



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

## Exploring perceptions of marine biosecurity interventions: insights from the commercial marina sector.

Vye, Siobhan; Wynne-Jones, Sophie; Masterson Algar, Patricia; Jenkins, Stuart

### Marine Policy

DOI:

[10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104027)

Published: 01/08/2020

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

*Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):*

Vye, S., Wynne-Jones, S., Masterson Algar, P., & Jenkins, S. (2020). Exploring perceptions of marine biosecurity interventions: insights from the commercial marina sector. *Marine Policy*, 118, [104027]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104027>

#### Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## Manuscript Details

<b>Manuscript number</b>	JMPO_2019_187_R2
<b>Title</b>	Exploring perceptions of marine biosecurity interventions: insights from the commercial marina sector.
<b>Article type</b>	Full Length Article

### Abstract

Recreational boating is a largely unregulated vector of non-native species and contributes to both initial introduction and secondary spread. As such, marinas and ports often experience high propagule pressure and are hotspots of non-native species. In many countries, there is little or no legal requirement for marinas to implement biosecurity in day-to-day operations to reduce the risk of non-native species introduction. Instead, biosecurity is often encouraged and implemented voluntarily meaning uptake may be limited. To understand the range of perceptions of biosecurity within the marina sector, focus groups were conducted as part of a workshop attended by operators from Ireland and Wales. In the first focus group, participants discussed the barriers and drivers to the overall process of designing a biosecurity plan for a marina. A second focus group asked participants to identify strengths and weaknesses of a range of biosecurity tools, such as risk assessments and in-water quarantine berths. Thematic analysis revealed lack of financial resources, in combination with doubt regarding the effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, to be the greatest barriers to uptake. Aligning with good practice and the perceived benefits of a clean environment for business were seen as drivers. Integrating biosecurity into normal marina operations requires bottom up and top down support from customers and relevant authorities respectively. We recommend that alongside testing the effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, researchers should also present robust evidence of cost-effectiveness, and consider and address any potential effects on marina businesses.

<b>Keywords</b>	non-native species; invasive species; marinas; ports; recreational boating; focus group
<b>Corresponding Author</b>	Siobhan Vye
<b>Order of Authors</b>	Siobhan Vye, Sophie Wynne-Jones, Patricia Masterson-Algar, Stuart Jenkins
<b>Suggested reviewers</b>	Rebecca Geisler, Emma McKinley

## Submission Files Included in this PDF

### File Name [File Type]

200502\_CoverLetter.docx [Cover Letter]

200310\_Response to reviewers\_MPLLineNumbers.docx [Response to Reviewers (without Author Details)]

Highlights (1).docx [Highlights]

Abstract.docx [Abstract]

TitlePage\_Revised.docx [Title Page (with Author Details)]

200513\_FinalManuscriptRevised\_Clean.docx [Manuscript (without Author Details)]

Author Statement.docx [Author Statement]

To view all the submission files, including those not included in the PDF, click on the manuscript title on your EVISE Homepage, then click 'Download zip file'.

School of Ocean Sciences  
Bangor University,  
Menai Bridge,  
Anglesey,  
Wales,  
LL595AB

R.e: Response to reviewers' comments: JMPO\_2019\_187

Dear Dr Hanich,

Please find outlined in the attached document how we have addressed all the reviewers' comments in our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Siobhan Vye

On behalf of all authors

Reviewer: 1

*This paper explores biosecurity in marinas used by recreational boaters, using focus groups to explore the perception of biosecurity amongst those working in the sector. The paper is timely- the 2014 EU invasion alien species legislation focuses on prevention. However, there is no legal driver for marine biosecurity regarding invasive species. The ms is clearly written and placed in the context of the literature. The data are clearly explored and interpreted. I have one major concern over the methodology that should be addressed/discussed in the manuscript. The workshop was immediately preceded by plenary sessions on non native species and biosecurity. These plenary talks are likely to increase the awareness of the participants, as well as to bias their conversations. The effect of this should be considered in the ms.*

We considered the use of plenary talks at some length before running the workshop and felt that including them led to benefits which outweighed the potential disadvantages. We have added in further discussion of the potential bias that the structure of the workshop may have introduced in lines 180-182, and 184 to 190.

