

Crossing Frontiers in Tackling Pathways of Biological Invasions

FRANZ ESSL, SVEN BACHER, TIM M. BLACKBURN, OLAF BOOY, GIUSEPPE BRUNDU, SARAH BRUNEL, ANA-CRISTINA CARDOSO, RENÉ ESCHEN, BELINDA GALLARDO, BELLA GALIL, EMILI GARCÍA-BERTHOU, PIERO GENOVESI, QUENTIN GROOM, COLIN HARROWER, PHILIP E. HULME, STELIOS KATSANEVAKIS, MARC KENIS, INGOLF KÜHN, SABRINA KUMSCHICK, ANGELIKI F. MARTINO, WOLFGANG NENTWIG, COLETTE O'FLYNN, SHYAMA PAGAD, JAN PERGL, PETR PYŠEK, WOLFGANG RABITSCH, DAVID M. RICHARDSON, ALAIN ROQUES, HELEN E. ROY, RICCARDO SCALERA, STEFAN SCHINDLER, HANNO SEEBENS, SONIA VANDERHOEVEN, MONTSERRAT VILÀ, JOHN R. U. WILSON, ARGYRO ZENETOS, AND JONATHAN M. JESCHKE

Substantial progress has been made in understanding how pathways underlie and mediate biological invasions. However, key features of their role in invasions remain poorly understood, available knowledge is widely scattered, and major frontiers in research and management are insufficiently characterized. We review the state of the art, highlight recent advances, identify pitfalls and constraints, and discuss major challenges in four broad fields of pathway research and management: pathway classification, application of pathway information, management response, and management impact. We present approaches to describe and quantify pathway attributes (e.g., spatiotemporal changes, proxies of introduction effort, environmental and socioeconomic contexts) and how they interact with species traits and regional characteristics. We also provide recommendations for a research agenda with particular focus on emerging (or neglected) research questions and present new analytical tools in the context of pathway research and management.

Keywords: alien species, impact, management, propagule pressure, temporal trends

Invasions of alien species begin with the human-assisted movement of living individuals or propagules across biogeographic barriers (Blackburn et al. 2011). The accelerating worldwide movement of people and goods is driving the increasing rate at which biological invasions are occurring (e.g., Essl et al. 2011, Seebens et al. 2013). As a result, the contributions of specific pathways (i.e., “any means that allows the entry or spread of” an alien species into a region; FAO 2007) to introduction and subsequent invasion—and the changes in the importance of pathways over time—are receiving increasing attention from scientists and policymakers (e.g., EC 2011, CBD 2014). Information on pathways is fundamental to alien-species risk assessments, management, monitoring, and surveillance (e.g., Clout and Williams 2009, Simberloff and Rejmanek 2011). For example, prevention strategies that consider pathways together with protocols focused on individual taxa are essential for reducing the arrival of new and damaging species in a particular region (e.g., Keller et al. 2009). To aid these efforts, a standardized pathway terminology and classification has been proposed (Hulme et al. 2008), and additional work has contributed to a better understanding of socioeconomic and other factors that affect the dissemination of propagules to and within new regions (Wilson et al. 2009).

Despite recent advances in the understanding of pathways, key features of their role in invasions remain poorly understood, available knowledge is widely scattered, and major frontiers in research and management are insufficiently characterized. However, the urgency of implementing improved policies calls for the re-evaluation of strengths and gaps in current approaches. Here, we address four key issues concerning research and management of introduction pathways: pathway classification, application of pathway information, management response, and management impact (tables 1, 2). For each issue, we outline priorities for research and their implications for policy, and we focus on factors that affect the likelihood of entry and spread of alien species in a region.

Pathway classification

Here, we outline features which are crucial for advancing alien species pathway classification.

Apply consistent pathway classification, hierarchy, and terminology. An invasion pathway includes both the vector that carries an organism and the route along which it travels (Carlton and Ruiz

Table 1. A simplified illustration of the consecutive stages that connect research on pathways with options for management.

	Purpose	Research Priorities	Recommendation
Pathway classification	Providing principles and definitions	Apply consistent pathways classification, hierarchy, and terminology	Use six categories (release, escape, contaminant, stowaway, corridor, unaided) at a broad level, and refine these using a hierarchical classification
		Account for uncertainties in pathway assessment	Develop a pathway manual for interpreting pathways and communicating uncertainty (cf. USDA 2000)
		Quantify spatiotemporal changes of pathways	Integrate historic and current proxies for quantifying introduction effort and spatiotemporal changes in pathway analyses (cf. appendix S4, S5)
		Develop minimum harmonization standards	Develop and test a common standard on pathways between existing alien-species databases to ensure interoperability (e.g., the GIASI Partnership pathway scheme) and structured ontologies
Pathway information application	Linking pathways with real-world data	Expand the taxonomic, environmental, and geographic coverage of pathway assessments	Identify gaps in coverage of alien-species databases (cf. figure 3) and direct resources to close them
		Account for the interaction of species traits and ecology with pathway features	Develop next-generation alien-species databases that integrate data from different domains (i.e., species, source region, and native region attributes)
		Account for the interaction of environmental, socioeconomic, and management factors with pathways	Move toward a quantitative classification of pathways and analyze the interaction of species, pathway, and region attributes

Note: Shown are the priority research questions and recommendations that are addressed in the main text.

2005). The multitude of potential pathways clustered within broad transport or commerce categories (Lodge et al. 2006) has galvanized considerable effort to classify and aggregate them. One approach has been to look at the dispersal events themselves, defining events in terms of the consequences for the organisms moved (see supplemental appendix S1). This can provide useful insights, such as highlighting differences between historical natural dispersal and human-mediated dispersal (Wilson et al. 2009), but it is often hard to translate such insights into management action. The other main approach is to focus on how pathways can be regulated and managed to enhance the prevention of invasions. Most basically, pathways can be distinguished either by whether they are deliberate (intentional) or accidental (unintentional) or in terms of the introduction mechanism: (a) the importation of a commodity, (b) the arrival of a transport vector, or (c) the natural spread from a region where the species is itself alien. These mechanisms can be divided into five pathways of introduction (*release, escape, contaminant, stowaway, and corridor*), and an additional category (*unaided*) to describe the natural spread of a species after its initial introduction into another territory (Hulme et al. 2008).

These six categories defined by Hulme and colleagues (2008) have been further modified and developed into a hierarchical pathway classification, which was adopted by the Convention on Biological Diversity (supplemental appendix S2; CBD 2014). This scheme was developed within the framework of the Global Invasive Alien

Species Information Partnership (GIASIPartnership, <http://giasipartnership.myspecies.info/>), tested using major global (Global Invasive Species Database, GISD), regional (Europe: Delivering Alien Invasive Species Inventories for Europe, DAISIE) and national (Great Britain: Great Britain's Non-Native Species Information Portal, GBNN SIP) databases. Pathway terminology has historically varied between alien-species databases (supplemental appendix S3), restricting comparisons across alien-species data repositories (CBD 2014). The new scheme aims to address this. When compared, 99% of GISD data, 79% of DAISIE data, and 81% of GBNN SIP data directly matched with the available categories of the pathway scheme. However, the pathway assignments that did not map directly onto the pathway scheme required additional interpretation, and in some cases, the pathway terms within DAISIE and GBNN SIP spanned more than one term within the proposed scheme. Mapping pathways revealed that the relevance of pathways is scale dependent. For instance, although *escape* is a dominant pathway at all scales, *transport contaminant* is more important at smaller (national, European) scales than on the global scale. The *unaided* pathway poses particular problems. In particular, dispersal barriers are species specific, because alien species with poor dispersal abilities may not be able to overcome obstacles such as large rivers and mountain ranges, which do not act as barriers for good dispersers. Therefore, we propose limiting the application of this pathway to the spread from adjacent regions (countries or else states or provinces

Table 2. A simplified illustration of key aspects of pathway management.

	Purpose	Management Priorities	Recommendation
Management response	Reducing the invasion risks of pathways	Consider pathways in alien-species risk assessments	Develop prevention strategies that consider pathways (e.g., pathway–commodity–import risk assessments) and, where appropriate, protocols focused on individual alien species
		Consider the wider context when regulating pathways	Take into account the socioeconomic factors that create, define, and mediate the introduction and dispersal of alien species
		Identify gaps in pathway management	Use new data (e.g., inspection data, next-generation databases) and techniques (e.g., network analyses, horizon scanning, geographic profiling) to identify current and emerging major pathways and source regions
		Evaluate the effectiveness of different policy instruments (voluntary versus binding ones)	Improve inspection and interception data collection methodology (cf. AQIM standard), expand it to priority pathways and commodities not yet covered, and make these data available for analyses
Management impact	Measuring the effectiveness of management and policy	Design and apply pathway indicators	Develop and apply pathway indicators on the basis of standardized data
		Provide data for assessing the effectiveness of alien-species pathway policy	Ensure that standardized data are collected and reported when introducing new pathway regulations (e.g., legislations, codes of conduct)
		Monitor alien-species policy and management impact on pathways	Provide assessments of pathway policies that allow for a review of the impact of their implementation

Note: Shown are the priority management questions and recommendations that are addressed in the main text.

of large countries) and in the absence of evidence of human assistance.

Of course, the level of detail required in pathway classification will depend on the management goal. For instance, a pest-risk assessor may need quite detailed knowledge of the pathway attributes of an individual commodity, including the region of origin of the commodity, the potential level of infestation, the volume of potentially infested material imported, and the maximum pest limit (the minimum number of individuals that could lead to establishment). The European Emergency Measure to ban the import of maple (*Acer*) plants (commodity) from China (origin) for several years provides an example of this approach (EC 2010). On the basis of the demonstrated risk associated with *Acer* imported from China (Van der Gaag et al. 2008), exporters were obliged to implement measures to prevent the contamination of transported *Acer* plants by the citrus longhorned beetle (*Anoplophora chinensis*). In contrast, quarantine officers inspecting goods at national borders require sufficient information to prioritize search efforts across commodities.

In summary, a hierarchical system of pathways that integrates higher-level categories valuable for regulatory purposes (e.g., Hulme et al. 2008) with more detailed subcategories that may be more applicable to specific management (Lodge et al. 2006) seems to best serve the general purposes of inspection, regulation, decisionmaking, and responsible behavior (appendix S2).

Account for uncertainties in pathway assessment, and develop minimum harmonization standards. Assigning the entry or spread of alien species to specific pathways is subject to uncertainty;

this is most problematic when introductions are unintentional and pathways may therefore be less well documented (e.g., contaminant, stowaway). For example, alien species in canals that connect previously isolated water catchments may travel as stowaways either outside (hull fouling) or inside (ballast water) ships, or may use the canal as a corridor and travel on their own. Similarly, for alien species that are mostly introduced accidentally, such as terrestrial and marine invertebrates or pathogens, the exact pathway responsible for a particular introduction is usually unknown. In most alien-species databases, these species are assigned post hoc by the assessor to the most likely introduction pathway or pathways, often more on the basis of assumptions of the assessor or from inference on the basis of a species' ecology than on hard evidence. It would be desirable to make such uncertainties transparent by providing an estimate of the uncertainty attached to the pathway assignment (e.g., Kenis et al. 2007, Bacon et al. 2012, Liebhold et al. 2012). In addition, vague or overlapping delineations of pathways may increase these uncertainties or introduce errors (USDA 2000). It is vital that pathways are defined so that different assessors apply them consistently. This can be achieved by providing guidelines on the delineation and interpretation of pathways (e.g., as a pathway manual; USDA 2000).

Quantify spatiotemporal changes of pathways. Spatiotemporal changes in pathways mean that the absolute number of species introduced via them changes over time, as do the proportions introduced among pathways (Hulme et al. 2008, Wilson et al. 2009, Liebhold et al. 2012). These fluctuations in the importance of pathways in space and time result from

complex interactions between the environment and socioeconomic factors (e.g., economic conditions, technology, consumer behavior, fashion, management interventions), traits of the species, the region of origin, and recipient regions (e.g., cultural and sociopolitical ties between regions, means and routes of transport; supplemental appendix S4; Kraus 2009, Katsanevakis et al. 2013, Hulme 2014, Lenda et al. 2014). They imply that a given pathway may exhibit substantial temporal, geographic, and taxonomic variation in importance (figure 1) and undergo substantial changes in key attributes; it may therefore differ in importance for the introduction of species that vary in functional traits or regions of origin.

Understanding the spatiotemporal variation in the importance of different pathways requires detailed information on the early stages of invasions (*sensu* Blackburn et al. 2011), because studies based on established or invasive alien species alone can give a biased view of the processes at work (e.g., Cassey et al. 2004). Because bird introductions were historically well documented, they provide a useful example of the value of information on introduction pathways. Bird translocations accelerated rapidly after 1860 with the foundation of the first acclimatization societies (Blackburn et al. 2015). The changing drivers of translocation have had knock-on effects on the characteristics of species moved and therefore also on the characteristics of species introduced, the likelihood of establishment (Blackburn et al. 2009), and the global biogeography of birds.

Application of pathway information

In this section, we summarize the status quo of pathway information and outline priorities for expanding it.

Expand the taxonomic, environmental, and geographic coverage of pathway assessments. To identify gaps in the taxonomic, geographic, and environmental coverage of pathways in alien-species data repositories, we compiled a list of 238 alien-species databases ranging from the subnational (e.g., islands, federal states) to the global. In total, 196 of these databases were still available online in August 2014 (appendix S3). The geographic coverage of the databases was uneven, with 16 databases having a global coverage; among the others, North America ($n = 78$) and Europe ($n = 75$) were most often (entirely or partly) covered, whereas Australia ($n = 15$), Asia ($n = 10$), South America ($n = 8$), and Africa ($n = 7$) were comparatively less so (figure 2c).

We found that, across environmental realms, a similar proportion (40%–60%) of these databases provided information on introduction pathways for the majority of species included (figure 2a). However, only 20% (terrestrial) to 36% (marine) of the databases consistently provided the rather basic distinction of intentional versus unintentional introduction. The number and delineation of pathways varied considerably among databases, with a peak of 6–10 pathway categories for all environments (figure 2b). In particular, there are only a few large-scale data sets that


collated introduction pathways for many species in a standardized way. GISD has a global scope and uses a standardized pathway classification, but it covers a lower number of species (approximately 2500 species) than does DAISIE, the European inventory of alien species, which covers more than 12,000 species and in which pathways are recorded in a standardized way for approximately 6500 species (DAISIE 2014).

Finally, we note a paucity of detailed information on pathways in alien-species databases. Supporting information on definitions for interpreting pathways was missing in 79% (marine) to 92% (terrestrial) of the databases included, and an assessment on temporal trends in pathways was missing in 95% (marine) to 97% (terrestrial) of the databases (figure 2a). Furthermore, information on species for which multiple pathways are relevant was often poorly captured, particularly with respect to the importance of each pathway.


Analyze and predict trends in pathways. Currently, many pathway studies do little more than describe the diverse routes by which alien species may have been introduced into a region. A major challenge to a predictive approach to invasion pathways is the quantitative assessment of the risk they pose in introducing or spreading harmful alien species (Pyšek et al. 2011). Ideally, several key variables would be needed to provide a more quantitative assessment of pathway risk (Hulme 2009): (a) the strength of association between species and commodity–vector–corridor at the point of export; (b) the volume of the commodity–vector–corridor imported; (c) the frequency of importation; (d) species survivorship and population growth during transport/storage; (e) the suitability of the environment for species establishment in the importing region (e.g., climate matching); (f) the appropriateness of the time of year of importation for species establishment; (g) the ease of species detection within consignments–vectors–corridors; (h) the effectiveness of management measures (e.g., fumigation, inspection regime); (i) how widely the commodity–vector is subsequently distributed in the importing region; and (j) the likelihood of transfer from the commodity–vector–corridor to a suitable habitat. Such parameters are known for very few species and only for quite specific pathways (Hulme 2014). If each species transported along a particular pathway has variable parameter values, scaling up pathways to address invasion patterns at the regional level becomes increasingly difficult. Consequently, much of the prediction of pathway risk relies on proxies for propagule pressure, which may include coarse trade data on transport routes, commodity imports (e.g., the volume of agricultural products imported), the volume of specific commodities (e.g., nursery stock), or other measures of introduction effort (e.g., area planted).

