandvik et al. (2013)
Risk analysis and prioritization (Ireland and Northern Ireland)	Partly	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	No	✓	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	Kelly et al. (2013)
Quantitative risk assessment for alien fishes	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	✓	No	Partly	No	No	✓	No	✓	No	✓	5	Kolar and Lodge (2002)
A conceptual framework for prioritization of invasive alien species for management according to their impact	✓	No	Partly	No	✓	Partly	✓	✓	No	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	Kumschick et al. (2012)
Generic impact-scoring system (GISS)	Partly	No	Partly	No	✓	No	✓	✓	No	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	7	Kumschick and Nentwig (2010) and Nentwig et al. (2010)
Biopollution index	No	No	Partly	No	✓	No	No	No	No	Partly	✓	✓	No	No	3	Olenin et al. (2007)
Chinese WRA	Partly	✓	✓	✓	✓	Partly	Partly	No	No	✓	✓	✓	No	✓	8	Ou et al. (2008)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Name	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	Number of minimum standard compliances	References
US weed ranking model	Partly	No	Partly	No	✓	No	Partly	No	✓	✓	No	Partly	No	No	3	Parker et al. (2007)
Australian WRA	Partly	No	Partly	Partly	✓	No	✓	No	No	✓	No	✓	Partly	✓	5	Pheloung (2001)
Freshwater invertebrates scoring kit (FI-ISK)	Partly	Partly	Partly	No	Partly	No	No	No	No	✓	✓	Partly	✓	✓	4	Tricarico et al. (2010)
Expert system for screening potentially invasive alien plants in South African fynbos	Partly	Partly	No	No	Partly	No	No	No	No	✓	No	Partly	✓	No	2	Tucker and Richardson (1995)
Invasive ant risk assessment	Partly	Partly	Partly	✓	✓	No	✓	No	No	✓	No	No	✓	No	5	Ward et al. (2008)
Classification key for neophytes	Partly	Partly	No	No	✓	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1	Weber et al. (2005)
Climate-match score for risk assessment screening	No	Partly	Partly	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	✓	No	Partly	No	1	van Wilgen et al. (2009)
Assessment of risk of establishment for alien amphibians and reptiles	No	Partly	Partly	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	✓	No	Partly	No	1	van Wilgen and Richardson (2012)

4.2 | Preliminary consultation

The preliminary consultation phase involved the provision of a preliminary list of risk assessment attributes to all contributing experts 2 weeks before the workshop. Experts were asked to rank the importance of each as a minimum standard on a scale of 1–5 (low to high importance, respectively). Experts were also asked to provide additional attributes that were not included within the preliminary list of attributes.

4.3 | The workshop

The 2-day workshop was held in Brussels (27–28 March 2014). Participants contributed to discussions on each attribute for the preliminary list in relation to key themes of the risk assessment process: introduction, establishment and dispersal, environmental and socio-economic impacts. The discussions were consolidated through a voting process during which experts were asked to express agreement or disagreement with inclusion of each attribute as a minimum standard. In most cases, the participants were in unanimous agreement, but where there was substantial divergence in opinion, further discussion was invited to explore the basis of disagreement. In most cases, this led to re-wording of the minimum standard and subsequent consensus from the group. Therefore, the preliminary long list of attributes was modified substantially.

5 | MINIMUM STANDARDS DERIVED BY CONSENSUS

The annotated list of 14 minimum standards finally agreed upon is as follows:

5.1 | Description (taxonomy, invasion history, distribution range (native and introduced), geographic scope, socio-economic benefits)

The description of the species should provide sufficient information to ensure the risk assessment can be understood without reference to additional documentation. This is essential for decision-makers to ensure they have rapid access to the relevant information for their needs.

5.2 | Likelihood of introduction, establishment, spread and magnitude of impact

The risks of introduction, establishment, spread and impact are the four main components of alien species risk assessments. The risks of introduction and establishment are usually expressed as “likelihood,” dispersal as “likelihood,” “rate” or “rapidity” and impact as both “likelihood” and “magnitude” of a detrimental effect. This minimum standard is relevant for full risk assessments and only in part (spread and magnitude of impact) for assessments which consider impact alone.