*Minor comments.*

*Abstract-the final sentence is rather “throw away”. Either include more material in the discussion that explores how the finding might inform development of biosecurity tools, or simply remove this sentence.*

We have removed the sentence.

*Practice is a noun, practise is a verb if using English spelling, or noun and verb are both spelled "practice" if using American spelling.*

We have checked the manuscript and now use practice throughout (nouns) except in one case where we use practise as a verb.

*More integration of table 3 into the text would be clearer*

We have referred to table 3 throughout the results so the reader can link through from discussion themes presented to the table (Line 256, 303, 481)

**-Reviewer 2**

-

*Overall, this paper is well written and clearly structured – and contributes to a wider discussion on the need for effective stakeholder engagement across marine resource use. As recreational boating across the UK continues to be impacted by challenging social and economic circumstances, the need to take a holistic approach to managing biosecurity issues is crucial. I am happy to recommend this paper for publication, subject to the recommendations and edits set out below.*

*Comments:*

*9: Delete ‘and therefore’ and replace with ‘meaning’*

This edit has been made (line 13)

*13: Delete “activity”*

This edit has been made (line 17)

*16: Not sure ‘conversely’ is the correct word here.*

The word has been removed for clarity (line 21)

*Abstract overall – are there any recommendations that you could present based on the work you’ve presented? It would be good to have some strong concluding comments here.*

We have added recommendations into the abstract (line 23-27) and the conclusion (line 705-720)

*33: Edit to read as “...such as those within the commercial shipping and aquaculture industries....”*

This edit has been made (line 75-76)

*37: Effective doesn’t feel like the correct word here – perhaps just state that is a ‘known vector’*

This edit has been made (line 80)

*39: Replace ‘have an’ with undergo*

This edit has been made (line 83)

*40: Edit to read as “These vessels, therefore, pose a high risk....”*

This edit has been made (line 84)

*45: Add in “...often encouraged as general best practice...”*

This edit has been made (line 89)

*71: Wales is a nation/ country in it’s own right - it would be more correct to reference it as such here.*

Clarification has been added (line 125)

*71-79: I wonder if this section would be improved by starting off with an introduction to the EU legislation and wider governance landscape, before narrowing down to the national approaches in Ireland and Wales. It might also be useful to include some additional context, adding in some information about the shared maritime history and connectivity supported by the recreational boating industry.*

We have restructured the paragraph and added in the recreational boating context (lines 125-138)

*96: 7 is quite a low number of marinas – I understand that this can happen with this type of data collection, but I would suggest including some sort of comment on the limitation that this would result in.*

We have added in a comment on the limitations in lines 160-164

*129: Edit to read “interventions, proposed by the facilitator, considering them in the context of their own marinas”.*

This edit has been made (line 205)

*140-150: Detailed description of analysis – very good to see this!*

*184: Edit to read as “for some of the biosecurity interventions, examined in the workshop...”*

This edit has been made (line 283)

*187: Kinda lives where? Consider whether this is the best quote for this discussion.*

We have added clarification to the quote on lines 291

*197: edit to “A lack of existing knowledge....”*

This edit has been made in line 307

*201: Edit to “It was also that even if...”*

This edit has been made (line 312-313)

*203: add in “legislation”*

This edit has been made in line 315

*227: Replace highlighted with stressed*

This edit has been made in line 321

*231: What is the relevance of this quote? Sometimes the quotes that are being used have not been edited to fit the flow of the discussion. I would suggest considering changing the approach of presenting the quotes in certain places, or edit the quotes so that they fit the discussion better.*

We have added in better links between the quotes and the text throughout the results section to ensure the quotes clearly demonstrate the ideas being discussed. The quote here has been deleted.

*246-254: This whole section is a bit complex – I’m not sure the quote clearly supports the point you’re trying to make.*

We have rewritten this section to clearly set out the point we are trying to make (lines 379-386)

*276-279: split the sentence if you can. Edit so it reads as “...can get that position in your place. If they have...”*

Unfortunately, splitting the sentence doesn’t accurately reflect the quote in the transcript.