Recent advances in satellite imagery and geographic information systems, together with improved availability of socioeconomic data, have allowed for the development of global-scale proxies of invasion pathways, such as proximity to transport routes, bilateral trade, population density, and

a Marine species



b Freshwater species



c Terrestrial arthropods




Figure 1. Geographic, taxonomic, and temporal variation in the importance of the main pathways of introduction for alien (a) marine species, (b) freshwater species, or (c) terrestrial arthropods in Europe. The size of the pie charts indicates the approximate numbers of alien species per recipient country of first introduction. Species of European origin have been counted in the country of first introduction in their alien range. Species with unknown pathways were not included in the pie charts but were included in the bar charts (European total). Outermost regions were excluded. For clarity, data are not shown for countries with very low numbers of first introductions. A few species that were linked to more than one pathway were given a value of 1 per k for each of the k-associated pathways so that the overall contribution of each species to the pie charts was always 1. Temporal trends of new introductions (the right panels) are given as black lines (the right axes). The pathway “Suez Canal” (a) refers to Red Sea species that moved unaided into the Mediterranean via the Suez Canal. Data on pathways and countries of first introduction were retrieved from the European Alien Species Information Network (EASIN; Katsanevakis et al. 2012).




Figure 2. Pathways as implemented in major alien-species databases (see appendix S3 for databases included). (a) The numbers of databases for different environments (terrestrial, marine, and freshwater; N = 182) and the proportions that contain species information on introduction pathways, provide guidance on pathway classification by a manual, and provide information on spatiotemporal changes of pathways. (b) The number of pathway categories in databases (n = 51) concerning different environments. (c) The geographic coverage (continents) of the databases and pathway assessments (n = 196).

human influence on ecosystems (supplemental appendix S5). Using such proxies, several studies have contributed to the quantification of pathways. For instance, a recent study demonstrated that the inclusion of proxies of propagule pressure in habitat-suitability models increased predictive accuracy by 20% (Gallardo and Aldridge 2013). Using global shipping data, Seebens and colleagues (2013) analyzed the role of global ship traffic on marine invasions and found that most introduced species originate from sites of intermediate geographic distances to destination ports. Helmus and colleagues (2014) showed that the distribution of alien lizards (*Anolis* spp.) on Caribbean islands depends on the degree of the economic isolation of these islands.

These findings suggest that carefully chosen and validated proxies of invasion pathways may provide a good reference to the likelihood of establishment and should be routinely integrated into predictive frameworks to inform geographically targeted policies for preventing and managing invasions. If this is not done, we might underestimate the species and areas with the highest invasion risk (Gallardo and Aldridge 2013). However, such quantification of the importance of specific pathways requires detailed data, which are not always available, especially for species that are introduced accidentally. Moreover, multiple introduction events, possibly through different pathways and from different locations, may complicate these predictions because of new genetic combinations that may arise from intraspecific hybridization (genetic “admixture”), as illustrated by

invasive populations of the Harlequin ladybird (*Harmonia axyridis*) in Europe (Lombaert et al. 2010).

Account for the interaction of pathways with the impacts of invasions. Pathways of introduction are related to the impacts of invasions in two ways. First, the number of individuals of a species transported and successfully introduced through a pathway will directly influence the impact associated with this pathway (Wilson et al. 2009). It is foreseeable that pathways carrying high quantities of alien species are more likely to introduce alien species that become established than pathways that carry low quantities (Lockwood et al. 2009). For example, if most alien plant pests and pathogens presently arrive through the live plant trade, it is because this trade has increased dramatically in recent years and because entire plants are able to carry high numbers of hidden pests and pathogens (Brasier 2008, Liebhold et al. 2012). Second, the impact of a pathway results from the impact of the individual alien species introduced by this pathway. Continuing with the plant-pests example, wood and especially wooden packaging materials are responsible for the introduction of a few but very damaging wood-boring insects; in North America, these have an even higher impact on woody plants than the more numerous sap feeders and defoliators that are typically introduced by live plants (Aukema et al. 2011).

Interactions between pathways and the impacts of invasions are correlative rather than causative. Nevertheless, a better understanding of these interactions is essential




Figure 3. The role of bilateral trade in explaining biological invasions. (a) Temporal trends (1950–2009) of total import volume of continents, which can be used as a proxy for propagule pressure of alien species. (b, d) The environment–trade niche (i.e., the histogram of trade volumes exchanged between countries as a function of annual average temperature and precipitation differences, respectively) shows that most goods are exchanged between countries of similar annual mean temperature and precipitation. In fact, 50% of the world trade volume (marked by the gray area) was exchanged during 2005 between countries with low differences in temperature (less than 5 degrees Celsius) and differences in precipitation (less than 300 millimeters). To analyze temporal changes of environment–trade niche widths, a normal distribution was fitted to the histogram of import volumes between countries at least 1000 kilometers apart from each other (the red line) and the standard deviation (σ) was extracted. (c, e) The temporal trends of σ during 1948–2009 show distinct and nonlinear changes of the niche widths. This indicates that the environmental similarity between countries of highest exchanged trade volumes changed continuously during the last decades. There is a temporal trend toward higher temperature similarity between countries. The 95% confidence intervals (the shaded areas) were calculated by repeating the calculation of σ 1000 times, with a subset of 10% of all country–country pairs. Abbreviations: mm, millimeters; °C, degrees Celsius.

because it informs management and regulation by providing a focus on the most threatening pathways and by preventing the emergence of new high-risk pathways. So far, the relationship between pathways and impacts—or traits related to impact—has been poorly studied. The examples mentioned above and others (e.g., García-Berthou et al. 2005, van Wilgen et al. 2010, Evans et al. 2014) concern single taxonomic or functional groups of invaders. Cross-taxon analyses relating pathways and impact per se are much more complicated because they require reliable methods of comparing impact levels across taxa. Such methods have been developed recently (e.g., Nentwig et al. 2010, Blackburn et al. 2014) but await validation at a large scale before they can be used reliably as tools for comparing impacts and pathways among taxa and environments. Furthermore, to develop preventive measures focusing on pathway management, assessments must consider not only broad pathway categories but also specific vectors (e.g., commodities) and the ways that particular sectors or enterprises mediate dissemination within regions following introduction. In other words, although it is interesting to know that the live plant trade is an increasingly important vector of introduction

for plant pests (Brasier 2008, Liebhold et al. 2012), from a management perspective, it is more important to know which commodities from which regions provide the highest risks. Pathway–commodity–import risk assessments are increasingly being carried out, but their adoption strongly varies among sectors and, within sectors, among regions. Even in the well-regulated plant-health sector, variations are substantial: Some countries implement a commodity risk assessment for all new importations (commodity \times origin), whereas others still base their plant-health regulation on species-based pest risk assessments, applying commodity risk assessments on a casual basis.

Account for the interaction of environmental, socioeconomic, and management factors with pathways. Many socioeconomic changes affect pathways (appendix S1). Global trade is steadily increasing, and so is the general likelihood of new introductions worldwide (figure 3a). However, trade routes are dynamic, and the transport of commodities from different regions of the world can result in very different pathway risks (Bacon et al. 2012). For example, imports of maize from the United States resulted in the establishment of the

western corn rootworm (*Diabrotica virgifera*) in Europe (Miller et al. 2005), but imports from Argentina are free from this pest because the species is not established there. Changes in attributes of pathways (appendix S1), trade agreements (or bans), trade regulations (e.g., border inspections), and consumer perceptions also contribute to shifts in the importance of pathways. For instance, most bilateral trade routes connect locations with similar climates: 50% of the world trade volume was exchanged during 2005 between countries with small differences in annual mean temperature (changes in temperature of less than 5 degrees Celsius) and precipitation (changes in precipitation of less than 300 millimeters; figure 3b, 3d). In the last 60 years, the average difference in annual mean temperatures between the largest trading partners (exchanging 50% of the world trade volume) decreased (figure 3c), raising the likelihood that alien species find suitable climatic conditions in the recipient country. For mean annual precipitation, the pattern strongly fluctuates without any clear trend (figure 3e).

Environmental changes can affect pathways directly, allowing faster transport of commodities and the connection of previously unconnected locations. A notable example is the melting of Arctic sea ice that has opened a cold-water trade route between Atlantic and Pacific ports, fostering the exchange of cold-adapted marine species between oceans that have been biogeographically separated for the last 2 million years. The new Arctic trade routes are expected to result in a large wave of new invasions to boreal and polar regions (Miller and Ruiz 2014). Environmental changes can also indirectly affect the relative importance of existing pathways (e.g., by changing land use), which in turn affects sensitivity to new invaders and opens new pathways for exporting pests.

Environmental and socioeconomic changes may also act in concert. For example, the Suez Canal is the primary route of introduction of alien species into the Mediterranean. The movement of species through this canal has been facilitated by a combination of factors, primarily by the periodic enlargement of the canal, which, by the midtwentieth century, had eliminated the salinity barrier posed by the Bitter Lakes that, for nearly a century, had limited the natural spread of alien species (Katsanevakis et al. 2013, Galil et al. 2014). Likewise, the doubling of the capacity of the Panama Canal (creating a new traffic lane and allowing more and bigger ships to transit), scheduled for completion in 2016, has important implications for the transfer and establishment of alien species (Galil et al. 2014, Muirhead et al. 2015).

Management response: Pathway-specific policy and enforcement

The importance of managing pathways as part of any strategy to reduce the escalation of biological invasions is widely acknowledged (e.g., Pyšek and Richardson 2010). Pathway management has been incorporated into the Aichi targets of the CBD, which have been widely adopted, for example, by the European Union in its EU Biodiversity Strategy 2020

(EC 2011). Pathway-specific policies most commonly have been implemented by animal and plant health authorities, primarily to reduce the damage caused by pests and diseases to livestock, aquaculture, fisheries, forestry, crops, and plants for planting. Most pathway policies in this area relate to pest and disease contaminants of specific imported commodities (CBD 2014), although there has been a recent push to tackle other pathway types, such as the import of timber packaging (FAO 2009) and stowaways in containers (FAO 2010).

There are relatively few comprehensive pathway-focused policies at the international and regional level to reduce impacts on the wider environment and biodiversity (Hulme et al. 2008). Even at the national level, only a handful of countries have implemented introduction pathway policies comprehensively, with most others either having no or piecemeal policies (e.g., EC 2013). Although animal and plant health policies are focused largely on contaminants, the range of pathways that introduce species harmful to biodiversity is broader, with escapes being the most common (CBD 2014). The policies that do exist are usually related to the release and escape pathways: In the European Union, for example, most member states have some provisions prohibiting the deliberate release of nonnative species: 12 have import restrictions covering between 1 and 136 species, and 13 have restrictions on holding and keeping alien species (EC 2013).

Where international and regional pathway policies have been introduced for alien species outside of plant and animal health regimes, they are commonly based on voluntary codes and agreements (e.g., Simons and DePoorter 2009, CBD 2014), the effectiveness of which may not be particularly high (Hulme 2011). An important exception, once it comes into power, will be the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, which seeks to reduce the impacts of marine invasive alien stowaways by regulating the treatment of ballast water. However, despite work beginning in 1992, the convention was adopted only in 2004 and remains yet unratified (IMO 2014). These delays reflect the difficulty and complexity of implementing international, legally binding pathway policies. Nonetheless, the ballast water convention is one of the most substantial measures introduced to regulate an introduction pathway on environmental grounds.

The European Union has adopted a new regulation to address the gaps in alien-species legislation for the region (EU 2014). It includes extensive provisions to prevent the keeping, sale, and transport of specific species, suggesting a focus on the regulation of intentional release and escape pathways. Provision for unintentional pathways is less prescriptive, with general requirements to prioritize pathways and develop pathway action plans, with particular reference to voluntary actions and codes of good practice. Clearly, the near-abolition of border inspections between EU countries will be a major challenge for regulating these pathways. Nevertheless, the regulation will represent a significant

improvement in the coordination, implementation, and consistency of pathway management across the European Union. It is designed to complement plant and animal health regulations, including the aquaculture regulation (Council 2007), and it is important that it will be integrated with existing pathway management mechanisms in these areas where appropriate.

Management impact: Are policy and management responses addressing pathways effective in reducing alien-species accumulation?

Policies for pathway management aim to reduce the rates of establishment of alien species (and ultimately impacts). Although it has been shown that strengthening alien-species policies does provide net socioeconomic benefits (Keller et al. 2007), it has proven difficult to demonstrate a direct link between a specific management implementation and subsequent changes in establishment rates (e.g., Fowler et al. 2007, Bacon et al. 2012, Liebhold et al. 2012). The reasons for this include the lack of baseline data on species introductions prior to the implementation of the measures and the gradual application of measures, in particular in the case of international treaties, which make before–after comparisons difficult. An example of gradual application is the national regulations on aquaculture that were enforced, on the basis of agreed Codes of Conduct (e.g., ICES 2005), prior to acceptance of the EU Regulation concerning the use of alien and locally absent species in aquaculture (Council 2007). The apparent lack of evidence for the effectiveness of pathway management could also be attributed to the seemingly weak signal of impact of the new measures or regulations against the rapid increase in trade and transport volume, which is a major reason for the increasing number of alien species establishing.

Aquaculture has been a marine pathway for which important management measures have been taken (Council 2007). Although the trend of new introductions by all other main marine pathways has been increasing, the incidence of new aquaculture-related introductions in Europe has clearly declined, suggesting the effectiveness of management measures (Katsanevakis et al. 2013). A few studies have also addressed the effect of regulation-driven changes in establishments through terrestrial pathways, including the reduced establishment rates for forest pests after the Plant Protection Acts were enacted in the United States and Canada in the twentieth century (Roques 2010) and the adoption of International Phytosanitary Standard 15 on the treatment of wooden packaging material (Haack et al. 2014). However, border inspection and interception data, on which some of these studies are based, are only available for the few countries that keep detailed interception records, and these rarely cover the period prior to the policy change. Indeed, most inspection methods and interception data do not allow for thorough analysis (e.g., Bacon et al. 2012, Liebhold et al. 2012). Key reasons for the nonsuitability of interception data are the unequal sample

sizes, nonrandom sampling, and the failure to record the inspections where no incursions were detected. Improved inspection data collection is therefore vital, and one example of appropriate inspection methodology and data collection is the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection Monitoring program (AQIM) in the United States (Liebhold et al. 2012). In this program, which only applies to selected pathways and commodities, samples are taken at random from all consignments during the sampling period, and sampling is based on hypergeometric statistics. Compliant (uncontaminated) consignments are also recorded. The adoption of similar inspection and recording protocols by other countries—in particular several years prior to legislative changes—would facilitate analysis of the policy’s impact.

Finally, to understand how many prohibited items enter a country, “blitzes” have proven effective. These are brief 100% inspections of selected pathways, introduction hubs, or high-risk commodities. This approach has already been successfully used several times. For instance, 100% of the baggage of 16,997 passengers on 153 incoming flights to Los Angeles from high-risk countries were inspected within one week in May 1990 (OTA 1993). In this case, it could be demonstrated that substantial illegal imports of fruits, vegetables, and animal products occurred. Blitzes can also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of new regulations.

The way forward: Emerging research questions and new approaches

In this section, we highlight fields and tools which deserve particular consideration to improve alien species pathway science.

