

NSW Weed Risk Management assessment: *Ligustrum lucidum*

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

		<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>		
		Broad-leaf privet		
		Oleaceae		
	Area considered:	NSW		
	Landuse:	Nature conservation		
	Density:	Low density in landuse		
		Standard weed management - little aside from site treatment with herbicides, fire and labour-intensive tools.		
Invasiveness			Do not know	
Q1	score	3	0.0	Mowatt and Smith (2004).
Q2	score	3	0.0	Little general management in landuse aside from fire which the species has some tolerance to.
Q3	a	0	0.0	4 years Blood (2001).
	b	1	0.0	Westoby <i>et al.</i> (1983) 400 fruit/sq. m canopy average.
	c	1	0.0	Some suckering e.g. Westoby <i>et al.</i> (1983).
	total	2		
Q3	score	1		
Q4	a	2	0.0	Johnson (2008).
	b	1	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
	c	1	0.0	Muyt (2001).
	d	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
	total	4		
Q4	score	2		
Q5	a	1	0.0	Intentional human plantings now planted rarely - species out of vogue.
	b	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
	c	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
	d	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
	total	1		
Q5	score	1		
Invasiveness score		10		
Impacts				
Q1	score	3	0.0	Swarbrick <i>et al.</i> (1999).
Q2	score	4	0.0	Swarbrick <i>et al.</i> (1999).
Q3	score	2	0.0	e.g. Coutts-Smith and Downey (2006), Johnson (2008) - areas invaded are never not suitable for conservation once rehabilitated.
Q4	score	2	0.0	Johnson (2008) not specified in literature.
Q5	score	1	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008).
Q6	a	0	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008) not major +ve or -ve.
	b	1	0.0	Fox and Adamson (1986), Swarbrick <i>et al.</i> (1999).

Ligustrum lucidum (cont.)

	<i>c</i>	0	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008) not major +ve or -ve.
	<i>d</i>	0	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008) not major +ve or -ve.
	<i>e</i>	0	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008) not major +ve or -ve.
	<i>f</i>	0	0.0	As summarised in Johnson (2008) not major +ve or -ve.
	<i>total</i>	1		
Q6	score	1		
Impacts score		13		
Potential distribution				
	score	0.5	0.0	Estimate of less than 5% of area.
Comparative weed risk and Uncertainty scores				
	Corrected Invasiveness	6.7		
	Corrected Impacts	6.8		
	Corrected Potential distribution	0.5		
Comparative Weed Risk		23		
		Low		
	Uncertainty Invasiveness	0.0		
	Uncertainty Impacts	0.0		
	Uncertainty Potential Distribution	0.0		
Control costs				
Q1	<i>a</i>	1	0.0	Johnson (2008) - not always distinct.
	<i>b</i>	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) - perennial.
	<i>c</i>	0	0.0	Hardin (1992).
	<i>d</i>	0	0.0	Hardin (1992) and pers. obs.
	<i>total</i>	1		
Q1	score	1		
Q2	score	1	0.0	Most sites likely to be readily accessible.
Q3	<i>a</i>	1	0.0	Low chemical cost with cut stump or stem injection applications.
	<i>b</i>	4	0.0	Assumed to be very high with range of hand removal or chemical techniques.
	<i>c</i>	1	0.0	Likely to be low equipment cost in general.
	<i>total</i>	6		
Q3	score	3		
Q4	score	1	0.0	Weed control not commonly undertaken in land use unless at specific sites.

Ligustrum lucidum (cont.)