*287: add in (referencing... closed loop...)*

This edit has been made (line 440)

*302: edit to read as “the number of moving parts susceptible to breakage...”*

This edit has been made (Lines460)

*307: Edit to read as “...were considered as harder to implement.”*

This edit has been made (line 466)

346. *Split the sentence by making however – However*

This edit has been made (line 521)

362: *when you say use it, what do you mean? Legislation? Or the education?*

We have added clarification to the quote (line 546)

389 – *the comments on financial resources and cost are a bit repetitive as the point has been implied in every paragraph of the discussion so far. I would consider streamlining the discussion.*

We appreciate the reviewer's comment, however, financial resources were raised consistently across all discussions in the results, and we feel that this paragraph that discusses resources, including financial, pulls together that narrative and hence is warranted.

426: *edit to read as "...as good practice, it was clear that managing biosecurity issues..."*

This edit has been made (line 623)

459: *It would perhaps be useful to reflect a little more on the literature around effective science communication.*

We have now added in additional reflection around science communication more broadly as suggested (lines 670-678)

*There is no concluding comments section – it would be useful to have recommendations or something summarising the key findings of the work and how it can be applied in a wider context. These are currently hidden in the text; it would be better to have them more explicitly presented the paper. This would strengthen the paper overall.*

We have now edited the final concluding paragraph to summarise our recommendations and draw together our conclusions more effectively (lines 703-720)

## Highlights

- Recreational boating is a vector for non-native species at local, regional and global scales.
- Marinas are hotspots for non-native species yet biosecurity is often voluntary.
- Marina operators identified cost and doubt of effectiveness as barriers to biosecurity.
- Alignment with good practice and maintaining the environment were drivers for biosecurity
- Bottom-up and top-down support is required to integrate biosecurity into marina operations.



## Abstract

Recreational boating is a largely unregulated vector of non-native species and contributes to both initial introduction and secondary spread. As such, marinas and ports often experience high propagule pressure and are hotspots of non-native species. In many countries, there is little or no legal requirement for marinas to implement biosecurity in day-to-day operations to reduce the risk of non-native species introduction. Instead, biosecurity is often encouraged and implemented voluntarily meaning uptake may be limited. To understand the range of perceptions of biosecurity within the marina sector, focus groups were conducted as part of a workshop attended by operators from Ireland and Wales. In the first focus group, participants discussed the barriers and drivers to the overall process of designing a biosecurity plan for a marina. A second focus group asked participants to identify strengths and weaknesses of a range of biosecurity tools, such as risk assessments and in-water quarantine berths. Thematic analysis revealed lack of financial resources, in combination with doubt regarding the effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, to be the greatest barriers to uptake. Aligning with good practice and the perceived benefits of a clean environment for business were seen as drivers. Integrating biosecurity into normal marina operations requires bottom up and top down support from customers and relevant authorities respectively. We recommend that alongside testing the effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, researchers should also present robust evidence of cost-effectiveness, and consider and address any potential effects on marina businesses.

Title: Exploring perceptions of marine biosecurity interventions: insights from the commercial marina sector.

Authors: Siobhan R. Vye<sup>1\*</sup>, Sophie Wynne-Jones<sup>2</sup>, Patricia Masterson-Algar<sup>3</sup> & Stuart R. Jenkins<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, Anglesey LL59 5AB, UK

<sup>2</sup>School of Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University

<sup>3</sup>School of Health Sciences, Bangor University

\* Corresponding author email address: [s.vye@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:s.vye@bangor.ac.uk)

Keywords: non-native species, invasive species, marinas, ports, recreational boating, perceptions, focus group.

*Declarations of interest:* None

#### *Acknowledgements*

The authors would like to acknowledge all participants in the workshop, and those who assisted with the running of the workshop: Sarah Brown, Gabrielle Wyn, Kate Griffith, Rohan Holt, Hannah Earp, Bryan Thompson, Aoife Coracon and Sonya Agnew and two anonymous reviewers whose comments improved the manuscript. This research was funded by the Ecostructure project which is part-funded by the European Regional Development Fund through the Ireland Wales Cooperation Programme 2014-2020.

