

Weed (Scientific name)	Ligustrum sinense - Oleaceae		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area			
Landuse	1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		
Assumptions	Used scoresheet from DI&I website to answer many questions		
<i>Invasiveness</i>	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	0.0		>3 yrs/never Q3
(b) Annual seed production	1.0		Low
(c) Vegetative reproduction	2.0		Frequent
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	2.0		Common
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		2.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	2.0		Common Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	1.0		Occasional
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		8.0	

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		3.0	> 50% reduction	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		4.0	> 50% reduction	Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		3.0	High	Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		3.0	High	Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		1.0	Low	Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		1.0		Q6
(a) food/shelter	0.0		Minor or no 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	
Total		7.9		
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		505		
Weed risk category		Very high		

Control Costs		Score	Total	
Q1. How detectable is the weed?			1	Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	0			
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0			
(c) Height at maturity	0			
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2			
				always distinct
				> 8 months
				> 2 m
				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			
(b) Labour costs/ha	4			
(c) Equipment costs	1			
				high (\$250-\$500/ha)
				very high (>\$500/ha)
				low
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?			1.0	Q4
				medium
	Total		5.8	
Persistence		Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?			1	Q1
				high
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?			0	Q2
				>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?			2.0	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2			
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	1			
				frequent
				occasional
	Total		2.7	
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?			6.0	Q1
				40-60% of land use
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?			2.0	Q2
				widespread
	Total		6.7	
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score			106	
Feasibility of coordinated control category			Low	

<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 style="text-align: center;">Manage weed Protect priority sites</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0%</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

In spite of the outcome of the co-ordinated control score above, representatives evaluating this weed considered that as a woody weed, it is still feasible to control this plant in targeted sites (does) form monocultures. It is imperative to control this weed to conserve biodiversity, and for the sustainable productivity of rural lands.

Re: Sources: Many of the answers above were obtained from the WRMA on the DI&I website. Control Costs, Distribution and Persistence questions were answered as a group by: C Williams, J Hill - Sydney Central SC, M Thurlow South-western Sydney WC and L Kaye -NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.

Source and comments

see below

If treated during periods of drought, or when plant is under stress, treatment is less successful.

While most infestations on public land are being managed, reinfestation from sources on private land commonly occurs.

uations (i.e. specific asset protection) to maintain biodiversity as this species can (and
ams & J Vollmer - Sydney North WC, M Costigan & D Whiteman - Sydney West/Blue