New data sources. A new generation of alien-species databases that integrate data from different domains is currently being developed for several major taxonomic groups (e.g., birds, vascular plants). These databases are rich sources for pathway-related studies. They offer information on alien-species introduction (e.g., years of first records, pathways), distribution (e.g., invasion status, abundance, regions of origin), and ecology (e.g., traits) together with environmental (e.g., climate) and socioeconomic data (e.g., proxies for human disturbance and propagule pressure; appendix S1) of the regions considered.

For vascular plants, the recently developed Global Naturalized Alien Flora database, which currently covers more than 10,000 alien species in more than 500 regions of the world, has been combined with data on the global bilateral trade network to analyze the global flow of alien species, changes over time, and likely future trajectories.

For birds, Dyer and Blackburn (unpublished) have compiled a spatially and temporally explicit database on the distributions of 973 alien bird species (including more than 400 species that have established apparently viable populations) called the Global Avian Invasions Atlas (GAVIA; Blackburn et al. 2015). GAVIA more than doubles the number of known introduced bird species, relative to the

previous best information, and increases the number of established species known by a similar proportion. Analyses of these new data will allow ongoing spatiotemporal changes in pathways to be explored further, which will in turn direct future research and policy priorities. For example, evidence of a shift in the geographical focus of the bird trade from Eurocentric acclimatization and trade to East Asian pet markets suggests that it is important to study the drivers of Eastern markets (e.g., Su et al. 2014).

Biological invasions are not a new phenomenon, and there are many historical examples that are well documented in the literature, often in great detail. Text mining of this corpus has the potential to rediscover and quantify historic vectors, pathways, and trends. Historical information was, for instance, used to determine the alien status and the causes and pathways of introductions of fish and crayfish species that had been thought to be native before (Clavero and Villero 2014). Studies of modern invasions often miss the whole time course, and it is only possible to understand the process by looking back in time. Text mining has only just become possible since the establishment of large digital repositories of literature, such as the Biodiversity Heritage Library (www.biodiversitylibrary.org), and interest in this approach is now increasing rapidly (e.g., Vellend et al. 2013).

New techniques and analyses

Here, we highlight the potential of promising new tools for pathway science and management.

Spatiotemporal changes in pathways and other covariates of invasions. To the best of our knowledge, little work has been done on the relationship between invasion pathways and other important covariates of invasions and on how these interactions change over time and in different regions. For instance, it is likely that the traits of species introduced have changed over time and across pathways (Blackburn et al. 2009). Therefore, ornamental plants differ in their suite of traits from plants introduced for other reasons, but fashions in ornamentals (e.g., specific characteristics desired in gardens) change over time. Large data sets on species traits (e.g., the TRY database for vascular plants; Kattge et al. 2011) are increasingly becoming available and are fundamental for understanding such changes and their consequences in terms of introduction risk. Because of the expected differences in life-history traits across pathways and the different timing of the importance of pathways, species are likely to differ in the area they occupy in their new range.

Network analysis of pathways. Pathways rarely involve the simple movement of propagules from point A to point B. More commonly, they are a complex web composed of a variety of actors performing as hubs and nodes in the network (Seebens et al. 2013). Knowledge of these networks is essential to discover the choke points where control can be targeted cost effectively (Kölzsch and Blasius 2011).

The use of network modeling is established in the field of epidemiology (Harwood et al. 2009). Diffusion models of the migration of plants and animals have been widely used to investigate the movements of alien species within the landscape, but such models ignore the long-distance dispersal often associated with the introduction of alien species. Therefore, these models are not always appropriate when considering movements through a trade network (Hastings et al. 2005). The connectivity between nodes is as much related to their transport links and cultural ties as they are to their physical proximity (Helmus et al. 2014).

Identifying future changes of pathways: Horizon scanning. Horizon scanning is the systematic examination of potential threats and opportunities within a given context (Sutherland et al. 2011) to prioritize the threat posed by potential new alien species in a region. This is an essential tool for anticipating which alien species are likely to cause future problems so that preventative action can be taken. Horizon scanning has historically focused on species, but attention could be given to pathways or species–pathways interactions. The methods employed for horizon scanning have generally combined extensive literature reviews—to ascertain species of concern—and some form of risk assessment. Roy and colleagues (2014) deployed a method for horizon scanning to create an ordered list of alien species that are likely to arrive, establish, and have an impact on biodiversity within Britain over the next ten years. The species which was ranked in first place by the authors—the quagga mussel (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*)—was found within the first year after the horizon scanning effort had been completed. Information on origins and pathways of arrival for the species was collated within this horizon-scanning approach and could be used for underpinning and prioritizing management for pathways of arrival. Indeed, Roy and colleagues (2014) predicted that the stowaway pathway (in land, air, or sea transport vehicles) is likely to be the most common mechanism of introduction but recognized that multiple pathways of introduction are anticipated for many species.

Alongside systematic methods for gathering and reviewing information (e.g., literature reviews and risk assessments), consensus methods provide robust and repeatable means of collaborative decisionmaking, leading to prioritization (Sutherland et al. 2011). The breadth of expertise required to implement horizon scanning should not be underestimated. Identifying emerging pathways requires multidisciplinary collaboration, combining expertise on socioeconomic perspectives alongside consideration of detailed invasion biology.

Geographic profiling. Geographic profiling is a statistical tool originating from criminology (Le Comber and Stevenson 2012, Stevenson et al. 2012). Using spatial (or preferably even spatiotemporal) data on invasions, it is possible to locate the source of a disease outbreak or an alien species of unknown origin. To do so, this method uses two

complementary concepts: a distance–decay function (invasions are less likely further away from a source) and a buffer-zone function. The buffer zone originally described the area surrounding the anchor point (e.g., residence) of a criminal, because it was believed that criminals would perform fewer crimes on their own doorsteps because of an increased risk of being recognized. In the biological context, the buffer zone may represent an area less suitable for the growth and reproduction of offspring in the immediate vicinity of a parent individual (e.g., because of competition or allelopathy), although all of these elements can be switched on or off in the models. Once the source of an invasion is located, this can facilitate (a) identifying the pathway that led to it and (b) better-targeted management actions.

Conclusions

The future of a progressive pathway classification to inform alien-species prevention will need to move away from qualitative classification toward quantitative approaches (Leung et al. 2012). Ideally, such a characterization of pathways should (a) identify causal chains between a putative pathway and levels of invasion in the region of interest; (b) assess the diversity, abundance, and survivorship of already introduced and potential new alien species along the pathway; (c) describe spatial (in terms of the suitability of different origins), taxonomic, and temporal (in terms of the rate and magnitude of potential introductions) variation in pathway risk; (d) describe the past and likely future magnitude of the impact caused by the invasions enabled by the specific pathways; and (e) present means for assessing and regulating the problems posed by the pathway.

The pivotal need for cross-sectoral and international cooperation in conjunction with the large and increasing number of alien-species data repositories (figure 2) has increased the need for defining and implementing minimum pathway standards (Ojaveer et al. 2014). Currently, data incompatibility is a frequent limitation to interoperability between databases, effectively blocking the automated aggregation of data and limiting the federation of services. This lack of harmony arises both intentionally, because of the specific research requirements, and unintentionally, because of either a lack of communication of standards or competition between standards. It would be desirable, for example, if the recently developed and tested GLASIPartnership pathway scheme would become a pathway standard, as also recommended by the CBD.

Within any framework, classifying invasion pathways is a multilayered task. An overly simplified standardization forces complex data into broad categories; therefore, many important details can be lost. In contrast, complicated standards lose the advantages of cross-compatibility. A solution that is rapidly gaining favor in many disciplines is the development of hierarchical domain ontologies. Such ontologies provide a means for creating a structured, controlled vocabulary for a domain. This is an area for future research on invasion pathways.

In this article, we have focused on factors affecting the likelihood of entry of alien species in a region. However, effective management also demands a wider consideration of pathways, including the elucidation of the many socioeconomic and other factors that create, define, and mediate the dimensions of particular pathways (Hulme 2015). Further consideration of such wider contexts of pathways is important for improving the effectiveness of management.

Acknowledgments

This manuscript is a joint effort of Working Group 2 within the COST Action TD1209 “Alien Challenge.” FE acknowledges support from the Austrian Climate Research Program (Project no. KR11AC0K00355 “Spec-Adapt”) and from the ERA-Net BiodivERsA (project WhoIsNext), with the national funder Austrian Science Foundation FWF. HS acknowledges support by the German VW-Foundation, and JMJ acknowledges support from the ERA-Net BiodivERsA (project FFII), with the national funder German Research Foundation DFG (JE 288/7-1). JMJ was additionally supported by the DFG project JE 288/9-1. SK, DMR, and JRW acknowledge support from the DST-NRF Centre of Excellence for Invasion Biology and the Working for Water programme through their collaborative initiative Integrated management of invasive alien species in South Africa. SK additionally acknowledges the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation and the Drakenstein Trust. HER acknowledges support from the Natural Environment Research Council, the Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs, and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee. MK and RE thank the Swiss Secretariat for Science, Education, and Research. JP and PP were supported by long-term research development project RVO 67985939 (The Czech Academy of Sciences) and projects no. 14-36079G, Centre of Excellence PLADIAS, and no. P504/11/1028 (from the Czech Science Foundation). PP acknowledges support by a Praemium Academiae award from The Czech Academy of Sciences. MV and BG acknowledge support from the Severo Ochoa Program for Centres of Excellence in R+D+I (SEV-2012-0262). The comments of the three anonymous reviewers are highly appreciated.

Supplemental material

The supplemental material is available online at <http://bioscience.oxfordjournals.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1093/biosci/biv082/-/DC1>.

References cited

- Aukema JE, et al. 2011. Economic impacts of non-native forest insects in the continental United States. *PLOS ONE* 6 (art. e24587).
- Bacon SJ, Bacher S, Aebi A. 2012. Gaps in border controls are related to quarantine alien insect invasions in Europe. *PLOS ONE* 7 (art. e47689).
- Blackburn TM, Lockwood JL, Cassey P. 2009. *Avian Invasions: The Ecology and Evolution of Exotic Birds*. Oxford University Press.
- Blackburn TM, Pyšek P, Bacher S, Carlton JT, Duncan RP, Jarošík V, Wilson JRU, Richardson DM. 2011. A proposed unified framework for biological invasions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 26: 333–339.

- Blackburn TM, et al. 2014. Towards a unified classification of alien species based on the magnitude of their environmental impacts. *PLOS Biology* 12 (art. e1001850).
- Blackburn TM, Dyer E, Su S, Cassey P. 2015. Long after the event, or four things we (should) know about bird invasions. *Journal of Ornithology*. doi:10.1007/s10336-015-1155-z
- Brasier CM. 2008. The biosecurity threat to the UK and global environment from international trade in plants. *Plant Pathology* 57: 792–808.
- Carlton JT, Ruiz GM. 2005. Vector science and integrated vector management in bioinvasion ecology: Conceptual frameworks. Pages 36–54 in Mooney HA, Mack R, McNeely JA, Neville LE, Schei PJ, Waage JK eds. *Invasive Alien Species: A New Synthesis*. Island Press.
- Cassey P, Blackburn TM, Jones KE, Lockwood JL. 2004. Mistakes in the analysis of exotic species establishment: Source pool designation and correlates of introduction success among parrots (Psittaciformes) of the world. *Journal of Biogeography* 31: 277–284.
- [CBD] Convention on Biological Diversity. 2014. Pathways of Introduction of Invasive Species, Their Prioritization, and Management. CBD. (5 May 2014; www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-18/official/sbstta-18-09-add1-en.pdf)
- Clavero M, Villero D. 2014. Historical ecology and invasion biology: Long-term distribution changes of introduced freshwater species. *BioScience* 64: 145–153.
- Clout MN, Williams PA, eds. 2009. *Invasive species management: A handbook of principles and techniques*. Oxford University Press.
- [Council] Council of the European Union. 2007. Concerning Use of Alien and Locally Absent Species in Aquaculture. Council. Council Regulation (EC) no. 708/2007. (26 May 2015; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32007R0708&from=EN>)
- [DAISIE] Delivering Alien Invasive Species Inventories for Europe. 2014. Delivering Alien Invasive Species Inventories for Europe. DAISIE. (9 June 2014; www.europe-aliens.org)
- [EC] European Commission. 2010. Commission Decision of 7 July 2010 Amending Decision 2008/840/EC as Regards Emergency Measures to Prevent the Introduction into the Union of *Anoplophora chinensis* (Forster). EC. (26 May 2015; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:174:0046:0050:EN:PDF>)
- . 2011. Our Life Insurance, Our Natural Capital: An EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. EC. (26 May 2015; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011DC0244>)
- . 2013. Impact Assessment Accompanying the Document “Proposal for a Council and European Parliament Regulation on the Prevention and Management of the Introduction and Spread of Invasive Alien Species. EC. (26 May 2015; www.parliament.bg/pub/ECD/134556SWD_2013_321_EN_DOCUMENTDETRAVAIL_f.pdf)
- Eschen R, Roques A, Santini A. 2015. Taxonomic dissimilarity in patterns of interception and establishment of alien arthropods, nematodes, and pathogens affecting woody plants in Europe. *Diversity and Distributions* 21: 36–45.
- Essl F, et al. 2011. Socioeconomic legacy yields an invasion debt. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108: 203–207.
- [EU] European Union. 2014. Regulation (EU) No 1143/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species (10 June 2015). <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1433946711511&uri=CELEX:32014R1143>)
- Evans T, Kumschick S, Dyer E, Blackburn TM. 2014. Variability of impact correlates between continents for birds: Significance for risk assessment and management. *Ecology and Evolution* 4: 2957–2967.
- [FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2007. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms. FAO. ISPM no. 5. (26 May 2015; http://agriculture.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/isp_m_05_version_2007_ang.pdf)
- . 2009. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Regulation of Wood Packaging Material in International Trade. FAO. n. 15 (26 May 2015; www.ispm15.com/IPPC%20ISPM15%20draft%20Apr%202013.pdf)
- . 2010. Minimizing Pest Movement by Sea Containers and Conveyances in International Trade. FAO. Specification no. 51. (26 May 2015; www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/20140225/1358783740_spec_51_minimizingpestmovementby_201402250918-120.94%20KB.pdf)
- Fowler AJ, Lodge DM, Hsia JE. 2007. Failure of the Lacey Act to protect US ecosystems against animal invasions. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 5: 353–359.
- Gallardo B, Aldridge DC. 2013. The “dirty dozen”: Socioeconomic factors amplify the invasion potential of 12 high-risk aquatic invasive species in Great Britain and Ireland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 757–766.
- Galil BS, et al. 2015. “Double trouble”: The expansion of the Suez Canal and marine bioinvasions in the Mediterranean Sea. *Biological Invasions* 17: 973–976. doi:10.1007/s10530-014-0778-y
- García-Berthou E, Alcaraz C, Pou-Rovira Q, Zamora L, Coenders G, Feo C. 2005. Introduction pathways and establishment rates of invasive aquatic species in Europe. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 62: 453–463.
- Haack RA, et al. 2014. Effectiveness of the International Phytosanitary Standard ISPM No. 15 on reducing wood borer infestation rates in wood packaging material entering the United States. *PLOS ONE* 9 (art. e96611).
- Harwood TD, Xub X, Pautasso M, Jeger MJ, Shaw MW. 2009. Epidemiological risk assessment using linked network and grid based modelling: *Phytophthora ramorum* and *Phytophthora kernoviae* in the UK. *Ecological Modelling* 220: 3353–3361.
- Hastings A, et al. 2005. The spatial spread of invasions: New developments in theory and evidence. *Ecology Letters* 8: 91–101.
- Helmus MR, Mahler DR, Losos JB. 2014. Island biogeography of the Anthropocene. *Nature* 513: 543–546.
- Hulme PE. 2009. Trade, transport and trouble: Managing invasive species pathways in an era of globalisation. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 46: 10–18.
- . 2011. Addressing the threat to biodiversity from botanic gardens. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 26: 168–174.
- . 2014. Resolving whether botanic gardens are on the road to conservation or a pathway for plant invasion. *Conservation Biology* 9: 816–824. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12426
- . 2015. Invasion pathways at a crossroad: Policy and research challenges for managing alien species introductions. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12470
- Hulme PE, et al. 2008. Grasping at the routes of biological invasions: A framework for integrating pathways into policy. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45: 323–341.
- [ICES] International Council for the Exploration of the Sea. 2005. Code of Practice on the Introductions and Transfers of Marine Organisms. ICES. (26 May 2015; www.ices.dk/publications/Documents/Miscellaneous%20pubs/ICES%20Code%20of%20Practice.pdf)
- [IMO] International Maritime Organization. 2014. BWM Convention and Guidelines. IMO. (27 August 2014; www.imo.org/OurWork/Environment/BallastWaterManagement/Pages/BWMConventionandGuidelines.aspx)
- Katsanevakis S, Bogucarskis K, Gatto F, Vandekerckhove J, Deriu I, Cardoso AC. 2012. Building the European Alien Species Information Network (EASIN): A novel approach for the exploration of distributed alien species data. *BioInvasions Records* 1: 235–245.
- Katsanevakis S, Zenetos A, Belchior C, Cardoso AC. 2013. Invading European seas: Assessing pathways of introduction of marine aliens. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 76: 64–74.
- Kattge J, et al. 2011. TRY: A global database of plant traits. *Global Change Biology* 17: 2905–2935.
- Keller RP, Lodge DM, Finnoff DC. 2007. Risk assessment for invasive species produces net bioeconomic benefits. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104: 203–207.
- Keller RP, zu Ermgassen PSE, Aldridge DC. 2009. Vectors and timing of freshwater invasions in Great Britain. *Conservation Biology* 23: 1526–1534.
- Kenis M, Rabitsch W, Auger-Rozenberg MA, Roques A. 2007. How can alien species inventories and interception data help us prevent insect invasions? *Bulletin of Entomological Research* 97: 489–502.