1  
2  
3 Title: Exploring perceptions of marine biosecurity interventions: insights from the commercial  
4 marina sector.  
5

6 Abstract  
7

8 Recreational boating is a largely unregulated vector of non-native species and contributes to  
9 both initial introduction and secondary spread. As such, marinas and ports often experience  
10 high propagule pressure and are hotspots of non-native species. In many countries, there is little  
11 or no legal requirement for marinas to implement biosecurity in day-to-day operations to reduce  
12 the risk of non-native species introduction. Instead, biosecurity is often encouraged and  
13 implemented voluntarily meaning uptake may be limited. To understand the range of  
14 perceptions of biosecurity within the marina sector, focus groups were conducted as part of a  
15 workshop attended by operators from Ireland and Wales. In the first focus group, participants  
16 discussed the barriers and drivers to the overall process of designing a biosecurity plan for a  
17 marina. A second focus group asked participants to identify strengths and weaknesses of a  
18 range of biosecurity tools, such as risk assessments and in-water quarantine berths. Thematic  
19 analysis revealed lack of financial resources, in combination with doubt regarding the  
20 effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, to be the greatest barriers to uptake. Aligning with  
21 good practice and the perceived benefits of a clean environment for business were seen as  
22 drivers. Integrating biosecurity into normal marina operations requires bottom up and top down  
23 support from customers and relevant authorities respectively. We recommend that alongside  
24 testing the effectiveness of biosecurity interventions, researchers should also present robust  
25 evidence of cost-effectiveness, and consider and address any potential effects on marina  
26 businesses.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118

## 1. Introduction

The introduction of non-native species through anthropogenic vectors, and their subsequent establishment and spread, is widely considered to be one of the greatest threats to ecosystems [1–3]. Once introduced, non-native species may have far-reaching economic and ecological consequences [4–6] and management or eradication of established populations in the marine environment, even those constrained to local areas, is extremely challenging [7]. Hence, prevention of initial introduction and secondary spread of non-native species through regulation of vectors is a major focus [8–11]. A range of vectors can introduce marine non-native species, including commercial shipping, aquaculture, and recreational boating [12]. In the marine environment, management of vectors has primarily focussed on those that already operate within a strict regulatory framework, such as those within the commercial shipping and aquaculture industries [13,14]. However, there has been increasing recognition of the potential role of recreational boating, a largely unregulated activity, in transporting non-native species [15,16].

Recreational boating links coastal areas at global, regional and local scales, and is a known vector for both initial introduction [17,18] and secondary spread of non-native species [15,16,19]. Recreational vessels often undergo infrequent voyages interspersed by long stationary periods in marinas and may not always undergo effective anti-fouling [20,21]. These vessels, therefore, pose a high risk for transfer of non-native species through hull fouling [22]. Marinas are often hotspots for non-native species [17,23] and may provide source populations for secondary spread [24,25]. Despite acknowledgement of the role of recreational boating in transporting non-native species, in most countries there is little or no legal obligation for marinas to consider non-native species biosecurity in day-to-day operations [15]. Instead, biosecurity is often encouraged as general best practice and implemented voluntarily, resulting in limited uptake and a dependence on the sector's perception of biosecurity [26].

Effective site-based biosecurity requires the formulation of a biosecurity plan that incorporates actions for different risk scenarios, and outlines the range of operational or infrastructure interventions that can be implemented to facilitate these actions [27,28]. Understanding the implications of biosecurity interventions for the commercial operation of marinas is crucial to encourage uptake where the implementation of biosecurity is voluntary. To date, research into marina biosecurity has focussed on quantifying the risk posed by vessels and operations [29–31], understanding non-native species awareness by marina owners and users [32,33] and the development and testing of novel tools, such as in-water quarantine systems [20,34]. However, there has been little in-depth investigation into marina operators' perceptions of biosecurity interventions beyond limited investigations into their current practices [32]. Marina operators' perceptions and experiences of biosecurity interventions are likely to influence their engagement with voluntary practices [35]. In particular, engaging with marina operators and understanding their perceptions of specific tools would allow general themes to be identified and focus ongoing research on developing tools that are feasible in the commercial operation of a marina.

