

Weed (Scientific name)	Asparagus plumosus - Liliaceae - Asparagaceae		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area			
Landuse	1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		
Assumptions	Assessment based on current distribution. Climbing Asparagus has potential to significantly increase in density and distribution.		
Invasiveness	Score	Total	
Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?		3.0	Seedlings establish within dense vegetation or weeds Q1
Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?		3.0	95% + weeds survive common management Q2
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		2.0	
(a) Time to seeding	1.0		>1-3 yrs Q3
(b) Annual seed production	1.0		Low
(c) Vegetative reproduction	1.0		Infrequent
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		2.0	
(a) Flying animals	2.0		Common Q4
(b) Other wild animals	1.0		Occasional
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		1.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	2.0		Common Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		7.3	

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		1.0	< 10% reduction	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		1.0	< 10% reduction	Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		1.0	Low	Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		1.0	Low	Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		0.0	None	Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		0.0		Q6
(a) food/shelter	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(b) fire regime	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(c) altered nutrient levels	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(d) soil salinity	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(e) soil stability	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(f) soil water table	0.0		Minor or no effect	
Total		2.1		
Potential Distribution				
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		8.0	60-80% of land use	Q1
Comparative weed risk score		124		
Weed risk category		High		

Control Costs		Score	Total	
Q1. How detectable is the weed?			1	Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	0		always distinct	
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0		> 8 months	
(c) Height at maturity	0		> 2 m	
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2		below canopy	
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?			1	Q2
			medium	
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?			4	Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	3		high (\$250-\$500/ha)	
(b) Labour costs/ha	4		very high (>\$500/ha)	
(c) Equipment costs	1		low	
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?			2.0	Q4
			low	
	Total		6.7	
Persistence		Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?			3	Q1
			low	
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?			1	Q2
			1-2 years	
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?			0	Q3
			< 2 years	
Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?			3.0	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2		frequent	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2		frequent	
	Total		6.4	
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?			0.1	Q1
			<1% of land use	
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?			1.0	Q2
			scattered	
	Total		0.9	
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score			39	
Feasibility of coordinated control category			Medium	

<p style="text-align: center;">Management priority category</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Calculation of overall uncertainty score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>	<p>Protect priority sites</p> <p>0%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

Re: Sources: Many of the questions above answered as a group by: C Williams - Sydney North WC, R Adlmayer Sydney Central WC, M Costigan Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, and

Source and comments

pers. obs. SS
see below
Asparagus Weeds Best Practice Management Manual. pers. obs. SS
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7255.htm http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&state=&s=&ibra=all&card=V16
pers. obs. SS

At present. Suspected 'sleeper' weed, based on observations of other areas, e.g. Lord Howe Island.

At present. Suspected 'sleeper' weed, based on observations of other areas, e.g. Lord Howe Island.

Is medium in sites where well established.

Is medium in sites where well established.

pers. obs. SS Shepherd	Richardson, Richardson & http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7255.htm

Assessment based on current distribution. Climbing Asparagus has potential to significantly increase in density and distribution.	

M Hall & L Kaye NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.