Assessors should use the best available evidence but transparently document where information may be lacking. It may take into account extrinsic factors, such as pathways and propagule pressure.

5.3 | Description of the current and potential distribution, spread and magnitude of impact

The description of current and potential distribution within the invaded range coupled with information on spread capacity and the magnitude of impact contributes to the classification of an alien species as invasive or not. This minimum standard expands descriptively on the previous minimum standard, providing an overview of documented information, and is critical for both full risk assessments and impact assessments.

5.4 | Inclusion of multiple pathways and vectors of introduction and spread both intentional and unintentional

Information on the mode of introduction including pathway information (CBD, 2014) is essential for informing IAS management strategies. All pathways of entry and spread should be considered for a given species, and pathway categories should be clearly defined and sufficiently comprehensive to ensure interoperability with other assessments.

5.5 | Assessment of environmental impacts with respect to biodiversity (and ecosystem) patterns and processes

Environmental impact should consider negative effects on biodiversity (genetic and species) as well as on the structure and function (processes) of natural or semi-natural ecosystems (e.g. habitat diversity and complexity, succession, food web dynamics, nutrient and energy cycles).

5.6 | Assessment of adverse impacts with respect to ecosystem services

The assessment of adverse impacts to ecosystem services was acknowledged as difficult because empirical evidence is often sparse and such an assessment requires an agreed list and/or classification of ecosystem services. The Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) (<http://cices.eu/>), although still a work in progress, is currently commonly endorsed as the preferred classification system. However, while further progress is made on common classification of ecosystem services, it is foreseen that assessment would be at qualitative and descriptive level to meet this minimum standard.

5.7 | Assessment of adverse socio-economic impacts

Assessment of adverse socio-economic impacts by alien species should cover a range of possible socio-economic consequences,

encompassing relevant economic sectors and aspects of human health, including broader well-being. As per the general nature of risk assessments, the assessment should focus on the negative/adverse impacts to inform decision-makers of the potential risks, with possible socio-economic benefits of IAS outlined qualitatively in the general description (cf. minimum standard 1). Recently, a standardized method for classifying alien taxa in terms of the magnitude of their impacts on human well-being based on the capability approach from welfare economics has been developed (Bacher et al., 2017). A systematic assessment of IAS socio-economic impacts, such as SEICAT, would require a common list and/or classification of documented impacts (and it should be noted that it is also essential to include potential but so far undocumented impacts). Here, a preliminary classification is provided (supporting information Table S3), which builds on the current, commonly identified socio-economic consequences, that is loss of biodiversity and degradation of ecosystems and related services.

5.8 | Status (threatened or protected) of species or habitat under threat

Threatened species and habitats are those that are “critically endangered,” “endangered” or “vulnerable” according to the Red Lists relevant for the assessment area (www.iucnredlist.org/technical-documents/categories-and-criteria) (Keith et al., 2013). It is feasible that any impact on a threatened species or habitat could be more critical, or perceived as being more critical, than on species and habitats of “least concern” because threatened species and habitats of specific conservation concern may be (or perceived to be) less resilient in the face of biological invasions (Stohlgren et al., 1999). However, when severely threatened by an IAS, a common species or habitat may also eventually become designated as threatened, and this highlights the importance of regular review of risk assessments. Useful sources to look for species potentially affected include the European Alien Species Information Network (EASIN, <http://easin.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>); Global Invasive Species Database (GISD, www.iucngisd.org/gisd/); CABI-Invasive Species Compendium (www.cabi.org/isc/); Global Register of Introduced and Invasive Species (GRIIS, <http://griis.org/>); European Network on Invasive Alien Species (NOBANIS, www.nobanis.org/); and/or DAISIE database (www.europe-aliens.org/).