In order to understand the perceptions of marina operators to biosecurity interventions, we conducted a workshop with marina owners and operators from Wales and Ireland, two highly connected countries but with different regulatory environments. The workshop aimed to engage with marina operators and owners from around the Irish Sea and better understand the drivers and barriers to biosecurity planning in commercial marina operations, and the strengths and weaknesses of various specific biosecurity tools and operations (hereafter referred to as interventions) that are either under development or in practice in other countries.

119  
120  
121 *2. Methods*  
122

123 *2.1. Context*  
124

125 Wales and the Republic of Ireland are separated by the Irish Sea, over a distance of  
126 approximately 47 miles at its narrowest point. This relatively short distance, and the presence  
127 of marinas and sailing clubs on both coasts, has resulted in a high number of recreational sailing  
128 and racing routes between the two countries [36]. Within both countries, implementing  
129 biosecurity in marinas is not legally required for day-to-day operations, although it may be a  
130 consideration by licencing authorities for specific activities, such as construction. Both  
131 countries have more general biosecurity obligations stipulated by international regulations,  
132 such as those required by the International Ballast Water Convention [37]. In Wales,  
133 implementing marine biosecurity is also considered best practice by the statutory authorities  
134 [28]. However, in the Republic of Ireland, national regulations around marine biosecurity  
135 practices are less well developed, although implementing the EU Regulation on the prevention  
136 and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species [38] will require  
137 further steps in the development of national policy.  
138

139 *2.2. Data collection - workshop for marina operators*  
140

141 The study aimed to understand perceptions of the barriers and drivers to the general concept of  
142 biosecurity planning, and utilise the experiences of marina operators to understand the range  
143 of practical challenges to implementing biosecurity. Capturing experiential knowledge of  
144 potential biosecurity practitioners is essential to understand context-dependent considerations  
145 and hence, facilitate the translation of biosecurity research into practice [35]. This study used  
146 qualitative methodologies, namely semi-structured focus group discussions, to enable the  
147 capture of experiential knowledge and perceptions [35,39]. The aim was to gain greater depth  
148 of insight into how participants conceptualised biosecurity issues rather than attempt to fully  
149 represent and quantify all perspectives [39,40].  
150

151 Twenty seven coastal marinas in the Republic of Ireland and Wales were invited via email and  
152 telephone to a one day workshop. Invitations were addressed to marina operators and owners,  
153 and included a brief outline of the purpose of the workshop, i.e. for researchers to collect  
154 information on the drivers and barriers to biosecurity and to provide information to participants  
155 on non-native species and biosecurity. Marinas were selected on the basis of their location  
156 within, or near to, the research funding area (see Acknowledgements). Nine marinas accepted  
157 the invitation (reduced to 7 marinas, represented by 8 participants on the day, owing to  
158 inclement weather). Primary reasons for marinas not accepting the invitation included lack of  
159 response and calendar conflicts with prior commitments. Although the workshop was attended  
160 by a relatively small proportion (~20%) of marinas from the study area, attendees represented  
161 a wide range of marina types, from independent Yacht Clubs to marinas managed by larger  
162 harbour authorities and regional councils, and fulfilled a range of roles, including marina  
163 managers, management committee members, environmental managers and marina owners. All  
164 participants had understanding of the day-to-day operations of the marinas they represented,  
165 alongside some level of decision-making or management responsibility. Discussions  
166 throughout the day revealed that participants had a range of familiarity with non-native species,  
167 from a basic understanding of the issue through to direct interaction with non-native species  
168 management.  
169

170  
171 The workshop began with two plenary talks to provide information to all participants regardless  
172 of role or experience, followed by two focus group sessions. The first plenary covered an  
173 introduction to non-native species including definitions, vectors, example species and impacts.  
174 A second shorter plenary introduced the concept and practice of biosecurity planning [28].  
175  
176  
177