- Kölzsch A, Blasius B. 2011. Indications of marine bioinvasion from network theory. *The European Physical Journal B* 84: 1–12.
- Kraus F. 2009. *Alien Reptiles and Amphibians: A Scientific Compendium and Analysis*. Springer.
- Le Comber SC, Stevenson MD. 2012. From Jack the Ripper to epidemiology and ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27: 307–308.
- Lenda M, Skorka P, Knops JMH, Morón D, Sutherland WJ, Kuszewska K, Woyciechowski M. 2014. Effect of the Internet commerce on dispersal modes of invasive alien species. *PLOS ONE* 9 (art. e99786).
- Leung B, et al. 2012. TEASing apart alien species risk assessments: A framework for best practices. *Ecology Letters* 15: 1475–1493.
- Liebold AM, Brockerhoff EG, Garrett LJ, Parke JL, Britton KO. 2012. Live plant imports: The major pathway for forest insect and pathogen invasions of the US. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 10: 135–143.
- Lockwood JL, Cassey P, Blackburn TM. 2009. The more you introduce, the more you get: The role of colonization and propagule pressure in invasion ecology. *Diversity and Distributions* 15: 904–910.
- Lodge DM, et al. 2006. Biological invasions: Recommendations for US policy and management. *Ecological Application* 16: 2035–2054.
- Lombaert E, Guillemaud T, Cornuet JM, Malausa T, Facon B, Estoup A. 2010. Bridgehead effect in the worldwide invasion of the biocontrol Harlequin Ladybird. *PLOS ONE* 5 (art. e9743).
- Miller N, Estoup A, Toepfer S, Bourguet D, Lapchin L, Derridj S, Kim KS, Reynaud P, Furlan L, Guillemaud T. 2005. Multiple transatlantic introductions of the western corn rootworm. *Science* 310: 992–992.
- Miller W, Ruiz GM. 2014. Arctic shipping and marine invaders. *Nature Climate Change* 4: 413–416.
- Muirhead JR, Minton MS, Miller WA, Ruiz GM. 2015. Projected effects of the Panama Canal expansion on shipping traffic and biological invasions. *Diversity and Distributions* 21: 75–87.
- Nentwig W, Kühnel E, Bacher S. 2010. A generic impact-scoring system applied to alien mammals in Europe. *Conservation Biology* 24: 302–311.
- Ojaveer H, et al. 2014. Ten suggestions for advancing assessment and management of non-indigenous species in marine ecosystems. *Marine Policy* 44: 160–165.
- [OTA] Office of Technology Assessment, US Congress. 1993. *Harmful Non-Indigenous Species in the United States*. US Government Printing Office.
- Pyšek P, Richardson DM. 2010. Invasive species, environmental change and management, and health. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 35: 25–55.
- Pyšek P, Jarošík V, Pergl J. 2011. Alien plants introduced by different pathways differ in invasion success: Unintentional introductions as greater threat to natural areas? *PLOS ONE* 6 (art. e24890).
- Roques A. 2010. Alien forest insects in a warmer world and a globalised economy: Impacts of changes in trade, tourism, and climate on forest biosecurity. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* 40: 77–94.
- Roy HE, et al. 2014. Horizon scanning for invasive alien species with the potential to threaten biodiversity in Great Britain. *Global Change Biology* 20: 3859–3871.
- Seebens H, Gastner M, Blasius B. 2013. The risk of marine bioinvasion caused by global shipping. *Ecology Letters* 16: 782–790.
- Simberloff D, Rejmanek M, eds. 2011. *Encyclopedia of Biological Invasions*. University of California Press.
- Simons SA, DePoorter M, eds. 2009. *Best Practices in Pre-Import Risk Screening for Species of Live Animals in International Trade: Proceedings of an Expert Workshop on Preventing Biological Invasions*, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA, 9–11 April 2008. *Global Invasive Species Programme*. (26 May 2015; www.issg.org/pdf/publications/GISP/Resources/workshop-riskscreening-pettrade.pdf)
- Stevenson MD, Rossmo DK, Knell RJ, Le Comber SC. 2012. Geographic profiling as a novel spatial tool for targeting the control of invasive species. *Ecography* 35: 704–715.
- Su S, Cassey P, Blackburn TM. 2014. Patterns of non-randomness in the composition and characteristics of the Taiwanese bird trade. *Biological Invasions* 16: 2563–2575. doi:10.1007/s10530-014-0686-1.
- Sutherland WJ, Fleishman E, Mascia MB, Pretty J, Rudd MA. 2011. Methods for collaboratively identifying research priorities and emerging issues in science and policy. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 2: 238–247.
- [USDA] US Department of Agriculture. 2000. *Guidelines for Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessments*. USDA. (26 May 2015; www.imok.ufl.edu/hlb/database/pdf/00001375.pdf)
- Van der Gaag DJ, Ciampitti M, Cavagna B, Maspero M, Hérard F. 2008. Pest Risk Analysis: *Anoplophora chinensis*. Plant Protection Service. (26 May 2015; <http://edepot.wur.nl/117610>)
- Van Wilgen NJ, Wilson JR, Elith J, Wintle BA, Richardson DM. 2010. Alien invaders and reptile traders: What drives the live animal trade in South Africa? *Animal Conservation* 13 (Suppl. 1): 24–32.
- Vellend M, Brown CD, Kharouba HM, McCune JL, Myers-Smith IH. 2013. Historical ecology: Using unconventional data sources to test for effects of global environmental change. *American Journal of Botany* 100: 1294–1305.
- Wilson JR, Dormontt EE, Prentis PJ, Lowe AJ, Richardson DM. 2009. Something in the way you move: Dispersal pathways affect invasion success. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 24: 136–144.

Franz Essl (franz.essl@univie.ac.at) is affiliated with the Division of Conservation Biology, Vegetation, and Landscape Ecology at the University of Vienna, in Austria; with Environment Agency Austria's Department of Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, in Vienna, Austria; and with the Centre for Invasion Biology in the Department of Botany and Zoology at Stellenbosch University, in South Africa. Sven Bacher is affiliated with the Department of Biology at the University of Fribourg, in Switzerland. Tim M. Blackburn is affiliated with the Department of Genetics, Evolution, and Environment at the Centre for Biodiversity and Environment Research, in London, United Kingdom; with the Distinguished Scientist Fellowship Program, at King Saud University, in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; and with the School of Biological Sciences and the Environment Institute at The University of Adelaide, in Adelaide, Australia. Olaf Booy is affiliated with the GB Non-Native Species Secretariat of the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), in York, United Kingdom. Giuseppe Brundu is affiliated with the Department of Agriculture at the University of Sassari, in Italy. Sarah Brunel is with the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP), in Paris, France. Ana-Cristina Cardoso is affiliated with the European Commission's Joint Research Centre at the Water Resources Unit of the Institute for Environment and Sustainability, in Ispra, Italy. René Eschen and Marc Kenis are affiliated with CABI, in Delémont, Switzerland. Belinda Gallardo and Montserrat Vilà are with the Estación Biológica de Doñana (EBD, CSIC), in Sevilla, Spain. Bella Galil is with the National Institute of Oceanography, in Haifa, Israel. Emili Garcia-Berthou is affiliated with the Institute of Aquatic Ecology and the Department of Environmental Sciences at the University of Girona, in Catalonia, Spain. Piero Genovesi is affiliated with the Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA), in Italy. PG and Riccardo Scalera are affiliated with the IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG), in Rome, Italy. Quentin Groom is affiliated with the Botanic Garden Meise, in Belgium. Colin Harrower and Helen E. Roy are with the Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, in Wallingford, United Kingdom. Philip E. Hulme is with the Bio-Protection Research Centre at Lincoln University, in Christchurch, New Zealand. Stelios Katsanevakis is affiliated with the Department of Marine Sciences at the University of the Aegean, in Mytilini, Greece. Ingolf Kühn is affiliated with the Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research–UFZ, in the Department of Community Ecology, in Halle, Germany; with the Department of Geobotany and Botanical Garden at the Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg, in Halle, Germany; and with the German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, in Leipzig, Germany. Sabrina Kumschick and David M. Richardson are with the Centre for Invasion Biology in the Department of Botany and Zoology at Stellenbosch University, in South Africa. Angeliki F. Martinou is affiliated with the Department of Agricultural Sciences, Biotechnology, and Food Science at the Cyprus University of Technology. Wolfgang Nentwig is affiliated with the Institute of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Bern, in Switzerland. Colette O'Flynn is with the National Biodiversity Data Centre,

in Waterford, Ireland. Shyama Pagad is with the IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) at the University of Auckland, in New Zealand. Jan Pergl and Petr Pyšek are with the Institute of Botany at The Czech Academy of Sciences, in Průhonice, Czech Republic. PP is also affiliated with the Department of Ecology at Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic. Wolfgang Rabitsch and Stefan Schindler are with Environment Agency Austria's Department of Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, in Vienna, Austria. Alain Roques is affiliated with the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (INRA), in Orléans, France. Hanno Seebens is with the Institute for Chemistry and Biology of the Marine Environment at the University of Oldenburg, in Germany. Sonia Vanderhoeven is with the Belgian Biodiversity

Platform, in Gembloux, Belgium. John R.U. Wilson is affiliated with the Centre for Invasion Biology in the Department of Botany and Zoology at Stellenbosch University, in South Africa, and with the Invasive Species Programme at the South African National Biodiversity Institute's Kirstenbosch Research Centre, in Claremont, South Africa. Argyro Zenetos is with the Institute of Marine Biological Resources and Inland Waters at the Hellenic Center for Marine Research, in Anavyssos, Greece. Jonathan M. Jeschke is affiliated with the Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), in Berlin, Germany, and with the Institute of Biology at the Department of Biology, Chemistry, and Pharmacy at Freie Universität Berlin, in Germany.

1 Supporting Material

2 Appendix S1. Changes in major pathway attributes over time, i.e. from a pre-globalized world
 3 (< mid-20th century) to a globalized world (> mid-20th century). We highlight characteristic
 4 changes, their major implications for biological invasions, and key references.

Pathway attribute	Pre-globalized world (< mid-20 th century)	Globalized world (>mid-20 th century)	Implications	References
Velocity of transport	Low	High	Improved chances of survival for short-lived organisms; change from transport of long-lived propagules to live plants	Brasier (2008), Liebhold et al. (2012)
Geographic range covered	Regional	Global	Increased probability of introduction for species from regions previously not covered by trade or from distant regions	Keller et al. (2011), Seebens et al. (2013), Su et al. (2014)
Volume of transport	Low	High	Increased probability of introduction	Seebens et al. (2013, subm.), Bacon et al. (2012)
Microclimatic conditions during transport	Mostly uncontrolled	Often controlled (e.g. cooled)	Changed probability of survival during transport	Kobelt & Nentwig (2008)
Size of transport unit (e.g. size of ships)	Small	High	Increased probability of simultaneous introduction of many individuals / propagules	Sturtevant et al. (2007), WTO (2007), UNCTAD (2008), Dickie (2014)
Points of entry	Eurocentric trade network	Global network	Increased range of environments at the points of entry encountered → increased likelihood of establishment	Crosby (1986), WTO (2007), Hulme (2009), Keller et al.

				(2011)
Regional retailer network	Slow, decentralized retailer network	Rapid, centralized retailer network (e.g. internet commerce)	Increased spread and spatial coverage of local distribution of goods from points of entry	Lenda et al. (2014)
Goods transported	Restricted range of goods (mostly valuable, durable, small)	Wide range of goods	Increased propagule pressure for species associated with goods formerly not traded	Huang (2004), Roques & Auger-Rozenberg (2006), Dehnen-Schmutz et al. (2007)
Interactions with other features of global change (land use, climate)	Little	Frequent, mostly synergistic	Increasing likelihood of establishment and spread	Gallardo & Aldrige (2013), Vellend et al. (2013), Bacon et al. (2014)
Packaging material	Restricted amount of packaging material, small range, but high proportion, of unprocessed natural materials (e.g. hay, wood)	Wide range of packaging material, incl. new materials (e.g. plastics)	Changed (mostly increased) likelihood of introduction by packaging material	Haack et al. (2014)
Inspections and regulations	Largely absent	In part (biased)	Increased likelihood of detection of quarantine species easily to be detected	Bacon et al. (2012), Haack et al. (2014)
Legislation and Codes of Conduct	Absent	In part available, but still missing for many pathways and regions	Decreased introduction risk per unit of good transported	FAO (2007, 2009a, 2009b, 2010), Heywood & Brunel (2011), Scalera et al. (2012),

				Heywood & Sharrock (2013), Monaco et al. (2013), IMO (2014)
--	--	--	--	---

1

2 **References to Appendix S1**

3 Bacon SJ, Aebi A, Calanca P, Bacher S 2014. Quarantine arthropod invasions in Europe: the role of climate,
4 hosts and propagule pressure. *Diversity and Distributions* 20: 84-94.

5 Bacon SJ, Bacher S, Aebi A. 2012. Gaps in border controls are related to quarantine alien insect invasions in
6 Europe. *PLoS One* 7: e47689.

7 Brasier CM 2008. The biosecurity threat to the UK and global environment from international trade in plants.
8 *Plant Pathology* 57: 792–808.

9 Crosby AW 1986. *Ecological imperialism: the biological expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. Cambridge University
10 Press, Cambridge.

11 Dehnen-Schmutz K, Touza J, Perrings C, Williamson M 2007. A century of the ornamental plant trade and its
12 impact on invasion success. *Diversity and Distributions* 13: 527-534.