5.9 | Possible effects of climate change in the foreseeable future

Alien species may be in the process of establishing or expanding when they are first assessed, and so it is essential to consider not only the current situation but also predictable changes in the foreseeable future (where the time-scale should be clearly defined and appropriate to the specific IAS under assessment). Alien species may benefit from climate change, and therefore, risk assessments should take possible effects into account. For instance, climate change can alter patterns of human transport, changing the propagule pressure of species with the potential to become invasive (Hellmann, Byers, Bierwagen, & Dukes, 2008). Climate change may also prolong the

optimal climatic conditions for successful colonization or provide conditions that are closer to the climatic optimum of IAS (Walther et al., 2009). Additionally, climate change may increase the rate of spread and extend suitable areas for IAS, which might offer new opportunities for repeat introductions via corridors and unaided introductions (so increasing propagule pressure). Extreme events such as floods, tsunamis and strong winds may directly help IAS spread and indirectly open new areas for colonization. One approach to investigate the potential consequences of climate change for IAS is to revisit components of the risk assessment in the light of predicted climate changes (supporting information Table S4).

5.10 | Data limitations

The best available evidence should be used throughout the risk assessment process. There may be a paucity of information on some species, but it is essential that risk assessment can still proceed, with precautionary approaches applied where appropriate, to enable decision-makers to undertake risk management. Therefore, it is critical that the range of sources, including expert opinion, is accompanied by a statement indicating the assessor’s confidence level in the quality and reliability of the data/information (see minimum requirement 13). Additionally, risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and revised when new data and/or information becomes available.

5.11 | Information sources

The information sources should be well documented and supported with references to the scientific literature (peer-reviewed publications). If this is lacking, then it may also include other sources (“grey literature” and expert opinion). In all cases, confidence levels should be assigned to the information sources (see minimum requirement 13).

5.12 | Summary of the different components of the risk assessment in a consistent and interpretable form and an overall summary

Many risk assessments are divided into related component sections corresponding to invasion stages such as introduction, establishment, spread and impact alongside an overall summary. Both the individual questions (protocols) and the system summarizing risks should be consistent and unambiguous. The summary information could be as a nominal scale (e.g. low, medium, high risk) or numerical scale (1 = low risk to 5 = high risk). It is important that clear interpretation guidance or definitions of the summaries are provided for each component of the risk assessment so that decision-makers can rapidly refer to the most pertinent aspects for their needs.

5.13 | Uncertainty (confidence)

For many biological invasions, there may be a lack of information and a high degree of uncertainty surrounding the risk assessment, simply because the species may not have been the subject of previous

study, and this may be both for the species' native and introduced ranges. Alternatively, there may be information available, but the assessor may still have a level of uncertainty with respect to the interpretation of the information into a response to a risk assessment question. Therefore, it is essential that the answers provided within risk assessments are accompanied by an uncertainty ranking (e.g. certainty or confidence level) from the assessor (Baker et al., 2008). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Mastrandrea, Heller, Root, & Schneider, 2010) provides a framework for a consistent approach to the treatment of uncertainties whereby confidence is considered as a function of evidence and agreement. Evidence relates to the type, amount, quality and consistency of the data (D'hondt et al., 2015).

5.14 | Quality assurance

It is important that the quality of the risk assessment is assured. There are many possible approaches to quality assurance, from peer review after the risk assessment has been conducted through to the involvement of a panel of experts invited to review the risk assessment in a collaborative manner to ensure that it is "fit for purpose" (Mumford et al., 2010). Eliciting multiple expert opinions and their associated confidence levels provides the possibility of deriving the degree of agreement between experts (Vanderhoeven et al., 2017).

It is important to note that while all the minimum standards are relevant for risk assessments, covering pre-invasion and post-invasion processes, while most but not all are also relevant to impact assessments. Specifically, the minimum standards that include assessment or description of entry (namely 2. Likelihood of invasion; 3. Distribution, spread and impacts; 4. Assessment of introduction pathways; Figure 1) would not be comprehensively considered within an impact assessment.

