

<b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>	Lonicera japonica - Caprifoliaceae		
<b>Region</b>	Sydney		
<b>Management Area</b>			
<b>Landuse</b>	1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		
<b>Assumptions</b>			
<b><i>Invasiveness</i></b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	Seedlings establish after moderate disturbance Q1
<b>Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	Between 50 and 95% of weeds survive Q2
<b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
(a) Time to seeding	?		Do not know Q3
(b) Annual seed production	1.0		Low
(c) Vegetative reproduction	2.0		Frequent
<b>Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100m) by natural means?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
(a) Flying animals	1.0		Occasional Q4
(b) Other wild animals	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
<b>Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100 m) by human means?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
(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
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.7</b>	

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		<b>2.0</b>	10 - 50% reduction Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		<b>3.0</b>	25 - 50% reduction Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		<b>2.0</b>	Medium Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		<b>2.0</b>	Medium Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		<b>2.0</b>	Medium Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		<b>3.0</b>	Q6
(a) food/shelter	1.0		Major negative effect
(b) fire regime	1.0		Major negative effect
(c) altered nutrient levels	?		Do not know
(d) soil salinity	?		Do not know
(e) soil stability	?		Do not know
(f) soil water table	?		Do not know
<b>Total</b>		<b>7.4</b>	
<b>Potential Distribution</b>			
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		<b>10.0</b>	>80% of land use Q1
<b>Comparative weed risk score</b>		<b>344</b>	
<b>Weed risk category</b>		<b>Very high</b>	

<b>Control Costs</b>		<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How detectable is the weed?</b>			<b>1</b>	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	
<b>Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?</b>			<b>1</b>	Q2
			medium	
<b>Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?</b>			<b>5</b>	Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	4		very high (>\$500/ha)	
(b) Labour costs/ha	4		very high (>\$500/ha)	
(c) Equipment costs	2		medium	
<b>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</b>			<b>1.0</b>	Q4
			medium	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>6.7</b>	
<b>Persistence</b>		<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?</b>			<b>3</b>	Q1
			low	
<b>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>			<b>?</b>	Q2
			do not know	
<b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>			<b>?</b>	Q3
			do not know	
<b>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?</b>			<b>2.0</b>	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	1		occasional	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2		frequent	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>6.8</b>	
<b>Current distribution</b>				
<b>Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?</b>			<b>1.0</b>	Q1
			5-10% of land use	
<b>Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?</b>			<b>1.0</b>	Q2
			scattered	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>1.7</b>	
<b>Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</b>			<b>76</b>	
<b>Feasibility of coordinated control category</b>			<b>Low</b>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Management priority category</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Calculation of overall uncertainty score</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Response</b></p>	<p>Manage weed Protect priority sites</p> <p>11%</p> <p><b>Submit Assessment</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Impacts</b></p>	
<p><b>References/Other comments</b></p>	

Re: Sources: Many of the questions above answered as a group by: C Williams & J Vollmer - Sydney North WC, M Costigan & D Whiteman - Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, J Hill - S assistance of Sue Stevens.

**Source and comments**

[http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7304.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7304.htm)  
<http://www.esc.nsw.gov.au/weeds/Sheets/vines/V%20Japanese%20honeysuckle.htm>

see below

Most spread is by movement of stem fragments.  
<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/pests/japanese-honeysuckle>  
[http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera\\_japonica\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera_japonica_htmlwra.htm)

[http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7304.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7304.htm)  
[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf)

<http://www.esc.nsw.gov.au/weeds/Sheets/vines/V%20Japanese%20honeysuckle.htm>  
[http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera\\_japonica\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera_japonica_htmlwra.htm)

Smothers most plants from the ground to the medium canopy.  
<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/pests/japanese-honeysuckle>

<http://www.esc.nsw.gov.au/weeds/Sheets/vines/V%20Japanese%20honeysuckle.htm>

[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf) Depends upon density of infestation.

[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf)

Berries are poisonous.  
<http://www.esc.nsw.gov.au/weeds/Sheets/vines/V%20Japanese%20honeysuckle.htm>  
[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf)

Creates fire hazard in natural ecosystems. Host for pest and pathogens.  
[http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera\\_japonica\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/pier/wra/pacific/lonicera_japonica_htmlwra.htm)

[http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7304.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7304.htm)

see belwo

[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf)

[http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap\\_fskm\\_awwa\\_report.pdf](http://www.hear.org/species/reports/lonjap_fskm_awwa_report.pdf)

---

sydney Central SC, M Thru low South-western Sydney WC and L Kaye -NPWS, with the