13 Dickie JW 2014. *REEDS 21st century ship management*. Bloomsbury, London.

14 FAO 2007. International standards for phytosanitary measures. Glossary of phytosanitary terms. ISPM No. 5.
15 http://agriculture.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/ispm_05_version_2007_ang.pdf.

16 FAO 2009a. ISPM No. 15 (as revised by CPM-8): Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade.
17 <http://www.ispm15.com/IPPC%20ISPM15%20draft%20Apr%202013.pdf>.

18 FAO 2009b. Specification 48 - International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment.
19 https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents//1357549335_Spec_48_Used_machinery_equipment.pdf.

20 FAO 2010. Specification 51 - Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international
21 trade.

22 https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/20140225/1358783740_spec_51_minimizingpestmovementby_201402250918--120.94%20KB.pdf.

1 Gallardo B Aldridge DC 2013. The ‘dirty dozen’: socio-economic factors amplify the invasion potential of 12
2 high-risk aquatic invasive species in Great Britain and Ireland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 757–766.

3 Haack RA, et al. 2014. Effectiveness of the International Phytosanitary Standard ISPM No. 15 on reducing wood
4 borer infestation rates in wood packaging material entering the United States. *PLoS One* 9: e96611.
5 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096611.

6 Heywood VH, Brunel S 2011. European Code of Conduct on Horticulture and Invasive Alien Species. Council
7 of Europe, Strasbourg, Nature and Environment 162. Council of Europe Publishing, F-67075.

8 Heywood VH, Sharrock S 2013. European Code of Conduct for Botanic Gardens on Invasive Alien Species.
9 Council of Europe, Strasbourg, Botanic Gardens Conservation International, Richmond. Council of Europe
10 Publishing, F-67075.

11 Huang SW 2004. Global trade patterns in fruits and vegetables. Agriculture and Trade Report WRS-04-06.
12 USDA, Economic Research Service.

13 Hulme PE 2009. Trade, transport and trouble: managing invasive species pathways in an era of globalization.
14 *Journal of Applied Ecology* 46: 10-18.

15 IMO 2014. Website (accessed 27/8/2014)
16 <http://www.imo.org/OurWork/Environment/BallastWaterManagement/Pages/BWMConvention.aspx>.

17 Keller RP, Drake JM, Drew MB, Lodge DM 2011. Linking environmental conditions and ship movements to
18 estimate invasive species transport across the global shipping network. *Diversity and Distributions* 17: 93-102.

19 Kobelt M, Nentwig W (2008). Alien spider introductions to Europe supported by global trade. *Diversity and*
20 *Distributions* 14: 273-280.

21 Lenda M, Skorka P, Knops JMH, Morón D, Sutherland WJ, Kuszewska K, Woyciechowski M 2014. Effect of
22 the internet commerce on dispersal modes of invasive alien species. *PLoS One* 9: e99786.
23 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099786.

24 Liebhold AM, Brockerhoff EG, Garrett LJ, Parke JL, Britton KO 2012. Live plant imports: the major pathway
25 for forest insect and pathogen invasions of the US. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 10: 135–143.

26 Monaco A, Genovesi P, Middleton A 2013. Code of Conduct on Hunting and IAS. T-PVS/Inf (2013) 20.
27 [https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2398195](https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2398195&SecMode=1&DocId=2021112&Usage=2)
28 [&SecMode=1&DocId=2021112&Usage=2](https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2398195&SecMode=1&DocId=2021112&Usage=2).

1 Roques A, Auger-Rozenberg MA 2006. Tentative analysis of the interceptions of non-indigenous organisms in
2 Europe during 1995–2004. *EPP0 Bulletin* 36: 490-496.

3 Scalera R, Genovesi P, de Man D, Klausen B, Dickie L. 2012. European Code of Conduct on Zoological
4 Gardens and Aquaria and Invasive Alien Species. T-PVS/Inf (2011) 26 revised.
5 [https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2176840](https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2176840&SecMode=1&DocId=1943806&Usage=2)
6 [&SecMode=1&DocId=1943806&Usage=2](https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2176840&SecMode=1&DocId=1943806&Usage=2).

7 Seebens H, Gastner M, Blasius B 2013. The risk of marine bioinvasion caused by global shipping. *Ecology*
8 *Letters* 16: 782–790.

9 Seebens H, Essl F, Dawson W, Fuentes N, Moser D, Pergl J, Pyšek P, van Kleunen M, Weber E, Winter M,
10 Blasius B (in review). Trade triggers trouble: globalization will accelerate plant invasions in emerging
11 economies.

12 Sturtevant R, Ricciardi A, Reid DF 2007. Great Lakes: recent history of saltwater vessel traffic, delivery of
13 ballast water, and the effect of ballast water exchange on aquatic species invasions. *NOAA Technical*
14 *Memorandum* 142, 61-82.

15 UNCTAD 2008. *Review of Maritime Transport 2008*. UNCTAD, New York and Geneva.

16 Vellend M, Brown CD, Kharouba HM, McCune JL, Myers-Smith IH 2013. Historical ecology: using
17 unconventional data sources to test for effects of global environmental change. *American Journal of Botany* 100:
18 1294–1305.

19 Ware C, Berge J, Sundet JH, Kirkpatrick JB, Coutts ADM, Jelmert A, Olsen SM, Floerl O, Wisz MS, Alsos IG
20 2014. Climate change, non-indigenous species and shipping: assessing the risk of species introduction to a high-
21 Arctic archipelago. *Diversity and Distributions* 20: 10–19.

22 WTO 2007. *World Trade Report 2007: six decades of multilateral trade cooperation: What have we Learnt?*
23 Geneva.

1 **Appendix S2.** Categorization of pathways for the introduction of alien species developed
2 through the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership (GIASIPartnership) in
3 recognition of the need for free and open access to standardized invasive alien species and
4 pathway information globally. This pathway classification has recently been adopted by the
5 CBD (<http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-18/official/sbstta-18-09-add1-en.pdf>;
6 Decision XII/17 CBD COP12).

Category	Subcategory
RELEASE IN NATURE (1)	Biological control
	Erosion control/ dune stabilization (windbreaks, hedges...)
	Fishery in the wild
	Hunting in the wild
	Landscape/flora/fauna improvement
	Conservation introduction
	Release in nature for use (other than above, e.g. medical use, fur..)
	Other Intentional release
ESCAPE FROM CONFINEMENT (2)	Agriculture (including biofuel feedstosks)
	Aquaculture/mariculture
	Botanical garden/zoo/aquaria (excluding domestic aquaria)
	Farmed animals
	Forestry
	Fur farms
	Horticulture
	Ornamental purpose other than horticulture
	Pet/aquarium/terrarium species
	Research (in facilities)
	Live food and live bait
	Other escape from confinement
	TRANSPORT – CONTAMINANT (3)
Contaminated bait	
Food contaminant	
Contaminant on animals (except species transported by host/vector)	
Contaminant on plants (except species transported by host/vector)	
Parasites on animals	
Parasites on plants	
Seed contaminant	

	Timber trade
	Transportation of habitat material (soil, vegetation...)
TRANSPORT – STOWAWAY (4)	Angling/fishing aquaculture equipment
	Container/bulk
	Hitchhikers in or on plane
	Hitchhikers on ship/boat
	Machinery/equipment
	People and their luggages/equipment
	Ship/boat ballast water
	Ship/boat hull fouling
	Vehicles (car, trains...)
	Other means of transport
CORRIDOR (5)	Interconnected waterways/basins/seas
	Tunnels and land bridges
UNWAIDED (6)	Natural dispersal across borders of alien species that have been introduced through pathways 1 to 5

1

2 Notes:

3 (1) **Release** in nature refers to the intentional introduction of live alien organisms for the
4 purpose of human use in the natural environment. Examples include for biological
5 control, erosion control (and dune stabilization), for fishing or hunting in the wild;
6 hunting in the wild; landscape “improvement” and introduction of threatened
7 organisms for conservation purposes.

8 (2) **Escape** refers to the movement of (potentially) invasive alien species from
9 confinement (e.g.: in zoos, aquaria, botanic gardens; agriculture, horticulture,
10 aquaculture and mariculture facilities; scientific research or breeding programmes; or
11 from keeping as pets) into the natural environment. Through this pathway the
12 organisms were initially purposefully imported or otherwise introduced into the
13 confined conditions, but then escaped from such confinement, unintentionally. This
14 may include accidental or irresponsible release of live organisms from confinement.

15 (3) Transport – **Contaminant** refers to the unintentional movement of live organisms as
16 contaminants of commodity that are intentionally transferred through international
17 trade, development assistance, emergency relief. This includes, in contaminants,
18 including pests and diseases, of food, seeds, timber and other products of agriculture,
19 forestry, and fisheries.

20 *Related to a transport Vector:*

21 (4) Transport – **Stowaway** refers to the moving of live organisms attached to transporting
22 vessels and associated equipment and media. The physical means of Transport-
23 stowaway include various conveyances, ballast water and sediments, bio-fouling of
24 ships, boats, offshore oil and gas platforms and other water vessels, dredging, angling

1 or fishing equipment, civil aviation, sea and air containers. Stowaways of any other
2 vehicles and equipment for human activities, in military activities, emergency relief,
3 aid and response, international development assistance, waste dispersal, recreational
4 boating, tourism (e.g. tourists and their luggage) are also included under this pathway.

5 **Dispersal mechanism**

6 (5) **Corridor** refers to movement of alien organisms into a new region following the
7 construction of transport infrastructures in whose absence spread would not have been
8 possible. Such trans-biogeographical corridors include international canals
9 (connecting river catchments and seas) and trans-boundary tunnels linking mountain
10 valleys or oceanic islands.

11 **Unaided** refers to the secondary *natural* dispersal of invasive alien species that have been
12 introduced by means of any of the foregoing pathways.

13
14 The standard categorization has been produced based on relevant literature (e.g. Molnar et al.
15 2008, Hulme et al., 2008, Panov et al., 2009, Wilson et al., 2008) and on main online
16 databases (IUCN SSC Global Invasive Species Database, CABI Invasive Species
17 Compendium, DAISIE). It has been tested for consistency with international instruments and
18 programs (decisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, recommendations and
19 International Standard Phytosanitary Measures). The categorization has been presented to the
20 Convention on Biological Diversity with a note by the Executive Secretary of the Convention
21 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/sbstta/sbstta-18/official/sbstta-18-09-add1-en.pdf>). With
22 decision XII/17 the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity calls
23 Member States to make use of the categorization for their prioritization and management of
24 pathways.

26 **References**

27 Molnar JL, Gamboa RL, Revenga C, Spalding MD 2008. Assessing the global threat of
28 invasive species to marine biodiversity. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6: 485–
29 492.

30 Hulme PE, et al. 2008. Grasping at the routes of biological invasions: a framework for
31 integrating pathways into policy. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45: 323–341.

32 Panov VE, et al. 2009. Assessing the risks of aquatic species invasions via European inland
33 waterways: from concepts to environmental indicators. *Integrative Environmental*
34 *Assessment and Management* 5: 110–126.

35 Wilson JRU, Dormontt EE, Prentis PJ, Lowe AJ, Richardson DM 2009. Something in the

1 way you move: dispersal pathways affect invasion success. Trends in Ecology and
2 Evolution 24: 136–144.

3

ID	Continent	Project / Data base name	Full name	Geographic scale	Geographic coverage	Realms covered	Pathways assessed	Number of pathways differentiated	Pathways interpretation manual / description available	Pathway trends assessed	Intentionality assessed	Reference
1	Europe	DAISIE	Delivering Alien Invasive Species Inventories for Europe	regional	Europe (wider European area (up to 94 countries/regions). It covers all EU-27 states and Norway)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	15	No	No	Yes	DAISIE. (ed.), (2008) The Handbook of Alien Species in Europe, Springer-Verlag
2	Europe	NOBANIS	North European and Baltic Network on Invasive Alien Species	regional	Northern (and Central) Europe (20 countries in Northern and Central Europe: Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Faroe Islands, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, European part of Russia, Slovakia and Sweden.)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	19	No	No	Yes	Secretariat of NOBANIS (2012): Risk-mapping for 100 non-native species in Europe. Copenhagen. http://www.nobanis.org/files/Riskmapping_report.pdf
3	Europe	VECTORS	Vectors of Change in Oceans and Seas Marine Life, Impact on Economic Sectors (VECTORS)	regional	Europe	Marine	Partly	n.a.	No	No	Partly	Olenin, S., A. Narščius, D. Minchin, Matej David, B.S. Galil, Stephan Gollasch, A. Marchini, Anna Occhipinti-Ambrogi, H. Ojaveer, and Anastasija Zaiko. 2013. Making non-indigenous species information systems practical for management and useful for research: An aquatic perspective. Biological Conservation. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.07.040
4	Global	GISD	Global Invasive Species Database	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	48	No	No	Yes	Mooney HA et al. (2005) Invasive alien species: a new synthesis. Island Press.
5	Europe	PERMIT	Pathway evaluation and pest risk management in transport	regional	mainly Europe	Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	Santini et al. (2013) Biogeographical patterns and determinants of invasion by forest pathogens in Europe. New Phytologist 197, 238-250.
6	Europe	PRATIQUE	Enhancement of pest risk analyses techniques	regional	mainly Europe	Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	Partly	Baker et al. (2009). PRATIQUE: a research project to enhance pest risk analysis techniques in the European Union. EPPO Bulletin 39, 87–93
7	Europe	EASIN	European Alien Species Information Network	regional	Europe	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	8	No	No	Yes	Trombetti M, Katsanevakis S, Deriu I, Cardoso AC, 2013. EASIN-Lit: a geo-database of published alien species records. Management of Biological Invasions 4(3): 261-264.
8	Europe	ESENIAS	East and South European Network for Invasive Alien Species	regional	South and Eastern Europe (Participating countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary (invited country), Italy, Kosovo under UNSC Resolution 1244/99, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovenia (invited country), Romania and Turkey)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	Zenetos A., S. Katsanevakis, D. Poursanidis, F. Crocetta, D. Damalas, G. Apostolopoulos, C. Gravili, E. Vardala-Theodorou & M. Malaquias, 2011. Marine alien species in Greek Seas: Additions and amendments by 2010. Mediterranean Marine Science, 12, 1: 95-120.
9	Global	CABI Compendium	CABI Invasive Species Compendium	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	29	Yes	No	Yes	Pasiecznik, N.; CABI, Wallingford, UK, Pathways for plant introduction, 2004, pp unpaginated, 25 ref.
10	global	IUFRO Unit 7.03.12	IUFRO Unit on Alien Invasive Species and International Trade	global	global	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Evans HF, Oszako T (2007) Alien Invasive Species and International Trade. Forest Research Institute, Warsaw 2007. http://www.interpretscotland.org.uk/pdf/IUFRO_Jedlnia_2006.pdf/\$FILE/IUFRO_Jedlnia_2006.pdf
11	Europe	RINSE	Reducing the Impact of Non-Native Species in Europe	regional	UK, France, The Netherlands and Belgium	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	4	No	No	Yes	B. Gallardo, A. Zieritz and D. C. Aldridge (2013). 'Targeting and Prioritisation for INS in the RINSE Project Area' The RINSE Project and Cambridge Environmental Consulting Ltd. http://www.rinse-europe.eu/assets/_/files/condensed-report-final.pdf
12	Europe, Africa, Asia	EPPO	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization	regional	Europe, N-Africa, Central Asia	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	Partly	No	Journal: EPPO Bulletin https://www.eppo.int/PUBLICATIONS/bulletin/bulletin.htm
13	Europe	ISEFOR	Increasing Sustainability of European Forests	regional	Europe	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	Vannini et al. (2012) Manufactured wood trade to Europe: a potential unsuspected carrier of alien fungi. Biological Invasions 14: 1991-1997.
14	Europe	HCMR/EEA	Hellenic Centre for Marine Research Database	regional	European Seas	Marine	Yes	n.a.	n.a.	No	n.a.	Katsanevakis, S., Gatto, F., Zenetos, A., & Cardoso, A. C. (2013). How many marine aliens in Europe? Management of Biological Invasions, 4(1), 37-42 http://www.reabic.net/journals/mbi/2013/1/MBI_2013_1_Katsanevakis_et_al.pdf
15	Europe	EUROPHYT	European Union Notification System for Plant Health Interceptions	regional	Europe	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	Europhyt. (2011). European Union Notification System for Plant Health Interceptions. available from http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/europhyt/index_en.htm
16	Global	GBIF	Global Biodiversity Information Facility	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Berendsohn, Walter G., Vishwas Chavan, and James Macklin. "Summary of Recommendations of the GBIF Task Group on the Global Strategy and Action Plan for the Digitisation of Natural History Collections." Biodiversity Informatics 7.2 (2010).
17	Europe	Q-bank	Q-bank – Comprehensive Databases on Regulated Plant Pests	regional	Bulloc 2013 et al "20 countries including The Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, France, Denmark and Italy"	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Partly	Bonants, P., M. Edema, and V. Robert. "Q-bank, a database with information for identification of plant quarantine plant pest and diseases." EPPO Bulletin 43.2 (2013): 211-215.