6 | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is essential that risk assessments are repeatable, reliable and robust if they are to underpin IAS policy and decision-making. The minimum standards described here were developed within the context of the EU Regulation on IAS but have applicability to risk assessments worldwide. The 14 minimum standards provide a checklist against which a risk assessment scheme can be evaluated within the context of the process of invasion and management approaches (Figure 1). However, the process of deriving the minimum standards revealed gaps in the scope of risk (and impact) assessments (Table 1) and the knowledge required for completing them. This was most notable in relation to the assessment of impacts on ecosystem services, socio-economic activities and the likely impact that future, predicted changes in climate could have on the species under assessment. However, we suggest checklists for ensuring a structured approach to these broad themes with regard to the threat posed by the species under assessment. Our study provides a starting point for the inclusion of these relevant

perspectives within risk assessments, but further interdisciplinary work is required to inform a more robust risk assessment framework. It is anticipated that such frameworks will emerge over the next few years, and SEICAT (Bacher et al., 2017) is an encouraging development in this regard.

Of the 29 risk assessment protocols reviewed, three were considered to be nearly compliant: GB Non-Native Risk Assessment, EPPO Pest Risk Assessment and Harmonia⁺, but even these required modifications to meet fully the minimum standards. Indeed, all three of these risk assessment protocols have by now been enhanced to meet the minimum standards—demonstrating the utility of this approach. Furthermore, at least one further protocol, the Aquatic Species-Invasiveness Screening Kit (AS-ISK) has ensured consistency with the minimum standards (Copp et al., 2016). An additional component was included to provide background information on the species alongside questions on potential socio-economic impacts and those on ecosystem services. Furthermore, additional six questions were added to enable the assessor to consider how forecasted changes in climate are likely to influence the risks of introduction, establishment, dispersal and impact of a species (Copp et al., 2016).

Lack of empirical evidence is perhaps the greatest constraint to ensuring risk assessment is sufficiently reliable; however, expert opinion can provide complementary information. Additionally, there are a number of impact assessment schemes that do not comply because they do not consider the introduction phase of the invasion process but still have utility in providing structured frameworks to inform the content on impacts within a full risk assessment.

There is a clear need to develop harmonized approaches to ensure effective risk assessment of alien species to provide an evidence base for informing decision-making and so ultimately conservation action. Although information gaps and lags in provision of empirical evidence for assessing IAS as they arrive within a new region are inevitable, it is essential that the process of assessing the threat posed by an alien species is transparent and robust. Furthermore, communication and information exchange are essential for enabling a global response to IAS and as such the minimum standards described here provide an acceptable and practical check list which would achieve the aspired outcome.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the European Commission for funding this study. This consensus process led to the development of a framework for the establishment of minimum standards for assessing alien species to identify "IAS of European Union concern." This ensures that risk assessments undertaken on alien species are compliant with the Regulation and thus take into consideration relevant requirements, for example those of the WTO, whilst ensuring applicability to contexts beyond the Regulation. Particular thanks go to Valentino Bastino and Myriam Dumortier for their invaluable support and guidance throughout. Many of the authors benefitted enormously from networking through the COST Action TD1209 ALIEN Challenge. HER would like to thank the GB Non-Native Species

Secretariat and the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for support of wider work on non-native species through the GB Non-Native Species Information Portal. HER additionally acknowledges the Natural Environment Research Council for support through National Capability funding C6420. JP was partly supported by The Czech Academy of Sciences (no. RVO 67985939) and project 17-1902S (GACR). Participation by GHC was thanks to support from the UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. The authors would also like to gratefully acknowledge the many other experts who contributed to the study, in particular through the workshop and the contribution of case studies (Sandro Bertolino, Tim Blackburn, John Gurnell, Peter Lurz, Adriano Martinoli, Dan Minchin, Sergej Olenin, Hanno Sandvik, Luc Wauters). We very much appreciate the thoughtful comments and suggestions from the editor and anonymous reviewers of this manuscript.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

H.E.R., W.R., R.S., A.S. and F.E. developed the ideas following European Commission tender specification. H.E.R., B.G., P.G., W.R., R.S., A.S. and F.E. designed the approach, implemented and coordinated the methods for information gathering including the workshop and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the consensus approach as experts and critically reviewed the drafts giving final approval for publication.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

No primary data were generated through this study. The summary of attributes (including the name of the method, study type (original or further development of an existing method), geographic and taxonomic scope to which the method has been applied, total number of questions, types of question, output and associated reference) of selected risk assessments, and associated information is provided within Supporting Information Table S1.