178  
179  
180 These plenaries were delivered to ensure all participants had the baseline knowledge to  
181 understand the subject matter of discussion. Focus group sessions followed, and were  
182 facilitated by the authors, Siobhan Vye and Stuart Jenkins, who both have backgrounds in non-  
183 native species and biosecurity research. During focus group sessions, data were collected by  
184 independent note-takers for each group, dictaphone recordings, which were later transcribed,  
185 and participants' own notes captured on flipchart paper. To minimise the influence of the  
186 presence of expert speakers and researchers on marina participants' discussions, only the  
187 facilitators engaged with the marina operators' focus group discussions. Further discussions  
188 with experts and talks on non-native species legislation occurred after the focus groups. All  
189 participants were briefed on the purpose of the research and provided formal consent for  
190 anonymised quotes to be used in this research.  
191

192  
193 The core aims of the first focus group session (one group with 8 participants) were to explore  
194 the perceptions of biosecurity planning and to identify the barriers and drivers to creating a  
195 biosecurity plan. The facilitator (Siobhan Vye) was assisted by Sarah Brown, a co-author of  
196 the Marine Biosecurity Planning Guidance recommended by the statutory agencies in Wales  
197 [28], in answering questions regarding the process of biosecurity planning. The facilitator  
198 asked participants as a group to suggest what would be a driver in their marina and what would  
199 be a barrier, and then directed discussion around these subjects. Once the range of barriers and  
200 drivers was identified, the facilitator asked the group to deliberate and reach consensus through  
201 discussion on the most important driver and barrier to biosecurity planning.  
202

203 During the second focus group session (two groups with 4 participants each), a variety of  
204 specific biosecurity interventions were proposed by the facilitators and participants were asked  
205 to identify strengths and weaknesses in the context of their own marinas. Providing these "real-  
206 life" scenarios or actions facilitates the collection of experiential knowledge that is often  
207 situation-specific in nature [35,41]. Intervention examples were sourced from the scientific and  
208 grey literature, and were chosen to represent a range of effort and commitment levels from  
209 marina businesses and customers. Information on the eight example interventions was provided  
210 at the start of the session through factsheets that followed a standardised layout and described  
211 the intervention, its current status, and, where possible, a descriptive image. Interventions were  
212 split into two main types: infrastructure or operations, and were based on established practices  
213 in other countries or interventions that were currently at the early research and development  
214 stage (Table 1).  
215

### 216 2.3. Data analysis 217

218 All audio-recorded data from the focus group sessions was fully transcribed and hand-written  
219 notes were converted into electronic text. In order to draw out common themes, all qualitative  
220 data was analysed taking a thematic analysis approach [42]. All data was coded by the first  
221 author using an initial coding framework drawn from relevant literature. New codes were  
222 created for data falling outside the framework in order to avoid missing important concepts.  
223 Initial themes were then identified as meaningful patterns across coded data and were further  
224 refined until a final set were decided upon. To ensure analytical rigour, a second coder (*Name  
225 redacted for double blind review*) independently analysed approximately a third of the data  
226 and the results from this coding were compared with the first coder's results. Where there was  
227 significant deviation, or new themes were identified, these were refined until coders were  
228 satisfied the themes were sufficiently supported by the data.  
229

### 230 3. Results 231

232 Three overarching themes relating to the participants' perceptions of marina biosecurity were  
233 identified: the impact of biosecurity on a marina business, the efficacy of biosecurity  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239 interventions, and valuing the environment as a driver for biosecurity. Within these overarching  
240 themes, four sub-themes were drawn from the data (Table 2). In addition, a summary of the  
241 specific perceived strengths and weaknesses of each biosecurity intervention discussed is  
242 provided in Table 3.  
243

244 *Theme 1: Impacts of biosecurity adoption on a marina business*

245  
246 *Sub-theme 1.1: Intervention requires resource investment (time, money and information)*