18	Global	GAVIA	GAVIA database	global	global	n.a.	No	No	n.a.	No	Yes	n.a.
19	Global	GISIN	Global Invasive Species Information Network	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Party	n.a.	Party	Party	Party	n.a.
20	Global	IBIS	Island Biodiversity and Invasive Species Database	global	global islands	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a. [year]. Global Invasive Species Information Network, providing free and open access to invasive species data. USA. http://www.gisin.org . [Accessed dd month, year].
21	Global	DIISE	Database of Island Species Eradications	global	global islands	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Invasive Species Specialist Group –ISSG (2012) Island Biodiversity and Invasive Species Database -IBIS Version 2012.1 < http://ibis.fos.auckland.ac.nz/ > n.a.
22	Global	n.a.	Global Marine Invasive Species Assessment	global	global seas and oceans	Marine	Yes	57	Yes	Yes	Yes	Jennifer L Molnar, Rebecca L Gamboa, Carmen Revenga, Mark D Spalding. 2008. Assessing the global threat of invasive species to marine biodiversity. <i>Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment</i> . Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 485-492. - See more at: https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPractices/Marine/Pages/marineinvasives.aspx#sthash.x4UMlhr0.dpulplenty... Including: the 1988 FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 294 http://www.fao.org/docrep/X5628E/X5628E00.htm
23	Global	DIAS	FAO Database on Introductions of Aquatic Species	global	global	Freshwater, Marine	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Partly	GloBallast Monograph Series, e.g.: Identifying and Managing Risks from Organisms Carried in Ships' Ballast Water. GloBallast Monograph Series No. 21
24	Europe	GloBallast	GEF/UNDP/IMO Global Ballast Water Management Programme	global	global	n.a.	No	No	No	No	No	Freee, R. and D. Pauly. Editors. 2014. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase.org . version (04/2014).
25	Global	FishBase	FishBase – A Global Information System on Fishes	global	global	Freshwater, Marine	No	No	No	No	No	McKinney, Michael L. "Correlated non-native species richness of birds, mammals, herptiles and plants: scale effects of area, human population and native plants." <i>Biological Invasions</i> 8.3 (2006): 415-425.
26	Global	Avibase	Avibase – the world bird database	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Steves B, Fuller P, Ruiz G, & Dalton S. 2003. NISbase Distributed Invasive Species Database. http://www.nisbase.org/ . Access Date: 13-May -2014
27	Global	Nisbase	An International Nonindigenous Species Database Network	global	global seas and oceans	Marine	Party	n.a.	Party	Party	Partly	Rodall R. 2002. A global compendium of weeds. Second Edition, Publisher: Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia
28	Global	GCW	Global Compendium of Weeds	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Fuentes N, Pauchard A, Sánchez P, Esquivel J & Marticorena A. 2012. A new comprehensive database of alien plant species in Chile based on herbarium records. <i>Biological Invasions</i> . http://www.lib.udec.cl/archivos_descargas_pdf/pdf_publicaciones_2013/Fuentes%20et%20al%202013.pdf
29	South America	n.a.	Nueva base de datos de especies invasoras de Chile	national	Chile	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	www.inbiar.org.ar Invasive alien species database, I3N Argentina – Universidad Nacional del Sur, Bahía Blanca
30	South America	I3N-Argentina	I3N Invasive Species Network - National Invasive Species Database for Argentina	national	Argentina	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Visited on (DATE). n.a.
31	South America	n.a.	Brazil Survey on Invasive Alien Species	national	Brazil	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Party	n.a.	No	No	Yes	Gardener, M., Causton, C., Atkinson, R., Guézou, A. (2011). CDF Checklist of Galapagos Introduced Species - FCD Lista de especies de Especies Introducidas de Galápagos. In: Bungartz, F., Herrera, H., Jaramillo, P., Tirado, N., Jiménez-Uzcátegui, G., Ruiz, D., Guézou, A. & Ziemmeck, F. (eds.). Charles Darwin Foundation Galapagos Species Checklist - Lista de Especies de Galápagos de la Fundación Charles Darwin. Charles Darwin Foundation / Fundación Charles Darwin, Puerto Ayora, Galapagos: http://www.darwinfoundation.org/datazone/checklists/introduced-species/ Last updated 05 Jul 2011.
32	South America	n.a.	Galapagos Introduced Species Checklists	national	Galapagos (Chile)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	Partly	SARASOLA, M.M., RUSCH, V.E., SCHLICHTER, T.M., GHERSA, C.M. 2006. Invasión de coníferas forestales en áreas de estepa y bosques de ciprés de la cordillera en la Región Andino Patagónica. Asociación Argentina de Ecología. <i>Ecología Austral</i> , v.16 n. 2:143-156. http://ecologiaaustral.com.ar/index2.php?volumen=16&numero=2&pagina=143-156
33	South America, Africa, Australia (and Oceania)	SHNC	Southern Hemisphere Network on Conifer Invasions	global	Southern hemisphere	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a. http://i3n.iabin.net/fact_sheet.html
34	South America, Central America	IABIN-I3N	Inter American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN) - Invasive Species Network (I3N)	regional	"Latin America" (Argentina Bolivia Brazil Colombia Chile Costa Rica Guatemala Jamaica Paraguay Uruguay)	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
35	South America	I3N-Chile	I3N-CHILE	national	Chile	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
36	South America, Central America	InfoNatura	InfoNatura – Birds, Mammals and Amphibians of Latin America	regional	Latin America	Freshwater, Terrestrial	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
37	Asia	n.a.	Introduction to Invasive Species In China	national	China	n.a.	No	No	No	No	No	evtl.: http://www.planta.cn/forum/files_planta/1_invasive_species_in_china_an_overview_2001_716.pdf
38	Asia	n.a.	Exotic Plants Information System of China	national	China	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
39	Asia	APASD	Asia-Pacific Alien Species Database	regional	Asia-Pacific (Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam, mainland China)	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
40	Asia	n.a.	Invasive Plants Database (Japan)	national	Japan	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
41	Global	n.a.	Rod Randall's Big Weed List (Australia)	global	global	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
42	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Weeds Australia database	national	Australia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
43	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Weed Watcher (Australia)	(sub-)national	Australia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
44	Australia (and Oceania)	PlantNET	PlantNET (New South Wales, Australia)	national	Australia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
45	Australia (and Oceania)	NIMPIS	National Introduced Marine Pests Information System	national	Australia	Marine	Yes	6	Yes	No	Yes	n.a.
46	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Introduced Marine Aquatic Invaders (Australia)	national	Australia	Marine	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.

47	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Australian Government Agriculture Portal	national	Australia	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
48	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Feral.org.au (Australia/New Zealand)	national	Australia/New Zealand	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
49	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Invasive Invertebrates in Natural Ecosystems (New Zealand)	national	New Zealand	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
50	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	New Zealand Weeds Database	national	New Zealand	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
51	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Weed Index (New Zealand)	(sub-)national	New Zealand	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
52	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Pest Animal Index (New Zealand)	(sub-)national	New Zealand	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
53	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Aquatic Plant Management Species Guide (New Zealand)	national	New Zealand	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	(https://fb.is.niwa.co.nz/).
54	North America	IPCAN	Invasive Plants of Canada	national	Canada	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
55	North America	n.a.	Canadian Botanical Conservation Network	national	Canada	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
56	North America	NAISD	National Alien and Invasive Species Database	national	Canada	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	Yes	n.a.
57	North America	n.a.	Nova Scotia Noxious Weeds (Canada)	(sub-)national	Canada	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
58	North America	n.a.	Ontario Noxious Weeds (Canada)	(sub-)national	Canada	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
59	North America	n.a.	Inventory of Canadian Agricultural Weeds	national	Canada	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
60	North America	CIPM	CIPM Noxious Weeds Database (U.S. and Canada)	regional	USA & Canada	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
61	North America	n.a.	Invasive Species in Canada (Wildlife Federation Canada)	national	Canada	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	8	Yes	No	Yes	n.a.
62	North America	n.a.	Invasive Plant Program (Min. Forests / Canada)	national	Canada	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
63	North America	n.a.	NatureServe Explorer (USA & Canada)	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
64	Global	n.a.	Discover Life Global Mapper	global	global	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
65	Africa	n.a.	Forest Invasive Species Network for Africa (FISNA)	regional	Africa	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
66	Africa	n.a.	Swaziland's Alien Plants Database	national	Swaziland	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	e.g. Braun K. P. et al. Swaziland Flora Checklist (in press); detailed locality information: PRECIS, SDNH, Dr J.P. Roux, K.P. Braun Deall G. Maguga Checklist
67	Africa	WIP	Weeds and Invasive Plants (South Africa)	national	South Africa	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	e.g. Henderson, L. & Cilliers, C.J. 2002. Invasive aquatic plants. Plant Protection Research Institute Handbook No. 16, Agricultural Research Council, Pretoria.
68	Central America	CONABIO	Invasive species of Mexico	national	Mexico	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Conabio, 2014. system information on invasive species in Mexico . National Commission for the Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity. Date of access. URL: http://www.biodiversidad.gob.mx/invasoras
69	Central America	n.a.	Weeds of Mexico / Malezas de Mexico	national	Mexico	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
70	Australia (and Oceania)	n.a.	Pacific Islands Alien Snake Database	regional	Pacific Islands	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	http://www.archiveteam.org/index.php?title=NBII
71	Europe	Nisbase	Nonindigenous Species Database Network (SERC)	national	Portugal	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	different, depends on species
72	North America	NBII-NRIN	Yellowstone National Park Invasive Species (NBII-NRIN)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
73	North America	n.a.	INVADERS Database (Northwestern U.S.)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
74	Australia (and Oceania)	USGS	Alien Species in Hawaii	regional	Pacific Islands	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
75	North America	n.a.	Exotic Forest Pest Information System for North America (Forest Commission)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
76	North America	Bugguide	North American Non-Indigenous Arthropod Database (NANIAD) (USDA-APHIS)	regional	North America	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
77	North America	n.a.	Federal Noxious Weeds Database (USDA-APHIS)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
78	North America	n.a.	APHIS Regulated Pest List (USDA-APHIS)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
79	North America	Pest Tracker	PestTracker (NAPIS USDA-APHIS)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
80	North America	IPPPRA	Identified Plant Pests Regulated by APHIS (IPPPRA) (USDA)	national	USA	n.a.	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
81	North America	n.a.	Federal and State Noxious Weeds in GRIN (USDA)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
82	North America	TEAM	Leafy Spurge (USDA)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
83	North America	GPDD	Global Pest and Disease Database (USDA / PPQ) (restricted access)	national	USA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
84	North America	NISIC	Invasive Species Information Center (USDA)	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
85	North America	PMIS	Noxious & Nuisance Plant Management Information System (USArmy Corp)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
86	North America	APIRS	Aquatic, Wetland & Invasive Plant Information Retrieval System	regional	n.a.	Freshwater	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
87	North America	WeedUS Plant List	Database of Plants Invading Natural Areas in the U.S. (PCA-APWG)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
88	North America	Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council Invasive Plant Lists	Exotic Plant Database (Florida)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	FLEPPC, 2013. List of Invasive Plant Species. Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council. http://www.fleppc.org/list/list.htm
89	North America	FISF base	Floristic Inventory of South Florida Database Online	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
90	North America	n.a.	Florida's Exotic and Invasive Species	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.

91	North America	Cal-IPC	California Invasive Plant Council	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	http://www.cal-ipc.org/resources/booksanddocs/weedcontrol.php
92	North America	n.a.	California EncycloWeedia	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
93	North America	SWEPIC	Southwest Exotic Plant Information Clearinghouse (USGS)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
94	North America	SWEMP	Southwest Exotic Mapping Program (USGS)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
95	North America	IPANE	Invasive Plant Atlas of New England (New England)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
96	North America	AKEPIC	Alaska Exotic Plant Mapping Project (Alaska)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	AKEPIC (Year). Alaska Exotic Plant Information Clearinghouse database (http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/maps/akepic/). Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska, Anchorage. Accessed (Month, Date, Year).
97	North America	n.a.	Invasive Plants (Alaska)	(sub-)national	USA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
98	North America	MDA Noxious & Invasive Weed Program	Minnesota Weed Biocontrol Project (Minnesota)	(sub-)national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
99	North America	CIPM	Center for Invasive Plant Management	(sub-)national	USA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
100	North America	n.a.	Halting the Invasion: State Tools for Invasive Species Management (USA)	national	USA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
101	North America	EFPIISNA	Exotic Forest Pest Information System for North America (Forest Com)	national	USA	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	Anonymous. (1997). Exotic Forest Pest List Project, Implementation Plan. North American Forestry Commission, Insect and Disease Study Group. September 1997.
102	North America	BLM	BLM Weeds Web site	national	USA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
103	North America	n.a.	InvasivePlants.net	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
104	North America	N.J. Weed Gallery	N.J. (New Jersey Agricultural) Weed Gallery	national	USA	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	Partly	No	No	n.a.
105	North America	n.a.	Weed Identification Resources (Iowa)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
106	North America	n.a.	Noxious Weeds and Non-Native Plants (Colorado)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Partly	several, depends on species
107	North America	n.a.	Noxious Weed Lists and Monitor List (Washington State)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	Partly	n.a.
108	North America	n.a.	Invasive Species of Concern in Maryland	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
109	North America	n.a.	Idaho's Noxious Weeds	national	USA	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
110	North America	n.a.	Weed Identification Guide (Virginia Tech.)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
111	North America	n.a.	Weed Identification (Univ. Illinois)	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
112	North America	n.a.	Weeds of lawns, yards, & flowerbeds in Mississippi	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
113	North America	n.a.	Invasive Species in Wisconsin	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
114	North America	n.a.	Common Weeds of No-Till Cropping Systems	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
115	North America	n.a.	Invasive Species Monitoring Resources	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
116	North America	n.a.	Electro. Data Info. Source on Insects, Plant Diseases, Pesticides & Weeds	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
117	North America	n.a.	Stevens County Noxious Weed List	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
118	North America	n.a.	Pest Plants of Hawaiian Natural Ecosystems	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
119	North America	n.a.	WeedAlert.com Turf Weed Control	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
120	North America	n.a.	The Bugwood Network: GiST	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
121	North America	n.a.	Native Gardening and Invasive Plants Guide	national	USA	Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	USDA Plant Database
122	North America	n.a.	Catalog of Invasive Plant Species of the United States	national	USA	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
123	North America	n.a.	Texas Invasives Plant Database	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
124	North America	DIAS	Database on Introductions of Aquatic Species (FAO)	global	global	Freshwater, Marine	Yes	18	No	No	No	n.a.
125	North America	NANSC	National Aquatic Nuisance Species Clearing House (USA)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Marine	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
126	North America	NEMESIS	National Exotic Marine & Estuarine Species Information System (SERC)	national	USA	Marine	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	Fofonoff PW, Ruiz GM, Steves B, & Carlton JT. 2014. National Exotic Marine and Estuarine Species Information System. http://invasions.si.edu/nemesis/ . Access Date: 11-Oct -2014
127	North America	NBIC	National Ballast Water Information Clearinghouse (SERC)	national	USA	Marine	No	No	No	No	No	National Ballast Information Clearinghouse 2014. NBIC Online Database. Electronic publication, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center & United States Coast Guard. Available from http://invasions.si.edu/nbic/search.html ; searched 11-October-2014
128	North America	NOAA	Sea Grant Nonindigenous Species	national	USA	Freshwater	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
129	North America	n.a.	Washington's Freshwater Aquatic Plants Database (Washington state)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
130	North America	n.a.	Aquatic Nuisance Species (Washington State)	national	USA	Freshwater	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
131	North America	NAS Database	Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database (USGS)	national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	Different for each fact sheet
132	North America	n.a.	Aquatic Nuisance Species Program (South Carolina)	(sub-)national	USA	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	8	Yes	No	Yes	several/amongst others: USGS web site located at http://nas.er.usgs.gov/Geological Survey . Retrieved 13 February 2003 from http://nas.er.usgs.gov/mollusks/docs/co_flumi.html .
133	North America	n.a.	Exotic Species of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	national	USA	Marine	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
134	North America	n.a.	Aquatic Plant Fact Sheets (Aquatic Plant Management Society)	national	USA	Marine	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
135	North America	n.a.	Introduced and Cryptogrenic Species of Massachusetts (maps)	regional	USA	Marine	Yes	3	Yes	No	Yes	Several: http://massbay.mit.edu/exoticspecies/links.html
136	North America	n.a.	Invasive Species (Minnesota)	national	USA	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
137	Europe	n.a.	AT	national	Austria	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	ESSL, F. & RABITSCH, W. (2002): Neobiota in Österreich. Umweltbundesamt, Wien, 432 pp.