ORCID

Helen E. Roy  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6050-679X>

Sven Bacher  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5147-7165>

Wolfgang Nentwig  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9682-8483>

REFERENCES

- Bacher, S., Blackburn, T. M., Essl, F., Genovesi, P., Heikkilä, J., Jeschke, J. M., ... Kumschick, S. (2017). Socio-economic impact classification of alien taxa (SEICAT). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12844>
- Baker, R., Black, R., Copp, G. H., Haysom, K. A., Hulme, P. E., Thomas, M. B., ... Ward, N. L. (2008). The UK risk assessment scheme for all non-native species. *Biological Invasions – from Ecology to Conservation* (eds W. Rabitsch, F. Essl & F. Klingenstein), pp. 46–57. Neobiota.
- Bellard, C., Cassey, P., & Blackburn, T. M. (2016). Alien species as a driver of recent extinctions. *Biology Letters*, 12, 20150623. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0623>
- Beninde, J., Fischer, M. L., Hochkirch, A., & Zink, A. (2015). Ambitious advances of the European Union in the legislation of invasive alien species. *Conservation Letters*, 8, 199–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12150>
- Benke, K. K., Steel, J. L., & Weiss, J. E. (2011). Risk assessment models for invasive species: Uncertainty in rankings from multi-criteria analysis. *Biological Invasions*, 13, 239–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-010-9804-x>
- Biosecurity New Zealand. (2006). *Risk analysis procedures, version 1*. New Zealand: Biosecurity New Zealand.
- Blackburn, T. M., Essl, F., Evans, T., Hulme, P. E., Jeschke, J. M., & Kühn, I., ... Bacher, S. (2014). A unified classification of alien species based on the magnitude of their environmental impacts. *PLOS Biology*, 12, e1001850. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001850>
- Bomford, M. (2006). *Risk assessment for the establishment of exotic vertebrates in Australia: Recalibration and refinement of models*. Canberra: Bureau of Rural Sciences.
- Bomford, M., & Glover, J. (2004). *Risk assessment model for the import and keeping of exotic freshwater and estuarine finfish*. Canberra: Bureau of Rural Sciences.
- Bomford, M., Kraus, F., Braysher, M., Walter, L., & Brown, L. (2005). *Risk assessment model for the import and keeping of exotic reptiles and amphibians*. Canberra: Department of Environment and Heritage, Bureau of Rural Sciences.
- Bomford, M. (2008). *Risk assessment models for establishment of exotic vertebrates in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra: Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre.
- Branquart, E. (2009). *Guidelines for environmental impact assessment and list classification of non-native organisms in Belgium: version 2.6*. Bruxelles: Belgian Forum on Invasive Species.
- Brunel, S., Branquart, E., Fried, G., van Valkenburg, Y., Brundu, G., Starfinger, U., ... Baker, R. (2010). The EPPO prioritization process for invasive alien plants. *Bulletin OEPP/EPPO Bulletin*, 40, 407–422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2338.2010.02423.x>
- CBD. (2014). Pathways of introduction of invasive species, their prioritization and management. Note by the Executive Secretary. 18th Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) – Montreal, 23–28 June 2014. www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-18/official/sbstta-18-09-add1-en.pdf. Viewed 9 February 2017.
- CEC (2009). *Trinational risk assessment guidelines for aquatic alien invasive species*. Montréal: Commission for Environmental Cooperation.
- Copp, G. H., Garthwaite, R., & Gozlan, R. E. (2005). *Risk identification and assessment of non-native freshwater fishes: concepts and perspectives on protocols for the UK*, 32pp. Cefas Science Technical Report No 129. Lowestoft: Cefas.
- Copp, G. H., Vilizzi, L., Mumford, J., Fenwick, G. V., Godard, M. J., & Gozlan, R. E. (2009). Calibration of FISK, an invasive-ness screening tool for non-native freshwater fishes. *Risk Analysis*, 29, 457–467.
- Copp, G. H., Britton, J. R., Jeney, G., Joly, J.-P., Gherardi, F., Gollasch, S., & ... Thrush, M. (2008). *Risk assessment protocols and decision making tools for use of alien species in aquaculture and stock enhancement*, 84pp. Report to the European Commission, Project no.: 044142 (IMPASSE – Environmental impacts of alien species in aquaculture) for Coordination Action Priority FP6 2005-SSP-5A, Brussels, Sustainable Management of Europe's Natural Resources. Retrieved from: http://www.cefas.defra.gov.uk/media/437410/impasse_44142_d3-2.pdf
- Copp, G. H., Vilizzi, L., Tidbury, H., Stebbing, P. D., Trakan, A. S., Miossec, L., & Gouilletquer, P. (2016). Development of a generic decision-support tool for identifying potentially invasive aquatic taxa: AS-ISK. *Management of Biological Invasions*, 7, 343–350. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi>
- D'hondt, B., Vanderhoeven, S., Roelandt, S., Mayer, F., Versteirt, V., Adriaens, T., ... Branquart, E. (2015). Harmonia[®] and Pandora₊: Risk screening tools for potentially invasive plants, animals and their pathogens. *Biological Invasions*, 17, 1869–1883. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-0843-1>