247  
248 Participants indicated that the financial resources required for biosecurity were the greatest  
249 barrier and a weakness in 7 of the 8 specific interventions that were discussed. Participants  
250 highlighted that biosecurity would be an additional financial burden alongside other financial  
251 pressures marinas are facing, such as a decline in the number of marina users. Participants  
252 recognised that, currently, the operator would be responsible for the cost of implementing  
253 biosecurity, emphasising high initial costs particularly for infrastructure interventions (Table  
254 3). For example, one participant flagged the recent recession as a barrier for operators to invest  
255 in biosecurity:  
256

257 “Any of these situations we’re talking about will have to be funded by the operator. And  
258 we’ve gone through 10 years, of a very hard recession, there is not an awful lot of spare cash  
259 out there” Participant D

260  
261 Yet, participants articulated that the cost of dealing with an incursion of a non-native species  
262 was potentially more expensive than taking preventative measures through implementing a  
263 biosecurity plan. This indicates an expectation or perception that the financial responsibility of  
264 species management would fall on the marinas rather than on the relevant authorities. This is  
265 particularly illustrated by the following quotes, that reference weighing up the costs of dealing  
266 with an incursion against implementing the biosecurity to prevent it:  
267

268 “[...] If you put that [biosecurity] down as a cost, then you end up in a situation where you’ve  
269 got to bag all your piles, haul all the boats where you’ve got to get rid of something, then  
270 that’s not a cost. So depends how you look at it” Participant F

271 “Well, value for money vs financial risk of the consequences of an invasive species being  
272 introduced. So in order to make any headway, you actually need as a business to face up to  
273 the fact that these things do present a business risk.” Participant A  
274

275 The focus groups generated ideas to raise private and public revenue, such as grant aid from  
276 the government, or including a surcharge in their own berth leases. This suggests participants  
277 were not adverse to investment in biosecurity providing there is support available to generate  
278 the additional financial resource needed.  
279

280 Closely related to financial resource, participants discussed staff time that would be required  
281 for some of the biosecurity interventions examined in the workshop, such as the time required  
282 to turn rotating pontoon floats on a regular basis. Interventions perceived to require minimal  
283 staff input beyond initial set up, such as developing risk assessments, were often seen as  
284 attractive, as illustrated by the following participant:  
285

286 “[...] and there’s quite a bit of work getting a risk assessment procedure off the ground you  
287 know so in the initial stages you’re dedicating time, staff in setting it up and afterwards it  
288 kinda lives there.” Participant C (referring to the creation of the risk assessment being the  
289 most effort)

290 In contrast, an intervention that required similar amounts of time to an already established  
291 approach that may serve the same purpose, was perceived as unappealing. For example, one  
292  
293  
294  
295

296  
297  
298 group discussed that using the quarantine berth to decontaminate vessels, which could take up  
299 to 1-2 hours, was not of great benefit when hauling the vessel out for a scrub could be done in  
300 the same amount of time (Table 3):  
301

302 “What would the difference be to take the boat in, haul it, wash it down, and keep all the  
303 fouling, sweep it up and dump it?” Participant G  
304

305 A lack of existing knowledge within the sector was identified as a weakness particularly in  
306 cases where the intervention represented an emergency action after the detection of a non-  
307 native species. In this scenario, participants raised concerns that marina staff would not have  
308 the knowledge to identify the species. As demonstrated in the following quote, one participant  
309 suggested that it was not just specific knowledge or information that was lacking. It was also  
310 that even if information or knowledge was freely available, it may not be accessible to  
311 individuals without detailed understanding and knowledge of technical terminology, concepts  
312 and legislation associated with biosecurity:  
313

314 “[...] Because that’s a really big, you know, for people who, like myself, wouldn’t know how  
315 to do something like that, I’d be looking for templates, or I would be trying to tell the boss  
316 how to put the 6, 10 step process in place. Because it has to comply with legislation and  
317 everything else which I wouldn’t be familiar with.” Participant I  
318

319 Participants stressed that although the existing knowledge base within the sector may not be  
320 sufficient to attain effective biosecurity, there are resources available that can help break down  
321 this barrier, such as online courses for marina managers.  
322