138	Europe	n.a.	Invasive species in Belgium	national	Belgium	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	http://ias.biodiversity.be/meetings/200603_sos_invasions/doc/SOS_Invasions_docs_-_Recommendations_en.pdf
139	Europe	n.a.	Lijst niet-inheemse soorten Belgisch deel Noordzee en aanpalende estuaria	national	Belgium	Marine	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	
140	Europe	n.a.	Baltic Sea Alien Species Database	regional	Baltic Sea	Marine	Yes	4	Yes	No	Yes	Baltic Sea Alien Species Database, 2007. Olenin S, Daunys D, Leppakoski E, Zaiko A (editors). Retrieved: November 15, 2007, from <a assets="" content="" de="" documents="" href="http://www.corpi.ku.lt/nemo/Archavaleta, M., S. Rodríguez, M. Zurita & A. García (Coord.) 2010. Lista de especies silvestres de Canarias (hongos, plantas y animales terrestres) 2009. Gobierno de Canarias. 579 pp. Kuraskin, L.S. and N.A. Pochtoeva. 1998. Effect of natural and anthropogenic factors on the reproduction of biological resources (Caspian seal). P.p. 98-107. In: Scientific principles of sustainable fisheries and regional distribution of commercial species of the Caspian Sea (ed. V.N. Belyaeva, V.P. Ivanov, V.K. Zilanov). Moscow. VNIRO Press (in Russian). Weber et al. (2005) Schlüssel zur Einteilung von Neophyten in der Schweiz in die Schwarze Liste oder die Watch-Liste. Bot. Helv. v. 115: 169–194 http://www.infoflora.ch/de/assets/content/documents/neophyten/neophyten_diverses/neophyten_schluesel_BH.pdf
141	Europe	n.a.	Especies introducidas en Canarias	national	Canary Islands (Spain)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	
142	Europe, Asia	CASP-SEA	Caspian Environment	regional	Caspian	Marine	No	No	No	No	No	
143	Europe	n.a.	Info Flora	national	Switzerland	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	
144	Europe, Africa, Asia	CIESM	CIESM Atlas of Exotic Species in the Mediterranean	regional	Mediterranean Sea	Marine	Partly	n.a.	No	No	No	Galil B.S., 2008. Alien species in the Mediterranean Sea - which, when, where, why ? Challenges to marine ecosystems. <i>Hydrobiologia</i> , 606: 105-116.
145	Europe	DE-AQ	Aquatic alien species in Germanys Inland and coastal waters	national	Germany	Freshwater, Marine	Yes	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nehring, S. (2000): Neozoen im Makrozoobenthos der deutschen Ostseeküste. - <i>Lauterbornia</i> 39: 117-126.
146	Europe	DK	Invasive arter i Danmark	national	Denmark	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
147	Europe	EE	Võõrliikide Andemebaas	national	Estonia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
148	Europe	ELNAIS	Ellenic Network on Aquatic Invasive Species	national	Greece	Freshwater, Marine	No	No	No	No	No	Zenetos A., S. Katsanevakis, D. Poursanidis, F. Crocetta, D. Damalas, G. Apostolopoulos, C. Gravili, E. Vardala-Theodorou & M. Malaquias, 2011. Marine alien species in Greek Seas: Additions and amendments by 2010. <i>Mediterranean Marine Science</i> , 12, 1: 95-120.
149	Europe	INVASIBER	Especies exóticas invasoras de la península Ibérica	national	Spain (incl. Portugal??)	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	Gatto, Francesca, et al. "Evaluation of Online Information Sources on Alien Species in Europe: The Need of Harmonization and Integration." <i>Environmental management</i> 51.6 (2013): 1137-1146.
150	Europe	n.a.	National Invasive Species Database	national	Ireland	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	O'Flynn, C., Kelly, J. and Lysaght, L. (2014). Ireland's invasive and non-native species – trends in introductions. National Biodiversity Data Centre Series No. 2. Ireland National Biodiversity Data Centre. Series Editor: Dr Liam Lysaght © National Biodiversity Data Centre 2014 ISSN 2009-6844 (Print) ISSN 2009-6852 (Online)
151	Europe	n.a.	Species.ie	national	Ireland	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	n.a.	n.a.	No	No	Yes	Guiry, M.D. & Guiry, G.M. 2014.Species.ie version 1.0 World-wide electronic publication, National University of Ireland, Galway. http://www.species.ie ; searched on 11 October 2014.
152	Europe	n.a.	Flora of Iceland	national	Iceland	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	eventually: http://www.floraislands.is/Ritgerdir/blomarit.html FOr more info on icelands IA plant species (but probably unrelated to the database) see: Pawel Wasowicz, Ewa Maria Przedpelska-Wasowicz, Hörður Kristinnsson. Alien vascular plants in Iceland: Diversity, spatial patterns, temporal trends, and the impact of climate change, <i>Flora - Morphology, Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants</i> , Volume 208, Issues 10–12, December 2013, Pages 648-673, ISSN 0367-2530, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2013.09.009 .
153	Europe	n.a.	Fish of Latvia	national	Latvia	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
154	Europe	n.a.	Neophyten in Luxemburg	national	Luxemburg	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Pfeiffenschneider, Gräser (2011). Projekt Bioinvasion. Zwischenbericht. Musee national d'histoire Naturelle. Luxembourg. http://snl.mnhn.lu/mnhnl/neophytes/neophytes_rapport_2011.pdf
155	Europe	n.a.	Nederlands Soortenregister	national	Netherlands	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Spikmans, F. 2009. Zonnebaars <i>Lepomis gibbosus</i> . Nederlands Soortenregister versie 2.0, www.nederlandsesoorten.nl [geraadpleegd op 15 mei 2009].
156	Europe	n.a.	Artsdatabanken	national	Norway	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	4	Yes	No	Yes	Gederaas, L., Moen, T.L., Skjelseth, S. & Larsen, L.-K. (eds.). Alien species in Norway – with the Norwegian Black List 2012. The Norwegian Biodiversity Information Centre, Norway
157	Europe	n.a.	Invasoras	national	Portugal	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
158	Europe	REABIC	Regional Euro-Asian Biological Invasions Centre	regional	Europe	Freshwater, Marine	Partly	20	No	No	Yes	Runs 3 journals: <i>Aquatic Invasions</i> , <i>Bioinvasions Records</i> , <i>Management of Biological Invasions</i> http://www.reabic.net/journals/Default.aspx . See also Panov, 2004, http://www.reabic.net/Publ/Panov_Springer2004.pdf Panov and Gollasch 2004 http://www.reabic.net/Publ/Panov_Gollasch_2004.pdf
159	Europe, Asia	RU-ANIMALS	BioDat Database	national	Russia	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
160	Europe, Asia	RU-PLANTS	BioDat Database	national	Russia	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
161	Europe	n.a.	Fråmmne Arter i Svenska Hav	national	Sweden	Marine	Yes	4	Yes	No	Partly	n.a.
162	Europe	NNSS	GB non-native species secretariat	national	United Kingdom	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	2	No	No	Yes	Jedes Factsheet hat eigene Quelle!
163	Europe	BRC	Biological Records Center	national	United Kingdom	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	10	Yes	No	Yes	n.a.
164	Europe	n.a.	Invasive Alien Species in Northern Ireland	national	United Kingdom	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
165	Europe	n.a.	Non-native marine species in British waters	national	United Kingdom	Marine	Yes	7	No	No	No	Non-native marine species in British waters: a review and directory, Edited by N. Clare Eno, Robin A. Clark & William G. Sanderson Joint Nature Conservation Committee Monkstone House, City Road Peterborough PE1 1JYUK. Published by JNCC, Peterborough ISBN 1 86107 442 5 © Copyright Joint Nature Conservation Committee, 1997

166	Europe, Asia, Africa	MAMIASnet	Marine Mediterranean Invasive Alien Species Database	regional	Mediterranean Sea	Marine	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
167	Europe	ATAE	Alien Terrestrial Arthropods of Europe	regional	Europe	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	Rabitsch W (2010) Pathways and vectors of alien arthropods in Europe. Chapter 3. BioRisk 4(1):27-43
168	Europe	EXP	Expert's revisor	regional	Europe	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
169	Europe	Florabank	Florabank	national	Belgium	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
170	Europe	n.a.	Waarnemingen.be, Observations.be	national	Belgium	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
171	Europe	n.a.	Module d'encodage en ligne DEMNA - OFFH	national	Belgium	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
172	Europe	FCD	Flora Croatica Database	national	Croatia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
173	Europe	n.a.	Monitoring handbook of State Institute for Nature Protection	national	Croatia	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
174	Europe	n.a.	Database of the herbarium records in collections of Czech Republic	national	Czech Republic	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
175	Europe	n.a.	Flora Database of the Czech Republic	national	Czech Republic	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
176	Europe	n.a.	State Phytosanitary Administration	national	Czech Republic	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
177	Europe	NOVANA	National monitoring programme on nature and water.	national	Denmark	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
178	Europe	n.a.	Atlas Flora Danica	national	Denmark	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
179	Europe	n.a.	"Platform invasive species"	national	Denmark	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
180	Europe	n.a.	Data bank "WAtSon"	national	Germany	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
181	Europe	n.a.	National weed survey	national	Hungary	Terrestrial	Yes	5	No	No	No	Pinke G., Karácsony P., Czúcz B. & Botta-Dukát Z. (2011): Environmental and land-use variables determining the abundance of Ambrosia artemisiifolia in arable fields in Hungary. – Preslia 83: 219–235. n.a.
182	Europe	n.a.	Hungarian Land Administration (Földhivatal)	national	Hungary	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
183	Europe	n.a.	Aerobiological Network	national	Hungary	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
184	Europe	n.a.	Compendium voor de leefomgeving	national	Netherlands	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	CBS, PBL, Wageningen UR (2013). Exoten in de Nederlandse fauna, 1900/2012 (indicator 1375, versie 02, 14 mei 2013). www.compendiumvoordeleefomgeving.nl. CBS, Den Haag; Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, Den Haag/Bilthoven en Wageningen UR, Wageningen. Different references per fact sheet
185	Europe	n.a.	Invasieve Exoten	national	Netherlands	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	11	Yes	No	Partly	n.a.
186	Europe	n.a.	Alien Plant species in Poland	national	Poland	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	n.a.
187	Europe	n.a.	Catalogues of alien plant species for Poland: implication for conservation, management and legislation	national	Poland	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
188	Europe	n.a.	Polish Biodiversity Information Network	national	Poland	n.a.	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
189	Europe	n.a.	Polish Aerobiology Network	national	Poland	Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
190	Europe	Neobiota.de	Neobiota.de	national	Germany	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	Nehring S., Kowarik I., Rabitsch W, und Essl F (Hrsg.), 2013.Naturschutzfachliche Invasivitätsbewertungen für in Deutschland wild lebende gebietsfremde Gefäßpflanzen. Bundesamt für Naturschutz, BfN-Skripten Nr. 352, Bonn. n.a.
191	Europe	n.a.	Checklist of Latvia's bird species:	national	Latvia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
192	Europe	n.a.	Alien species in Slovenia (Project Thuja 2):	national	Slovenia	Freshwater, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
193	Europe	RAFTS	Invasive Species and Biosecurity Programme	national	United Kingdom	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	No	different internet-sources: http://www.invasivespeciesscotland.org.uk/invasive-species
194	Europe	n.a.	Invasive Species Ireland	national	Ireland	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	Yes	n.a.	No	No	Yes	n.a.
195	Europe	n.a.	Lumonet - Finnish CHM of the CBD (Finland)	national	Finland	Freshwater, Marine, Terrestrial	No	No	No	No	No	n.a.
196	Europe	BIOLFLO	Vascular Plant Search and Information System (Germany)	national	Germany	Freshwater, Terrestrial	Yes	9	Yes	No	No	Klotz, S., Kühn, I. & Durka, W. [Hrsg.] (2002): BIOLFLO - Eine Datenbank zu biologisch-ökologischen Merkmalen der Gefäßpflanzen in Deutschland. - Schriftenreihe für Vegetationskunde 38. Bonn: Bundesamt für Naturschutz.

1 **Appendix S4:** Suggested relationships between attributes of species, and source- and
2 recipient-regions with different pathways (based on Hulme et al. 2008). Symbols show the
3 prevailing type of interaction of the attribute with each pathway (+ = positive interaction; / =
4 no interaction; – = negative interaction). Abbreviations: Re = release, Es = escape, Co=
5 contaminant, St = stowaway, Cr = corridor, Un = unaided.