- Early, R., Bradley, B. A., Dukes, J. S., Lawler, J. J., Olden, J. D., Blumenthal, D. M., ... Miller, L. P. (2016). Global threats from invasive alien species in the twenty-first century and national response capacities. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12485.
- EFSA Panel on Plant Health. (2011). Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of plant pests. *EFSA Journal*, 9, 2460. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2460>.
- EPPO (2011) Guidelines on Pest Risk Analysis: Decision support scheme for quarantine pests. European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization. Retrieved from http://archives.eppo.int/EPPOStandards/PM5_PRA/PRA_scheme_2011.pdf
- Essl, F., Nehring, S., Klingenstein, F., Milasowszky, N., Nowack, C., & Rabitsch, W. (2011). Review of risk assessment systems of IAS in Europe and introducing the German-Austrian Black List Information System (GABLIS). *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 19, 339–350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2011.08.005>
- European Union. (2014). Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 57, 35.
- Gallardo, B., Zieritz, A., Adriaens, T., Bellard, C., Boets, P., Britton, J. R., ... Aldridge, D. C. (2016). Trans-national horizon scanning for invasive non-native species: A case study in western Europe. *Biological Invasions*, 18, 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-0986-0>
- Gederaas, L., Moen, T. L., Skjelseth, S., & Hansen, L.-K. (2013). *Alien species in Norway: with the Norwegian Black List 2012*. Trondheim: Artsdatabanken.
- Genovesi, P., Carboneras, C., Vilà, M., & Walton, P. (2015). EU adopts innovative legislation on invasive species: A step towards a global response to biological invasions? *Biological Invasions*, 17, 1307–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-014-0817-8>
- Genovesi, P., Scalerà, R., Brunel, S., Roy, D., & Solarz, W. (2010). Towards an early warning and information system for invasive alien species (IAS) threatening biodiversity in Europe. EEA technical report EEA. 5/2010: 52.
- Heikkilä, J. (2011). A review of risk prioritisation schemes of pathogens, pests and weeds: Principles and practices. *Agricultural and Food Science*, 20, 15. <https://doi.org/10.2137/145960611795163088>
- Hellmann, J. J., Byers, J. E., Bierwagen, B. G., & Dukes, J. S. (2008). Five potential consequences of climate change for invasive species. *Conservation Biology*, 22, 534–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00951.x>
- Keith, D. A., Rodríguez, J. P., Rodríguez-Clark, K. M., Nicholson, E., Aapala, K., Alonso, A., ... Barrow, E. G. (2013). Scientific foundations for an IUCN Red List of Ecosystems. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e62111. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062111>
- Kelly, J., O'Flynn, C., & Maguire, C. (2013). Risk analysis and prioritisation for invasive and non-native species in Ireland and Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland Environment Agency and National Parks and Wildlife Service.
- Kolar, C. S., & Lodge, D. M. (2002). Ecological predictions and risk assessment for alien fishes in North America. *Science*, 298, 1233–1236.
- Kulhanek, S. A., Ricciardi, A., & Leung, B. (2011). Is invasion history a useful tool for predicting the impacts of the world's worst aquatic invasive species? *Ecological Applications*, 21, 189–202. <https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1452.1>
- Kumschick, S., Bacher, S., Dawson, W., Heikkilä, J., Sendek, A., Pluess, T., ... Kühn, I. (2012). A conceptual framework for prioritization of invasive alien species for management according to their impact. *NeoBiota*, 15, 69–100.
- Kumschick, S., & Nentwig, W. (2010). Some alien birds have as severe an impact as the most effectual alien mammals in Europe. *Biological Conservation*, 143, 2757–2762.
- Leung, B., Roura-Pascual, N., Bacher, S., Heikkilä, J., Brotons, L., Burgman, M. A., ... Vilà, M. (2012). TEASing apart alien species risk assessments: A framework for best practices. *Ecology Letters*, 15, 1475–1493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12003>
