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International context

- EPPO member since 1951
- IPPC ratified in 1996
- Bilateral Agreement for Agriculture European Union and Switzerland since 1999
- Harmonised with EU plant health legislation
- EU lists => Swiss lists
- Currently revising our legislation based on EU Regulation 2016/2031
Facts and Figures

- Surface: 42,000 km² (Estonia 45,000 km²)
- Population: 8 mio
- Forest area: 1.3 mio ha ➔ 32% surface
- Protection forest: 585‘000 ha
The Functions of Swiss Forests
Forest Protection: A Shared Task

Federal level
- Adopt legal framework
- Inspections (nurseries, import etc.)
- Financial support
- Research, diagnostics

Cantonal level (26 regional authorities)
- Surveillance measures
- Outbreak management
- Finance measures
Practical Concerns to Manage Forestry Pests

Spruce bark beetle *Ips typographus*: classic forestry pest of Norway spruce *Picea abies*

Ash dieback *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*: new, epidemic, threatening European Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*

Tree of heaven *Ailanthus altissima*: introduced, invading forests, affecting protection forests

Need to Prioritise Forestry Pests

Goals

• Arguments for ressource allocation at political level
• Guidelines for prioritisation at cantonal level
• Produce an agreed set of priority pests in forestry
• Harmonise management measures throughout the country

Prioritisation Process

- Qualitative approach

- Taskforce with federal and cantonal representatives & scientists

- Scientists provided their opinion

- Discussions in 7 workshops in 2016
Method

1. Establish common criteria for prioritisation
   a) Damage potential for forestry functions
   b) Current distribution
   c) Spread potential
   ➢ Scored with 4 levels each (none, low, medium, high)

2. Score 74 species (18 insects, 20 plants, 32 fungi, 3 bacteria/mycoplasma, 1 nematode)

3. Sketch a nationwide strategy for top scored species, based on score and
   - Likelihood of introduction
   - Availability of mitigation measures
Result

• List with 28 species scored >20
• Score ranged from 5 – 29

• Many plants (growing practical concerns)

• Harmful organisms from Council Directive 2000/29 EC have special status
### Prioritisation of forestry pests in Switzerland

**Therese Plüss**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Harmful organisms</th>
<th>Organism group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><em>Phytophthora ramorum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><em>P. kernoviae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>Anoplophora glabripennis</em></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hymenoscyphus fraxineus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><em>Agrilus planipennis</em></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ailanthus altissima</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anoplophora chinensis</em></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ips typographus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><em>Inonotus weirii</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pueraria montana var. lobata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ceratocystis fagacearum</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Prunus laurocerasus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>Collybia fusipes</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Scirrhia acicola</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Scirrhia pini</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Trachycarpus fortunei</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Clematis vitalba</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Gibberella circinata</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Fungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Impatiens glandulifera</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rubus armeniacus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next steps

- Brief portrait with recommendations for authorities
- List shall be revised on regular basis
- Include upcoming EU listings
Conclusions

• Make criteria transparent and comprehensible

• Criteria need to be agreed upon for acceptance

• Participation process rises acceptance of decisions and in consequence enhances implementation of measures

• Feasibility of measures must be taken in account

• Given the scarce resources and the ever rising number of species, prioritisation is key
Challenges of Prioritisation

Having transparent criteria is good, but….  

• We still rely on expert knowledge  
  (make sure that all are heard)

• Depending on scales or responsibility, experts have other priorities

• What do we do with new, yet unknown organisms ?
• We are always one step behind

=> be flexible and well connected
Thank you!