

NSW Weed Risk Management assessment: *Rubus niveus*

(Return to: <http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/pests-weeds/weeds/wrm-system>)

		<i>Rubus</i>		
		<i>niveus</i>		
		Hill raspberry/Mysore raspberry		
		Rosaceae		
	Area considered	Coffs Harbour to Grafton NSW NC		
	Landuse	Nature Conservation		
	Density	Low density in landuse		
		Standard weed management is site treatment with a range of labour-intensive tools.		
	Invasiveness		Do not know	See reference below
Q1	score	3	0.0	Ron Smith pers. comm. Plants come through <i>Imperata cylindrica</i> and <i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>
Q2	score	3	0.0	There is no routine management for this weed in the land use.
Q3	a	1	0.0	Species needs to produce floricanes once primocanes have established
	b	2	0.0	Seed production is over 1000/plant in the literature
	c	1	0.0	Vegetative reproduction occurs but probably only approaches 10 new plants from 1 existing plant per year
	total	4		
Q3	score	2		
Q4	a	2	0.0	Dispersal by birds is common
	b	1	0.0	Dispersal by other wild animals is probable but not mentioned in Australian literature
	c	0	0.0	Dispersal by water is unlikely in Australia
	d	0	0.0	Dispersal by wind is very unlikely
	total	3		
Q4	score	2		
Q5	a	2	0.0	A commonly planted fruit species.
	b	0	0.0	Unlikely to be accidentally spread
	c	0	0.0	Unlikely to be spread as a contaminant
	d	1	0.0	Possibly moved by farm/domestic animals but not mentioned in literature
	total	3		
Q5	score	2		
	Invasiveness score	12		
	Impacts			
Q1	score	1.5	1.5	Do not know if establishment of desirable plants is reduced
Q2	score	2	2.0	Do not know if yield or amount of desirable plants is reduced but likely
Q3	score	1	0.0	No impacts on biodiversity recorded but could be found in future

Rubus niveus (cont.)

Q4	score	3	0.0	Major impediment to physical movement
Q5	score	0	0.0	Not known to affect animal or human health
Q6	<i>a</i>	0	0.0	Harbors pests but also provides food for wildlife cancels each other out here
	<i>b</i>	0	0.0	No effect recorded in literature
	<i>c</i>	0	0.0	No effect recorded in literature
	<i>d</i>	0	0.0	No effect recorded in literature
	<i>e</i>	0	0.0	No effect recorded in literature
	<i>f</i>	0	0.0	No effect recorded in literature
	<i>total</i>	0		
Q6	score	0		
	Impacts score	7.5		
	Potential distribution			
	score	5	5.0	Do not know without mapping
	Comparative weed risk and Uncertainty scores			
	Corrected Invasiveness	8.0		
	Corrected Impacts	3.9		
	Corrected Potential distribution	5.0		
	Comparative Weed Risk	158		
		High		
	Uncertainty Invasiveness	0.0		
	Uncertainty Impacts	31.8		
	Uncertainty Potential Distribution	100.0		
	Control costs			
Q1	<i>a</i>	1	0.0	Sometimes distinct (pers. obs.)
	<i>b</i>	0	0.0	An perennial species but may be frosted out
	<i>c</i>	0	0.0	Grows to more than 2 metres
	<i>d</i>	2	0.0	Grows below forest canopy
	<i>total</i>	3		
Q1	score	2		
Q2	score	1	0.0	Sites are mostly readily accessible but some steeper country would be the exception.

Rubus niveus (cont.)

Q3	a	0	0.0	Chemical costs will be low because hand applied
	b	4	0.0	Labour costs will be high for bushland regen crew
	c	1	0.0	Likely to be low equipment cost.
	total	5		
Q3	score	3		
Q4	score	2	0.0	Weed control rarely undertaken in land use but there is increasing interest in the species
Control costs score		8		
Persistence				
Q1	score	0	0.0	Ron Smith pers. comm.Targetted maangement is very effective with no regrowth.
Q2	score	1	0.0	Species needs to produce floricanes once primocanes have established so takes up to 2 years min.
Q3	score	1	1.0	Persistent seed bank mentioned in literature but not specified
Q4	a	2	0.0	Natural dispersal likely
	b	1	0.0	Conintued human dispersal unliekly
	total	3		
Q4	score	2	0.0	
Persistence score		4		
Current Distribution				
Q1	score	0.1	0.0	In less than 1% of area currently
Q2	score	1	0.0	A number of small infestations
Current Distribution score		1.1		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control and Uncertainty scores				
Corrected Control costs		6.7		
Corrected Persistence		3.6		
Corrected Current distribution		0.9		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control		22		
		High		
Uncertainty Control costs		0.0		

Rubus niveus (cont.)

Uncertainty Persistence	16.7	
Uncertainty Current distribution	0.0	
Overall Uncertainty score	25	Revisit existing literature (doing a map would reduce this markedly)
Positive impacts	Has been planted for fruit in the past	
Comments	This species is an Asian species and grows in more tropical areas	

Determining priorities

Weed risk is HIGH

Feasibility of Coordinated Control is HIGH

On the Management action matrix the weed falls into the 'CONTAIN SPREAD' area of the lower right of the matrix

Suggested Management actions of 'Contain spread' category

Aims to prevent the ongoing spread of the weed species in the geographic area being considered

Surveillance and mapping to locate all infested properties.

Control of all infestations, aiming for a significant reduction in weed density.

Prevention of entry to geographic area, and movement and sale within.

Must not allow to spread from cultivated plants (if grown).

Monitor change in current distribution

References

NBII&ISSG, National Biological Information Infrastructure and Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) (2008). *Rubus niveus*. Global Invasive Species Database. URL: <http://www.issg.org/database> (accessed: 2 February 2009).