



Draft Framework for Guidelines

- **Rationale for the guidance – biofuels introducing new invasive species risk to the region, likely to get worse with 2nd Gen, needs intervention asap**
- **Links between IS and biodiversity**
- **Recognise opportunities**

- **“Alien Alert”?**



Draft Framework for Guidelines

- **Common misconceptions and facts related to invasive species**
- **Examples of invasion and the causes historically - sisal Prosopis, ricinus, palm oil, black wattle in SA**



CONTEXT AND FOCUS OF GUIDELINES

- We recognise other issues that may impact on the risks of invasive species such as tenure, GHG, rural development prioritisation of biofuels, access to energy in rural areas etc... *however, this paper will focus on the specific linkages between commercial scale biofuel developments and invasive species risks especially in the Eastern and Southern African Region, which are already apparent and likely to be exacerbated in the near future.*
- Taxonomy



TARGET AUDIENCE

- **Clarify the target audience – RSB and its Principles & Criteria and therefore the Investors, Producers, Suppliers and Governments that are members of the RSB**



Guidance of possible intervention points along the biofuels supply chain from 1–4

- **1. Feedstock selection and development, and feasibility assessments**
- Ideally national govts should conduct a full SEA
- alongside an EIA funded by the developer
- but as a minimum conduct a strategic selection of the feedstock species and a WRA to identify the potential threat of invasion by the feedstock being considered.
- Include the possible costs of invasion into cost-benefit analysis



2. Importation of feedstocks and propagules

- Compliance by the importer with all national regulations relating to introduction of live plants or propagules, risk assessments and quarantine – implementation issues with existing legislation
- Box on how assessments should be based on ecosystems rather than national boundaries e.g. Australia. With COMESA the risk is likely to increase
- Recommend development of industry-led self compliance for the benefit of industry! Potential for future certification (RSB?)



3. Feedstock Production

EMP should include:

- Creation of a contingency plan and fund (funds should be external – held by govt) Requirement for insurance? Deposits for production licenses?
- Development and implementation of a monitoring system that checks for escapes
- Includes best practices for risk reduction e.g. biological control agents
- EMP should be audited by a third party
- EIA requirements and agricultural regulations need to incorporate IS issues
- Trade regulations



Best practices (examples) will vary..

- Biological control
- Fencing, weeding
- Sterile varieties
- Pre fruit/seed harvesting
- IPM best practices



4. Transportation

- Clarify that this includes all risks related to invasion once the feedstock has left the field
- Containment of propagules on site
- Recommend that ideally there should be on-site conversion to an inert tradeable product (if not the finished tradeable fuel) – Outline environmental and economic benefits of this
- Awareness of transporters in relation to propagules



Further guidance

- **Finally – Summarise the limitations and challenges to the successful implementation of our guidance and recommendations, focusing on regional context.**
- **Awareness raising**
- Money/Funding
- Capacity building – identify key centres?
- In order to put in place the above, there are some universal requirements such as sufficient funding mechanisms that promote the polluter pays principle?
- Possible cost-recovery options....

