

**Question 1: What recommendations do you have, if any, on the National EDRR Framework draft Mission statement?**

**Working Mission Statement:** The mission of the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework is to find and eradicate invasive species new to the United States or those demonstrating secondary spread by coordinating across federal and non-federal partners and investing in innovative approaches for surveillance, data integration, and response capabilities for natural resource management.

**RECOMMENDED EDITS:**

Working Mission Statement: The mission of the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework is to expand our capability and capacity to prevent, find and eradicate new invasive species ~~new to the United States~~ or those demonstrating secondary spread by coordinating across federal and non-federal partners and investing in innovative approaches for surveillance, data integration, and response ~~capabilities~~ for natural resource management.

**CLEAN VERSION OF WORKING MISSION STATEMENT:**

The mission of the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework is to expand our capability and capacity to prevent, find and eradicate new invasive species or those demonstrating secondary spread by coordinating across federal and non-federal partners and investing in innovative approaches for surveillance, data integration, and response for natural resource management.

**Question 2: How would you define successful implementation of the Framework, and what metrics would be most effective at measuring that success?**

**Participation**

1. Number of jurisdictions participating in the Framework
  - a. Total count of organizations that have participated in Framework projects: commented on design or products; edited content or products; has joined a list serv; or sits on communities of practice.
    - i. A high number suggest better engagement
2. Number of groups participating in the Framework (broken down into Federal, State, Tribal, University, or NGO groups)
  - a. Count by organizations that have participated in Framework projects: commented on design or products; edited content or products; has joined a listserv; or sits on communities of practice.
    - i. A high number suggest better engagement across Federal, State, Tribal, University, or NGO groups.
3. Activity in broad ecosystem types, habitats, and organisms,
  - a. Descriptions of the areas of focus for the Framework. The goal is good representation across the U.S. that includes freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems and species.
    - i. More ecosystems and species covered by the Framework projects the better

**Surveillance**

4. Framework surveillance (either informed by the Framework or funded surveillance) for non-native species that are not yet present/established in the U.S., a jurisdiction, or watershed country or within a region, the continued non-establishment of those species.
  - a. Count of species with surveillance projects from the Framework not in U.S., State, watershed.
    - i. A higher number may not be the goal, look towards proportion of the high-risk species identified through the horizon scan and risk assessments from the Framework.
  - b. Surveillance type (traditional verses eDNA).
    - i. Good to see both types of surveillance
5. How many new species to the U.S., a jurisdiction, or watershed are found due to the Framework surveillance or planning?
  - a. Count of newly detected species found due to Framework information or projects (surveillance, hotspots, horizon scans)
  - b. Count of newly detected species found to the U.S., a jurisdiction, or watershed due to Framework information or projects (surveillance, hotspots, horizon scans)
    - i. Higher number indicates the additional focus or investments in surveillance has provided more opportunities for detection.
6. Number of high-risk invasion hotspots surveyed from Framework planning including pilot surveillance projects
  - a. Count of hotspots (stream, lake, terrestrial)
  - b. Proportion by number of hotspots in the watershed or State
    - i. Higher number shows more effort on the ground for early detection
7. Number of eDNA samples ran through the Molecular Lab Network associated with the surveillance projects
  - a. Utilization of the Molecular Lab Network is important for the eDNA detection portion of the Framework. A proportion of the allowable samples vs. what was processed. The goal would be 100% of funded sample processing would be utilized.
8. Description of the locations, ecosystems and target species the READINET usage/use of loaner program was utilized
  - a. General description of the areas the READINET system was used.
    - i. More diversity the better
9. The number of verified positive detections for target species through the READINET system
  - a. Count and description of verified positive detections found through the surveillance of READINET
    - i. Not sure a baseline for this metric but verified detections would show the technology works.

## **EDRR**

10. Percentage of new species found due to the Framework surveillance or planning, and management action was initiated by the jurisdiction (control, additional surveillance, risk assessment, spread prevention)
  - a. Proportion of all species found in total from question 4.
  - b. Proportion of species found by the jurisdiction.

- i. The closer to 100% the better
- 11. Percentage of new species found due to the Framework surveillance or planning, and jurisdiction is planning an eradication attempt through rapid response funds
  - a. GOLD STAR metric- Count of species
  - b. Proportion of all species found in total from question 4.
  - c. Proportion of species found by the jurisdiction.
    - i. Higher numbers are better, but never will be 100%
- 12. Continue to exhaust Rapid Response Fund
  - a. Proportion of the available funds
    - i. Want to use 100% of available funds
- 13. Number applications for the Rapid Response Fund
  - a. Count of unique applications
    - i. Higher diversity of groups using the Rapid Response Fund the better to show wide adoption and need for its continuation.
- 14. Diversity of applications for the Rapid Response Funds
  - a. Count of lead groups (Federal, State, and Tribal) and support groups (e.g. university and NGOs) associated with a proposal
    - i. Higher the number better
- 15. Number funded Rapid Response projects (by project, jurisdiction, and species of focus)
  - a. Count of projects, jurisdiction, and species of focus
    - i. Higher diversity of groups using the Rapid Response Fund the better to show wide adoption and need for its continuation.

### **Reporting**

- 16. Reporting to Framework surveillance to individual databases – EDDMapS, NAS, Wild Spotter, iMapInvasives
  - a. Count of reports associated with Framework surveillance
    - i. More is better
- 17. Reporting EDRR projects through SIREN website
  - a. Count of reports associated with Framework or Rapid Response Fund
    - i. More is better

### **Use of tools/ products**

- 18. Traffic to SIREN website, USGS NAS website, INHABIT website, eDNA toolkit website, EDDMapS
  - a. Total Number of Visits
    - i. This metric tells you the total number of times your website was visited during a specified period: monthly, quarterly, or annually.
  - b. Total Unique Visitors
    - i. Unique visitors are the actual number of people you reached.
  - c. Page Views
    - i. This metric shows the total number of times any of your webpages loaded in a browser. So, even repeated page loads by the same user are counted.
- 19. Logins to SIREN website – different agencies and organizations, regional use
  - a. Total Number of Visits

- i. This metric tells you the total number of times your website was visited during a specified period: monthly, quarterly, or annually.
- 20. How many species were added to genetic library
  - a. Count of new taxa
    - i. More is better
- 21. Intergration of eDNA standards, designs, and error concerns in surveillance projects.
  - a. Description of the process of inclusion of eDNA standards, designs, and error concerns into sampling plans for Framework projects.
  - b. Provides more confidence in the process and results by addressing concerns
- 22. Adoption of metabarcoding standards by agencies and labs
  - a. Count of labs and agencies adopting the new metabarcoding standards
    - i. More is better, proportion of agencies and labs using eDNA with surveillance with the Framework