- Mastrandrea, M., Heller, N., Root, T., & Schneider, S. (2010). Bridging the gap: Linking climate-impacts research with adaptation planning and management. *Climatic Change*, 100, 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-010-9827-4>
- McGeoch, M. A., Genovesi, P., Bellingham, P. J., Costello, M. J., McGrannachan, C., & Sheppard, A. (2016). Prioritizing species, pathways, and sites to achieve conservation targets for biological invasion. *Biological Invasions*, 18, 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-1013-1>
- Mumford, J. D., Booy, O., Baker, R. H. A., Rees, M., Copp, G. H., Black, K., ... Hartley, M. (2010). Invasive non-native species risk assessment in Great Britain. *Aspects of Applied Biology*, 104, 49–54.
- Nentwig, W., Kühnel, E., & Bacher, S. (2010). A generic impact-scoring system applied to alien mammals in Europe. *Conservation Biology*, 24, 302–311.
- Olenin, S., Minchin, D., & Daunys, D. (2007). Assessment of biopollution in aquatic ecosystems. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 55, 379–394.
- Ou, J., Lu, C., & O'Toole, D. K. (2008). A risk assessment system for alien plant bio-invasion in Xiamen, China. *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 20, 989–997.
- Parker, C., Caton, B. P., & Fowler, L. (2007). Ranking nonindigenous weed species by their potential to invade the United States. *Weed Science*, 55, 386–397.
- Pergl, J., Sádlo, J., Petrušek, A., Laštůvka, Z., Musil, J., Perglová, I., ... Vohralík, V. (2016). Black, Grey and Watch Lists of alien species in the Czech Republic based on environmental impacts and management strategy. *NeoBiota*, 28, 1. <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.28.4824>
- Pheloung, P. C. (2001). Weed risk assessment for plant introductions to Australia. In R. H. Groves, F. D. Panetta, & J. G. Virtue (Eds.), *Weed risk assessment* (pp. 83–92). Collingwood, Australia: CSIRO Publishing.
- Roy, H. E., Schonrogge, K., Dean, H., Peyton, J., Branquart, E., Vanderhoeven, S., ... Stewart, A. (2014). Invasive alien species – framework for the identification of invasive alien species of EU concern (ENV.B.2/ETU/2013/0026). European Commission, Brussels.
- Sandvik, H., Sæther, B. E., Holmern, T., Tufto, J., Engen, S., & Roy, H. E. (2013). Generic ecological impact assessments of alien species in Norway: a semi-quantitative set of criteria. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 22, 37–62.
- Seebens, H., Blackburn, T. M., Dyer, E. E., Genovesi, P., Hulme, P. E., Jeschke, J. M., ... Essl, F. (2017). No saturation in the accumulation of alien species worldwide. *Nature Communications*, 8, 14435. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms14435>
- Shine, C., Kettunen, M., Genovesi, P., Essl, F., Gollasch, S., Rabitsch, W., ... ten Brink, P. (2010). *Assessment to support continued development of the EU Strategy to combat invasive alien species*. Final Report for the European Commission. Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP), Brussels.
- Stohlgren, T. J., Binkley, D., Chong, G. W., Kalkhan, M. A., Schell, L. D., Bull, K. A., ... Son, Y. (1999). Exotic plant species invade hot spots of native plant diversity. *Ecological Monographs*, 69, 25–46. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9615\(1999\)069\[0025:EPSIHS\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9615(1999)069[0025:EPSIHS]2.0.CO;2)
- Sutherland, W. J., Fleishman, E., Mascia, M. B., Pretty, J., & Rudd, M. A. (2011). Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 2, 238–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2010.00083.x>
- Tittensor, D. P., Walpole, M., Hill, S. L., Boyce, D. G., Britten, G. L., Burgess, N. D., ... Alkemade, R. (2014). A mid-term analysis of progress toward international biodiversity targets. *Science*, 346, 241–244. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1257484>
- Tollington, S., Turbé, A., Rabitsch, W., Groombridge, J. J., Scalerà, R., Essl, F., & Schwartz, A. (2015). Making the EU legislation on invasive species a conservation success. *Conservation Letters*, 10, 112–120.
- Tricarico, E., Vilizzi, L., Gherardi, F., & Copp, G. H. (2010). Calibration of FI-ISK, an invasiveness screening tool for nonnative freshwater invertebrates. *Risk Analysis*, 30, 285–292.

