

## **Incorporating passive surveillance into management of weeds**

Oscar Cacho<sup>1</sup> and Susie Hester<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UNE Business School, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales 2351, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis, University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia  
(shester@une.edu.au)

**Summary** Information on the location of pests and diseases often comes from members of the public, industry groups, plant or animal health professionals and their networks, all of whom report suspected detections at their discretion. Surveillance that leads to these ‘passive detections’ is activated and maintained through public- or industry-funded awareness campaigns. While several recent studies have demonstrated the benefits of passive surveillance across a range of pests and diseases, and while public awareness campaigns have become an integral part of invasion management programs, there is still much to learn about this type of

surveillance. This includes the ‘return on investment’ in the activities that lead to passive surveillance, the size and types of investment required to achieve the desired level of reporting from the public, which parts of the community are more likely to report and whether these reports are reliable. This paper discusses recent findings on passive surveillance and puts forward a general framework for assessing the cost-effectiveness of passive surveillance.

**Keywords** Passive surveillance, general surveillance, community engagement, cost-effectiveness.