

Living with Tree Pests and Diseases

Note of Practical Actions Workshop

Wednesday 25th May 2011 (10:00 – 16:30)

Thistle Grand Hotel, Bristol

This note summaries the workshop discussion and feedback. It is intended as an informed aide memoire rather than a comprehensive record. It does not attempt to capture the detail of the wide-ranging debate, to reconcile views or to comment on the validity of the comments made by participants. A list of attendees is attached at Annex A.

The aim of the workshop was to identify a range of practical actions and to assign responsibility for those actions. These are summarised in the table below:

Summary of Actions and suggested Owners of those actions

| | Actions | Owners |
|--------------|--|--|
| PREPAREDNESS | Imports | |
| | - Develop and Implement more effective PH border controls and ensure that they are strictly enforced. | FC/Fera/HMRC |
| | - Encourage appropriate national or local sourcing | Trade Associations; specifiers; landscape designers |
| | - Better checks on receipt of plants | Forest Managers; NGOs eg Woodland Trust & National Trust; Parks and Gardens staff; Tree officers; nurseries managers |
| | - Promote culture of value of clean plants | FC; Fera; Industry Associations & Societies; Companies; CLA |
| | - Plant passports & collaboration with EU partners | FC; Fera |
| | - No unsterilised woodfuel (need to balance this requirement with government biomass targets and the need to import much of the required material) | FC to explore import controls |
| | - Rapid response team of inspectors | FC; Fera; Devolved administrations (UK PHSI) |
| | - Measures to address threats from uncontrolled trade | FC; Fera |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Standards | |
| | - Develop a recognised BSI for plants | ConFor; HTA |
| | - Incorporate biosecurity within UKFS and UKWAS | FC; UKWAS steering group |
| | - Role of industry champions | Trade and industry associations |
| | - Urban trees | Tree officers; local authorities supported by FC Fera; tree wardens |
| | Training | |
| | - Continuing Professional Development | RFS, ICF; Arb. assoc.; Tree officers; RICS; Inst. Landscape designers |
| | - Specific courses | FC L&D; Govt inspectorates; companies |
| | - All courses dealing with trees | Universities; colleges |
| | Use of Gov't Resilience forums through working groups | |
| | -explore options for tapping into other national/regional mechanisms | FC/Fera to explore |
| | Stakeholder action groups - explore mechanisms for encouraging owners to report possible disease outbreaks. | FC/Fera to explore |
| | Pest risk analysis – forward prep | |
| | - Pathway analysis | FC/Fera/FR |
| | - Risk mapping of susceptible hosts and potential pests | FC/Fera/FR |
| | - Contingency plans – strengthen with stakeholders | FC; Industry |
| ACTIONS | Nurseries | |
| | - Quarantine procedures and areas | Nursery managers; Parks and garden managers; UK PHSI |
| | - More rigorous inspections | UK PHSI |
| | Sector – adopt biosecurity procedures and show lead | |
| | - more support to FR | FC; Defra; LWEC; Industry |
| | Communications | |
| | - Regular dissemination of available knowledge | FC; Fera; ConFor; CLA; RFS; RSFS; ICF; Arb. Asscn.; London Tree Officers; Local Authorities |
| | - need to share problem | Government and whole sector |
| | - idiots guide to past success and failures | FR |
| | - Single source of information | FC; Fera; UK PHSI |
| - Cost of loss to society in general – CBA | FC/Defra economists | |
| - building networks with other sectors | RFS, ConFor; HTA; EFIP; Wales forest Partnership; FIAB | |

