

|   |   |              |   |
|---|---|--------------|---|
| <b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>   | <b>Asparagus aethiopicus - Liliaceae - Asparagaceae</b> |              |   |
| <b>Region</b>   | <b>Sydney</b>   |              |   |
| <b>Management Area</b>  | <b>Sydney</b>   |              |   |
| <b>Landuse</b>  | <b>1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS</b>         |              |   |
| <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>3.0</b>   | Seedlings establish within dense vegetation or weeds Q1 |
| <b>Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?</b> |   | <b>3.0</b>   | 95% + weeds survive common management Q2                |
| <b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>                      |   | <b>2.0</b>   |   |
| (a) Time to seeding   | 1.0   |              | >1-3 yrs 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>3.0</b>   |   |
| (a) Flying animals  | 2.0   |              | Common Q4   |
| (b) Other wild animals  | 2.0   |              | Common  |
| (c) Water   | 2.0   |              | Common  |
| (d) Wind  | 0.0   |              | Unlikely  |
| <b>Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100 m) by human means?</b>                  |   | <b>2.0</b>   |   |
| (a) Deliberate spread by people   | 2.0   |              | Common Q5   |
| (b) Accidentally by people and vehicles   | 2.0   |              | Common  |
| (c) Contaminated produce  | 0.0   |              | Unlikely  |
| (d) Domestic/farm animals   | 1.0   |              | Occasional  |
| <b>Total</b>  |   | <b>8.7</b>   |   |

| <b>Impacts</b>   | <b>Score</b> | <b>Total</b>     |                       |
|--|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?  |              | <b>3.0</b>       | > 50% reduction Q1    |
| Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?  |              | <b>4.0</b>       | > 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>0.0</b>       | None Q5               |
| Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?                                       |              | <b>2.0</b>       | Q6                    |
| (a) food/shelter   | 1.0          |                  | Major negative effect |
| (b) fire regime  | 1.0          |                  | Major negative 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    |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>6.8</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>8.0</b>       | 60-80% of land use Q1 |
| <b>Comparative weed risk score</b>   |              | <b>474</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>2</b>     | Q1                    |
| (a) Distinguishing features   | 0            |              | always distinct       |
| (b) Period of year shoot growth visible   | 0            |              | > 8 months            |
| (c) Height at maturity  | 2            |              | <0.5 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>4</b>     | Q3                    |
| (a) Chemical costs/ha   | 3            |              | high (\$250-\$500/ha) |
| (b) Labour costs/ha   | 4            |              | very high (>\$500/ha) |
| (c) Equipment costs   | 1            |              | low                   |
| <b>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</b>     |              | <b>2.0</b>   | Q4                    |
|   |              |              | low                   |
| <b>Total</b>  |              | <b>7.5</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>1</b>     | Q2                    |
|   |              |              | 1-2 years             |
| <b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>                                      |              | <b>0</b>     | Q3                    |
|   |              |              | < 2 years             |
| <b>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?</b>    |              | <b>3.0</b>   | Q4                    |
| (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means  | 2            |              | frequent              |
| (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means  | 2            |              | frequent              |
| <b>Total</b>  |              | <b>6.4</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>80</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>0%</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 - 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.  
Plants can grow from fragments of woody rhizome. pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

Deliberate spread by people via dumping of garden waste. SS

pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

Some members of Liliaceae toxic to cats. pers. comm. MC

Has positive habitat effects for native fauna food source (berry-eating birds). Holds soil together on top of rocks. pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

No info for *A. aethiopicus*, but time to reproduction recorded as 1 year for similar spp. *A. scandens* in Tas. <http://www.dpiw.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/SWEN-7S74GE?open>

pers. obs. SS

Widespread in coastal areas and steadily progressing westward.

---

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