	Species / region attributes	Re	Es	Co	St	Cr	Un	Selected references
Human factors	Attractiveness	+	+	/	/	/	/	Jeschke & Strayer (2006), Garcia-Berthou (2007), Pyšek & Richardson (2007)
	Economic importance	+	+	/	/	/	/	Levine & D'Antonio (2003), Meyerson & Mooney (2007), Westphal et al. (2008), Essl et al. (2011)
Species traits	Longevity	+	+	+	+	+	+	Cassey et al. (2004), Jeschke & Strayer (2006)
	Size	/	-	-	-	+	/	Cassey et al. (2004), Jeschke & Strayer (2006), Blanchet et al. (2010)
	Long-lived propagules	/	+	+	+	+	+	Pyšek & Richardson (2007)
Biogeography	Distance to native range	/	/	-	-	-	/	Seebens et al. (2013)
	Size of native range	/	/	+	+	+	/	Jeschke & Strayer (2006), Moodley et al. (2013)
	Abundance in native range	/	/	+	+	+	/	Jeschke & Strayer (2006)
	Association with humans in native range	+	/	+	+	+	/	Alcaraz et al. (2005), Jeschke & Strayer (2006)
Broad taxonomy	Plants	/	+	+	/	-	/	Hulme et al. (2008)
	Fungi	-	-	+	+	/	/	Palm & Rossmann (2003), Schwartz et al. (2006), Desprez-Lousteau et al. (2007)
	Animals							
	Vertebrates	+	+	-	-	/	/	Hulme et al. (2008)
	Invertebrates	-	+	+	+	+	/	Hulme et al. (2008)
	Microorganisms	-	-	+	+	/	/	Hulme et al. (2008)
Source & recipient region	Land use intensity	+	+	+	+	/	+	Vilà & Ibáñez (2011)
	Transport network	/	/	+	+	+	+	Bacon et al. (2012, 2014), Gallardo & Aldridge (2013), Gallardo (2014)
	Human population density	+	+	+	+	+	+	Garcia-Berthou et al. (2005), Pyšek et al. (2010), Gallardo & Aldridge (2013)
	Socio-economic activity	+	+	+	+	+	+	Leprieur et al. (2008), Pyšek et al. (2010), Gallardo & Aldridge (2013), Gallardo (2014)

7 **References to Appendix S4**

8 Alcaraz C, Vila-Gispert A, Garcia-Berthou E. 2005. Profiling invasive fish species: the importance of phylogeny
9 and human use. *Diversity and Distributions* 11: 289–298.

10 Bacon SJ, Aebi A, Calanca P, Bacher S 2014. Quarantine arthropod invasions in Europe: the role of climate,
11 hosts and propagule pressure. *Diversity and Distributions* 20: 84-94.

12 Bacon SJ, Bacher S, Aebi A. 2012. Gaps in border controls are related to quarantine alien insect invasions in
13 Europe. *PLoS One* 7: e47689.

14 Blanchet S, Grenouillet G, Beauchard O, Tedesco PA, Leprieur F, Dürr HH, Busson F, Oberdorff T, Brosse S.

- 1 2010. Non-native species disrupt the worldwide patterns of freshwater fish body size: implications for
2 Bergmann's rule. *Ecology Letters* 13: 421–431.
- 3 Cassey P, Blackburn TM, Jones KE, Lockwood JL 2004. Mistakes in the analysis of exotic species
4 establishment: source pool designation and correlates of introduction success among parrots (Psittaciformes) of
5 the world. *Journal of Biogeography* 31: 277–284.
- 6 Desprez-Loustau ML, Robin C, Buée M, Courtecuisse R, Garbaye J, Suffert F, Rizzo DM 2007. The fungal
7 dimension of biological invasions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 22: 472–480.
- 8 Essl F, Moser D, Dullinger S, Mang T, Hulme PE 2011. Macroecological drivers of alien conifer naturalizations
9 worldwide. *Ecography* 34: 1–9.
- 10 Gallardo B 2014. Europe's top 10 invasive species: relative importance of climatic, habitat and socio-economic
11 factors. *Ethology, Ecology and Evolution* 26: 130–151.
- 12 Gallardo B, Aldridge DC 2013. The 'dirty dozen': socio-economic factors amplify the invasion potential of
13 high risk aquatic invasive species in Great Britain and Ireland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 757–766.
- 14 García-Berthou E 2007. The characteristics of invasive fishes: what has been learned so far? *Journal of Fish*
15 *Biology* 71: 33–55.
- 16 García-Berthou E, Alcaraz C, Pou-Rovira Q, Zamora L, Coenders G, Feo C 2005. Introduction pathways and
17 establishment rates of invasive aquatic species in Europe. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*
18 62: 453–463.
- 19 Hulme PE, et al. 2008. Grasping at the routes of biological invasions: a framework for integrating pathways into
20 policy. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45: 323–341.
- 21 Jeschke JM, Strayer DL 2006. Determinants of vertebrate invasion success in Europe and North America. *Global*
22 *Change Biology* 12: 1608–1619.
- 23 Leprieur F, Beauchard O, Blanchet S, Oberdorff T, Brosse S 2008. Fish invasions in the world's river systems:
24 when natural processes are blurred by human activities. *PLoS Biology* 6:e28.
- 25 Levine JM, D'Antonio CM 2003. Forecasting biological invasions with increasing international trade.
26 *Conservation Biology* 17: 322–326.
- 27 Meyerson LA, Mooney HA 2007. Invasive alien species in an era of globalization. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
28 *Environment* 5: 199–208.

1 Moodley D, Geerts S, Richardson DM, Wilson JR 2013. Different traits determine introduction, naturalization
2 and invasion success in woody plants: Proteaceae as a test case. *PLoS One* 8: e75078.
3 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0075078.

4 Palm ME, Rossman AY (2003) Invasion pathways of terrestrial plant-inhabiting fungi. Pages 31-43 in Ruiz GM,
5 Carlson JT, eds *Invasive Species*. Island Press.

6 Pyšek P, Richardson DM 2007. Traits associated with invasiveness in alien plants: where do we stand? Pages
7 97–125 in Nentwig W, ed. *Biological invasions*. Springer.

8 Pyšek P, et al. 2010. Disentangling the role of environmental and human pressures on biological invasions.
9 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 12157–12162.

10 Schwartz MW, Hoeksema JD, Gehring CA, Johnson NC, Klironomos JN, Abbott LK, Pringle A 2006. The
11 promise and the potential consequences of the global transport of mycorrhizal fungal inoculum. *Ecology Letters*
12 9: 501–515.

13 Seebens H, Gastner M, Blasius B 2013. The risk of marine bioinvasion caused by global shipping. *Ecology*
14 *Letters* 16: 782–790.

15 Vilà M, Ibáñez I 2011. Plant invasions in the landscape. *Landscape Ecology* 26: 461–472.

16 Westphal MI, Browne M, MacKinnon K, Noble I 2008. The link between international trade and the global
17 distribution of invasive alien species. *Biological Invasions* 10: 391–398.

18

19

20

1 **Appendix S5.** Proxies for quantifying introduction effort of alien species by different socio-
2 economic activities. Depending on species ecology and context, these proxies are related to
3 pathways sensu Hulme et al. (2008) and CBD (2014). A justification is provided for each
4 proxy together with proposed units of measurements, major data sources, and publications
5 that have used the data to analyse invasion trends and pathways.

Proxy for introduction probability	Justification	Units of measurements	Data source	Selected references
Import or trade links between countries	Proxy for propagule pressure	Quantity (volume) or value (monetary units), risk level (all goods or selected high risk goods)	http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~ksg/exptradegdp.html http://www.correlatesofwar.org http://faostat.fao.org http://stat.wto.org http://data.worldbank.org http://www.worldmrio.com www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook	Gleditsch (2002), Thuiller et al. (2005), Barbieri et al. (2009), Essl et al. (2011a), Seebens et al. (subm.)
Terrestrial transport network (roads, railways)	Proxy for habitat fragmentation, propagule pressure and connectivity	Length or density of transport network, quantity of goods transported	www.openstreetmap.org http://www.mapability.com http://irfnet.org/statistics http://data.worldbank.org www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook	Enserink (2008), Jeschke & Genovesi (2011)
Aquatic and marine transport network (canals, ship routes, ports)	Proxy for habitat fragmentation, propagule pressure and connectivity	Length or density of transport network, quantity of goods transported, no of ports etc.	www.aapa-ports.org http://www.mapability.com	Paini & Yemshanov (2012), Seebens et al. (2013)
Aviation transport	Proxy for propagule	Length or density of transport	http://openflights.org/data.html http://www.oagcargo.com	Hufnagel et al. (2004), Colizza et al.

network	pressure and connectivity	network, quantity of goods transported, no of airports etc.	http://data.worldbank.org www.iata.org/services/statistics/intelligence/globaldata	(2006)
Human population	Proxy for habitat modification and propagule pressure	Population density (people per km ²)	http://themasites.pbl.nl/tridion/en/themasites/hyde http://data.worldbank.org www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/	Pyšek et al. (2002, 2010), Leprieur et al. (2008), Essl et al. (2011a), Jeschke & Genovesi (2011)
Land use intensity	Proxy for habitat modification and propagule pressure	Proportion of arable land, urban area or strongly modified area, HANPP	http://sia.eionet.europa.eu/CLC2006 http://themasites.pbl.nl/tridion/en/themasites/hyde http://www.worldmrio.com	Leprieur et al. (2008)
Human Influence Index	Proxy for habitat modification and propagule pressure	Index value	http://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu http://www.worldmrio.com	Gallardo & Aldrige (2013)
Economic activity	Proxy for habitat modification and propagule pressure	Monetary units (GDP)	http://data.worldbank.org http://www.ggdcc.net/maddison/maddison-project/home.htm www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook	Leprieur et al. (2008), Pyšek et al. (2010), Essl et al. (2011a), Jeschke & Genovesi (2011)
Botanic gardens, garden centres	Cultivation and selling of live plants and seeds	Number and location of botanic gardens or garden centres	http://www.bgci.org	Hanspach et al. (2008), Hulme (2011, 2014), Lenda et al. (2014)
Pet industry, aquaculture centres	Cultivation and selling of live animals	Number and location of pet shops / breeding	http://www.mapability.com (aquaculture) http://trade.cites.org (pet trade)	De Silva et al. (2009), van Wilgen et al. (2010)

		facilities or aquaculture centres		
Alien forest tree plantations	Proxy for propagule pressure	Area and timing of plantations	http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra/en	Krivánek et al. (2006), Essl et al. (2011b)
Political history (colonial history, Iron Curtain)	Legacies of historical trade routes	Length or usage of historical trade routes etc.	https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/cliwoc/cliwoc15.htm (historical ship routes, 1750-1855)	Chiron et al. (2010)
Socio- economic and land use history	Legacies of historical socio- economic and land use trajectories	Monetary units, proportion of arable or strongly modified land	http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~ksg/exptradegdp.html http://www.correlatesofwar.org http://www.ggdnc.net/maddison/maddison-project/home.htm http://data.worldbank.org/ https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook http://themasites.pbl.nl/tridion/en/themasites/hyde	Gleditsch (2002), Essl et al. (2011a), Klein Goldewijk et al. (2011)
Infestation of commodities	Proxy for propagule pressure	Infestation rates (number of detected organisms or proportion of infested goods)	Only available for some countries, e.g. in the U.S. by the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection Monitoring program.	Bacon et al. (2012), Haack et al. (2014)
Visitors (e.g. in nature reserves)	Proxy for propagule pressure	Numbers of visitors	Information available from nature reserves	Chown et al. (2012), Foxcroft et al. (2013)

1 References to Appendix S5

- 2 Bacon SJ, Bacher S, Aebi A. 2012. Gaps in border controls are related to quarantine alien insect invasions in
- 3 Europe. PLoS One 7: e47689.

- 1 Barbieri K, Keshk OMG, Pollins BM 2009. Trading data: Evaluating our assumptions and coding rules. *Conflict*
2 *management and Peace Sciences* 26: 471–491.
- 3 Chiron F, Shirley SM, Kark S 2010. Behind the Iron Curtain: Socio-economic and political factors shaped exotic
4 bird introductions into Europe. *Biological Conservation* 143: 351–356.
- 5 Chown SL, et al. 2012. Continent-wide risk assessment for the establishment of nonindigenous species in
6 Antarctica. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109: 4938–4943.
- 7 Colizza V, Barrat A, Barthélemy M, Vespignani A. 2006. The role of the airline transportation network in the
8 prediction and predictability of global epidemics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103: 2015–
9 2020.
- 10 De Silva SS, Nguyen TTT, Turchini GM, Amarasinghe US, Abery NW 2009. Alien species in aquaculture and
11 biodiversity: a paradox in food production. *Ambio* 38: 24–28.
- 12 Enserink M 2008 A mosquito goes global. *Science* 320: 864–866.
- 13 Essl F, et al. 2011a. Socioeconomic legacy yields an invasion debt. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
14 *Sciences* 108: 203–207.
- 15 Essl F, Moser D, Dullinger S, Mang T, Hulme PE (2011b) Macroecological drivers of alien conifer
16 naturalizations worldwide. *Ecography* 34: 1076–1084.
- 17 Foxcroft LC, Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Genovesi P (eds) 2013. *Plant invasions in protected areas: patterns,*
18 *problems and challenges.* Springer, Dordrecht.
- 19 Gallardo B, Aldridge DC 2013. The ‘dirty dozen’: socio-economic factors amplify the invasion potential of 12
20 high risk aquatic invasive species in Great Britain and Ireland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 757–766.
- 21 Gleditsch KS 2002. Expanded trade and GDP data. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46: 712–724,
22 <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~ksg/exptradegdp.html>.
- 23 Haack RA, et al. 2014. Effectiveness of the International Phytosanitary Standard ISPM No. 15 on reducing wood
24 borer infestation rates in wood packaging material entering the United States. *PLoS One* 9: e96611.
25 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096611.
- 26 Hanspach J, Kühn I, Pyšek P, Boos E, Klotz S 2008. Correlates of naturalization and occupancy of introduced
27 ornamentals in Germany. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 10: 241–250.
- 28 Hufnagel L, Brockmann D, Geisel T 2004. Forecast and control of epidemics in a globalized world. *Proceedings*

- 1 of the National Academy of Sciences 101: 15124–15129.
- 2 Hulme PE 2011. Addressing the threat to biodiversity from botanic gardens. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*
3 26: 168–174.
- 4 Hulme PE 2014. Resolving whether botanic gardens are on the road to conservation or a pathway for plant
5 invasion. *Conservation Biology*, in print.
- 6 Jeschke JM, Genovesi P 2011. Do biodiversity and human impact influence the introduction or establishment of
7 alien mammals? *Oikos* 120: 57-64.
- 8 Klein Goldewijk K, Beusen A, van Drecht G, de Vos M 2011. The HYDE 3.1 spatially explicit database of
9 human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 20: 73–86.
- 10 Krivánek M, Pyšek P, Jarošík V 2006. Planting history and propagule pressure as predictors of invasions by
11 woody species in a temperate region. *Conservation Biology* 20: 1487–1498.
- 12 Lenda M, Skorka P, Knops JMH, Moroń D, Sutherland WJ, Kuszewska K, Woyciechowski M 2014. Effect of
13 the internet commerce on dispersal modes of invasive alien species. *PLoS One* 9: e99786.
14 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099786.
- 15 Leprieur F, Beauchard O, Blanchet S, Oberdorff T, Brosse S 2008. Fish invasions in the world's river systems:
16 when natural processes are blurred by human activities. *PLoS Biology* 6:e28.
- 17 Paini DR, Yemshanov D 2012. Modelling the arrival of invasive organisms via the international marine shipping
18 network: a Khapra beetle study. *PLoS One* 7: e44589. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0044589.
- 19 Pyšek P, Jarošík V, Kucera T 2002. Patterns of invasion in temperate nature reserves. *Biological Conservation*
20 104: 13–24.
- 21 Pyšek P, et al. 2010. Disentangling the role of environmental and human pressures on biological invasions.
22 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 12157–12162.
- 23 Seebens H, Essl F, Dawson W, Fuentes N, Moser D, Pergl J, Pyšek P, van Kleunen M, Weber E, Winter M,
24 Blasius B (in review). Trade triggers trouble: globalization will accelerate plant invasions in emerging
25 economies.
- 26 Thuiller W, Richardson DM, Pyšek P, Midgley GF, Hughes G, Rouget M 2005. Niche-based modelling as a tool
27 for predicting the risk of alien plant invasions at a global scale. *Global Change Biology* 11: 2234–2250.
- 28 van Wilgen NJ, Wilson JRU, Elith J, Wintle BA, Richardson DM 2010. Alien invaders and reptile traders: what

1 drives the live animal trade in South Africa? *Animal Conservation* 13 (Suppl. 1): 24–32.

2