- Tucker, K. C., & Richardson, D. M. (1995). An expert-system for screening potentially invasive alien plants in South-African fynbos. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 44, 309–338.
- Turbelin, A. J., Malamud, B. D., & Francis, R. A. (2016). Mapping the global state of invasive alien species: Patterns of invasion and policy responses. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 26, 78–92.
- van Wilgen, N. J., Roura-Pascual, N., & Richardson, D. M. (2009). A Quantitative Climate-Match Score for Risk-Assessment Screening of Reptile and Amphibian Introductions. *Environmental Management*, 44, 590–607.
- van Wilgen, N. J., & Richardson, D. M. (2012). The roles of climate, phylogenetic relatedness, introduction effort, and reproductive traits in the establishment of non-native reptiles and amphibians. *Conservation Biology*, 26, 267–277.
- Vanderhoeven, S., Branquart, E., Casaer, J., D'hondt, B., Hulme, P. E., Shwartz, A., ... Adriaens, T. (2017). Beyond protocols: Improving the reliability of expert-based risk analysis underpinning invasive species policies. *Biological Invasions*, 19, 2507–2517.
- Verbrugge, L. N. H., Leuven, R. S. E. W., & van der Velde, G. (2010). Evaluation of international risk assessment protocols for exotic species. *Reports on Environmental Science*, 352, 1–54.
- Walther, G.-R., Roques, A., Hulme, P. E., Sykes, M. T., Pyšek, P., Kühn, I., ... Bugmann, H. (2009). Alien species in a warmer world: Risks and opportunities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24, 686–693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.06.008>
- Ward, D., Stanley, M., Toft, R., Forgie, S., & Harris, R. (2008). Assessing the risk of invasive ants: A simple and flexible scorecard approach. *Insectes Sociaux*, 55, 360–363.
- Weber, E., Köhler, B., Gelpke, G., Perrenoud, A., & Gigon, A. (2005). Schlüssel zur Einteilung von Neophyten in der Schweiz in die Schwarze Liste oder die Watch-Liste. *Bot Helv*, 115, 169–173.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

How to cite this article: Roy HE, Rabitsch W, Scalera R, et al. Developing a framework of minimum standards for the risk assessment of alien species. *J Appl Ecol*. 2018;55:526–538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13025>