| | |
|--|---|
| - Join up across agencies | FC; Fera; Defra; NE; SNH; CCW |
| Early detection for rapid response | |
| - Develop techniques for detecting early stress in trees (including fruit trees) | East Malling Research /FR/Fera |
| - Tree health surveillance and diagnostic system - should be free so as to encourage reporting. | FR/FC/Fera |
| - Develop the framework for a centralised Pest and Disease reporting hub. This should incorporate a feedback and communications capability. | Tree wardens, LTOA, FR, other environmental groups such as Butterfly Conservation etc that could provide early warning. |
| - Facilitate the creation of a cadre of approved but honorary inspectors by develop a (low or no cost) training course in Tree Pest and Disease detection. | FC/Fera/Defra |
| - Recognise that there is a potential reservoir of pests already in the environment and ensure that monitoring and surveillance systems accommodate this threat. | FC/Fera/Defra/ devolved national environment agencies |
| Policy | |
| - UKFS | FC; UKFS management group |
| - Silviculture and management i.e. making our trees and forests more resilient | RFS, FR; FC; processing and haulage industry; forest managers; CLA; forest owners |
| - explore mechanisms for encouraging owners to report possible disease outbreaks. | FE/Fera/Defra |
| - explore the development of more effective mechanisms to fund the reestablishment of forests following action taken to eradicate P&D's | FC/Fera/Defra/ICF/RFS/CLA |

LIVING WITH TREE PESTS AND DISEASES WORKSHOP

HOLIDAY INN, BRISTOL CITY
25TH MAY 2011

PROGRAMME

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| 10.00 | Registration Tea/coffee | |
| 10.30 | Welcome | Wilma Harper |
| 10.35 | Context | John Morgan |
| 10.50 | Introduction to workshops | Roger Coppock |
| 11.00 | Workshop session 1 | |
| 12.15 | Plenary 1 | |
| 12.30 | Lunch | |
| 13.30 | Lessons from case studies: Pr on Japanese larch, Dendroctonus micans, Oak Processionary Moth (10 minutes each) | Bruce Rothnie Hugh Evans Nigel Straw |
| 14.00 | Workshop session 2 | |
| 15.15 | Plenary 2 | |
| 15.30 | Tea/coffee break | |
| 15.45 | Action priorities and ownership | Roger Coppock |
| 16.15 | Closing remarks | Geraint Richards |
| 16.30 | Workshop ends | |

1. General Introduction

Tree Health is one of the Forestry Commission's highest priorities. This workshop follows on from a more general "*Tree Health and Plant Biosecurity*" workshop convened by Bob Watson (Defra Chief Scientist) and Tim Rollinson (Forestry Commission Director General) that was held in February 2011.

The outputs from this Workshop will feed into the joint Forestry Commission and Defra Action Plan on "*Tree Health and Plant Biosecurity*". The action plan is being developed to address tree and plant health and biosecurity in its widest sense. It will look at import controls, research needs, behavioural change, and practical actions.

2. Welcome (Wilma Harper)

Wilma Harper (WH), Head of Forestry and Corporate Support with the Forestry Commission, welcomed participants to the meeting and outlined the importance of clear lines of action to help combat current and emerging tree biosecurity threats.

3. Context (John Morgan)

John Morgan (JM), Head of Plant Health with the Forestry Commission, gave a presentation outlining the desired outcomes from the workshop.

Tree health is seen as a priority for both Defra and the Forestry Commission, and the Secretary of State has requested both departments (with support from Forest Research and Fera) to work together to produce an Action Plan on tree health and plant biosecurity. This Action Plan is comprised of four themes (practical actions, import controls, public engagement and research).

4. Introduction to workshops (Roger Coppock)

Roger Coppock (RC), Head of Specialist Advisors with the Forestry Commission, explained that there would be two sessions of four workshops and that each delegate had, the option of attending two of the breakout groups during the day. This would ensure that there was a good mix of expertise in each group.

The plenary sessions would allow reporting of the key conclusions of each group and also an opportunity to feed in additional comments. RC explained that active participation by attendees was essential in order to inform the action plan.

Each group had a facilitator, and a rapporteur, introduced at the start of each workshop.