Control costs score		6		
Persistence				
Q1	score	1	0.0	Johnson (2008) most successful techniques have greater than 95% control.
Q2	score	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) far longer than 2 years.
Q3	score	0	0.0	Panetta (2000) - almost all gone inside 1 year.
Q4	<i>a</i>	2	0.0	Johnson (2008) - birds frequently disperse.
	<i>b</i>	0	0.0	Johnson (2008) - deliberate introduction is rare - very uncommonly planted now.
	<i>total</i>	2		
Q4	score	2	0.0	
Persistence score		3		
Current Distribution				
Q1	score	0.1	0.0	Far less than 1% of total biodiversity areas affected.
Q2	score	1	0.0	Mainly small infestations spread over much of the area.
Current Distribution score		1.1		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control and Uncertainty scores				
Corrected Control costs		5.0		
Corrected Persistence		2.7		
Corrected Current distribution		0.9		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control		13		
		Very high	but closer to High at 14-30	
Uncertainty Control costs		0.0		
Uncertainty Persistence		0.0		
Uncertainty Current distribution		0.0		
Overall Uncertainty score		0		
Positive impacts		Previously commonly planted as hedge, shade, shelter and garden trees and shrubs. Historic tree and hedge plantings may be still planted to maintain these plantings in urban areas.		
Further comments		None		

Determining priorities

Weed risk is LOW

Feasibility of Coordinated control is VERY HIGH but closer to HIGH

Ligustrum lucidum (cont.)

On the Management action matrix the weed falls into 'Monitor. Protect Priority Sites' in the upper right of the matrix

Suggested Management actions of 'Monitor' and 'Protect Priority sites'

Aims to detect any significant changes in the species' weed risk

Monitor the spread of the species and review any perceived changes in weediness.

Aims to prevent the spread of the weed species to key sites/assets of high economic, environmental and/or social value

Weed may be of limited current distribution but only threatens limited industries/habitats (lower weed risk), or the weed may be more widespread but is yet to invade/impact upon many key industries/habitats (higher weed risk).

Surveillance and mapping to locate all infested areas.

Identification of key sites/assets in the geographic area.

Control of infestations in close proximity to key sites/assets, aiming for a significant reduction in weed density.

Limits on movement and sale of species within geographic area.

Must not allow to spread from cultivated plants (if grown) in close proximity to key sites/assets.

Monitor change in current distribution within and in close proximity to key site/assets.

References

- Blood, K. (2001). Environmental weeds. A field guide for SE Australia. C. H. Jerram, Science Publishers. Mt. Waverly, Victoria. 226 pp.
- Coutts-Smith, A. J. and Downey, P. O. (2006). Impact of weeds on threatened biodiversity in New South Wales. Technical series no.11. Cooperative Research Centre for Australian Weed Management, Adelaide. 98 pp.
- Fox, M. D. and Adamson, D. (1986). The ecology of invasions. A natural legacy. Ecology in Australia, 2nd edition. eds. H. F. Recher, D. Lunney and I. Dunn. Pergamon press, Sydney. pp. 235-255.
- Hardin, D. W. (1992). Oleaceae. Chapter 135 In, Flora of New South Wales, Volume 3. Ed. G. J. Harden. New South Wales University Press, Kensington, New South Wales. pp. 470-477.
- Johnson, S. B. (2008). Review of the declaration of *Ligustrum* (privet) species in NSW. New South Wales Department of Primary Industries, Orange. 58 pp.
- Mowatt, J. and Smith, L. (2004). Privet. Agfact P7.6.8. New South Wales Department of Primary Industries, Orange.
- Muyt, A. (2001). Bush invaders of south-east Australia. R. G. and F. J. Richardson, Meredith, Victoria. pp. 194-196.
- Panetta, F. D. (2000). Fates of fruits and seeds of *Ligustrum lucidum* W.T.Ait. and *L. sinense* Lour. maintained under natural rainfall or irrigation. *Australian Journal of Botany*, **48**, 701-705.
- Swarbrick, J. T., Timmins, S. M. and Bullen, K. M. (1999). The Biology of Australian Weeds. 36. *Ligustrum lucidum* Aiton and *Ligustrum sinense* Lour L. *Plant Protection Quarterly*, **14**, 122-130.
- Westoby, M., Dalby, J. and Adams-Acton, L. (1983). Fruit production by two species of privet, *Ligustrum sinense* Lour. and *L. lucidum* WT Ait., in Sydney. *Australian Weeds*, **2**, 127-129.