5. Case Studies

To set the scene Forestry Commission experts Dr Hugh Evans, Dr Nigel Straw and Bruce Rothnie talked about the experiences with a range of forest pests including the Great Spruce Bark beetle (*Dendroctonus micans*), Oak Processionary Moth (OPM) and the fungus-like pathogen *Phytophthora ramorum*. The former is largely a success story in that by introducing a natural biological predator of the beetle the number of afflicted trees has been reduced to an economically negligible level. In contrast, the latter cases highlight the difficulties that are faced when trying to manage pests that have been introduced to an environment where their natural biological controls are absent and where native and introduced tree species have little or no natural resistance to them. In the case of OPM there is the added complication that the hairs borne by caterpillars of the moth are toxic to humans and animals including dogs, horses and deer.

6. Closing remarks (Geraint Richards)

Geraint Richards summed up the workshop by highlighting the increasing level of biosecurity threat that Britain's trees and forests are facing. He praised the good work that was being done to address these risks but emphasised that if we fail to work together, to tackle them, Britain's forests and trees and the services that they provide will suffer. Geraint challenged the public, private and voluntary sectors, to support the practical actions identified and to take ownership of them to ensure that they are implemented effectively and consistently.

7. Workshops

The titles of, and some background information to, the breakout groups were as follows:

Group 1. Understanding and minimising the threat

International trade and changing environment are generally accepted as the most important factors influencing the establishment of new pests and diseases. Do managers have sufficient information to protect the establishment of new woodland habitats available or are there opportunities to improve our understanding of how we might adopt successful models for dealing with pests and diseases? How might we need to amend our existing

practices to identify bio-security threats at an early stage? How do we best communicate these risks?

Issues that were suggested for discussion in this group included:

Identifying tree health threats

- Native pests and diseases (scope excludes animals and plants)
- Naturalised pests and diseases (scope excludes animals and plants)
- Recently introduced pests and diseases
- Potential new pests and diseases

Pathways under the influence of practitioners

- Endemic or introduced threats responding to a changing environment
- Movement of endemic or introduced threats through trade
- Natural dispersal mechanisms for endemic or introduced threats

Pest risk analysis (PRA)

- Consider PRA coverage for priority pests and diseases
- Measures to control and mitigate risk based on epidemiology

Communications – from the sector to the sector

The group discussions were aimed at answering the issues below.

Do managers have sufficient information to prevent the establishment of new woodland pest and disease threats? What needs to be done to resolve this?

What can we do to improve our understanding of how we might adopt successful models for dealing with pests and diseases?

What do we need to do to amend our existing practices to identify biosecurity threats at an early stage?

What do we need to do to communicate and engage with stakeholders to best effect?

Group 2. Mitigating the risk

Our management of woodland must incorporate resilience against the major threats from pests and diseases. Do our sustainable forest management policies and practice adequately account for the

threat from pests and diseases or are there conflicts that need to be re-prioritised and addressed? How do we best communicate these risks?

Issues that were suggested for discussion in this group included:

Means of mitigating risk

- Surveillance and monitoring
- Practical rapid action once an outbreak is identified
- Biosecurity protocols

Communications – from the sector and to the sector

The group discussions were aimed at answering the issues below.

Do our sustainable forest management policies and practice adequately account for the threat from pests and diseases? If not, what do we need to change, and how?

Are alternative silvicultural systems likely to result in more resilient woodlands? If so, what do we need to do to initiate the change towards a different management approach?

Are there conflicts that need to be re-prioritised and addressed? What actions does the sector/individuals/government need to undertake to resolve these?

What do we need to do to communicate and engage with stakeholders to best effect?

Group 3. Managing pests and diseases

There is an expectation that new quarantine organisms will either be contained or controlled as a high priority. What do we perceive to be a quarantine organism and what is our action required to avoid consequent damage. We have learned to live with a number of well established quarantine and non-quarantine organisms so are there general principles that need to be established? How do we best communicate these issues?

Issues that were suggested for discussion in this group included:

Management options

- Containment
- Eradication

- Concept of protected zones

Management best practice

- Alternative Silviculture systems
- Decision support

Communications – from the sector and to the sector

The group discussions were aimed at answering the issues below.

What do we perceive to be a quarantine organism? Are we content that we know enough about this subject? What needs to be done to get the sector fully up to speed with this aspect of biosecurity?

What actions can the sector take to support the statutory processes in place? What else can woodland owners, managers and tree professionals take to minimise or avoid consequent damage?

We have learned to live with a number of well established quarantine and non-quarantine organisms so are there may be general principles that can be established. If so what are they, and what lessons should we be learning from them?

What do we need to do to communicate and engage with stakeholders to best effect?

Group 4. Mitigating the impact of pests and diseases

Our trees and woodlands offer a wide range of social and economic benefits as well as providing essential habitat for other flora and fauna. The impact of tree pests and diseases is indiscriminate. Losses are incurred at all levels, from the individual owner and the local community to the forest industry and society as a whole. What further steps do we need to take to mitigate these impacts? How do we best communicate these impacts?

Issues that were suggested for discussion in this group included:

Economic impact on whole community

- Timber processing industry
- Timber co-products/by-products
- Supporting industries (forestry and non-forestry)

Protection of valuable ecosystems and heritage trees

Communications – from the sector and to the sector

The group discussions were aimed at answering the issues below.

Do we know enough about the economic impacts of new pests and diseases? How can we improve our knowledge of this?

What can the timber harvesting and processing industry do to mitigate these impacts?

How can we make our stakeholders, such as recreational users of forests, aware of the threats posed by pests and diseases? How can we enlist their help to mitigate the impacts?

How can we ensure that we protect valuable ecosystems and/or heritage trees?

What do we need to do to communicate and engage with stakeholders to best effect?

Annex A List of Attendees

| Name | Organisation |
|-----------------------|--|
| Andrew Sharkey | Woodland Trust |
| Andrew Shirley Priest | Abbey Forestry |
| Barnaby Wylder | FC South West England |
| Ben Clutterbuck | London Borough of Ealing |
| Bruce Rothnie | FCE Phytophthora Project Manager |
| Caroline Harrison | Confederation of Forest Industries (ConFor) |
| Dave Lofthouse | London Tree Officers Association |
| David Brown | The Horticultural Trades Association (HTA) |
| Derek McCann | Food and Environment Research Agency (Fera) |
| Dr Peter Savill | British & Irish Hardwood Trust |
| Gary Battell | Woodland Advisory Officer – Suffolk County Council |
| Gary Kerr | FC Alice Holt |
| Gavin Fry | PH Inspector |
| Geraint Richards | Duchy of Cornwall |
| John Clegg | John Clegg & Co. |
| Hugh Clayden | FCS Sustainable Forest Management Policy Advisor |
| Hugh Evans | FC Head of Forest Research in Wales |
| Iain Wright | National Trust |
| Ian Sanders | Food and Environment Research Agency (Fera) |
| John Deakin | The Crown Estate, Windsor: Chief Forester |
| John Jackson | Royal Forestry Society |
| John Morgan | FC Head of Plant Health |
| Jonathan Spencer | FCE Senior Ecologist |
| Karen Russell | Lockhart-Garratt |
| Kelly Noviss | Bartlett Tree Experts |
| Mick Biddle | FC South West England |
| Mike Seville | Forestry & Woodland Adviser for the CLA |
| Nigel Straw | FC Alice Holt |
| Philip Roger | Pryor & Rickett Silviculture |
| Ralph Parks | Consultant Ecologist |
| Roger Coppock | FC Head of Specialist Advisors |
| Stewart Snape | FC Deputy Head of Plant Health |
| Shireen Chambers | ICF Executive Director |
| Wilma Harper | FC Head of Corporate and Forestry Support |
| Kath Tubby | FC Alice Holt |
| Chris Jones | FC Research Liaison Officer |
| Mark Townsend | Consultant Ecologist |
| David Edwards | Tilhill |
| Chris Bradley | FC Graduate Development Support Officer CFS |
| Ted Green | Consultant to the Crown Estate |