323 Existing infrastructure resource can also restrict the use of interventions or be perceived to  
324 make some interventions redundant, depending on the local context. For example, introducing  
325 enforced haul-out protocols would be a challenge in some marinas that do not have haul-out  
326 facilities. In contrast, those marinas with haul-out facilities may not promote in-water hull  
327 cleaning or the use of a quarantine berth decontamination system because, with the local  
328 facilities and the correct anti-fouling regime, the intervention should not be needed. Biosecurity  
329 interventions that would require new infrastructure led to discussions on related difficulties,  
330 for example, one participant highlighted planning restrictions at marinas that were listed sites:  
331

332 “Lots of ports in [a region of Wales] are listed structures, there’s no way you’d be able to  
333 excavate for that purpose.” Participant H  
334

335 Beyond the modification of local planning regulations, participants identified a more general  
336 need for legislation or policy resources to support marinas implementing biosecurity actions.  
337 One participant explained how such external drivers could enable marinas to explain the new  
338 measures to their customers:

339 “[...] then you can say to the members “by the way, we must from such a date, we’re obliged  
340 to do this”. If you put the charges up a couple of extra euro for your lift up and wash down,  
341 but that covers that.” Participant G  
342

343 Participants highlighted that legislation and policy should not be restrictive and alternative  
344 solutions or activities should be possible. Furthermore, legislation should be joined up across  
345 authorities responsible for the different aspects of marina operations, such as marine licencing  
346 and planning departments.  
347

348 *Sub-theme 1.2: Intervention can have an impact on how customers and peers within the sector*  
349 *perceive and interact with the marina.*  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354



355  
356  
357 A barrier to biosecurity was the impact an intervention could have on interactions between the  
358 marina and customers, from direct conflicts with marina staff to reducing the customer base.  
359 Participants showed concern about potential conflicts with customers where the need for an  
360 intervention may be subjective. This is illustrated by the hypothetical situation the following  
361 participant describes:  
362

363 “Can you imagine standing on a dock arguing with a customer over the state of his boat?”

364 Participant D (referring to enforced haul out protocols)  
365

366 Participants raised concerns that some interventions would not only erode relationships  
367 between the marina and customers, but also make recreational boating less attractive, reducing  
368 custom for the marina. For example, where an intervention, such as enforced haul out protocols,  
369 requires additional cost or hassle then customers may not visit the marina, as illustrated by this  
370 participant’s comment:  
371

372 “It’s just another reason not to go, isn’t it?” Participant C  
373

374 Participants acknowledged that specific interventions could improve the facilities available at  
375 some marinas and that leadership by individual marinas could be important in driving  
376 behavioural change in the sector. However, this was contrasted against concerns about the  
377 negative effects of biosecurity interventions not being implemented universally across the  
378 sector. Here, the primary concern was that customers were likely to favour marinas that did not  
379 require the perceived hassle of additional biosecurity interventions. Hence, although  
380 behavioural change may require leadership from individual marinas, those marinas leading the  
381 way were likely to lose customers and, therefore, their businesses would be negatively  
382 impacted. One participant summarised this trade-off between showing leadership and losing  
383 customers in the following comment:  
384

385 “And you see word of mouth, if I introduce [inaudible] the first thing I will be asked what are  
386 [other yacht] clubs doing, what are they doing in [...], well [they] aren’t doing anything, then  
387 why are we doing it, someone will say, well that [other marina] are they doing it? Then why  
388 do we want to do it? Well if everybody starts...” Participant G (identifiable information  
389 retracted)  
390

391 However, there was also acknowledgement that doing nothing and risking a non-native  
392 incursion could lead to negative impacts for the business. In particular, one participant  
393 highlighted current difficulties with marine licencing owing to the presence of non-native  
394 species. Other participants raised concerns about the reputational damage associated with  
395 having a non-native species in the marina. The fear of reputational damage is demonstrated by  
396 this following quote:  
397

398 “Look, if I sit down in a pub [...] and say [...] don’t go to [...] guys, it’s got all these nasty  
399 bugs up there, what’s the effect? You know it’s the harsh reality” Participant C (identifiable  
400 information redacted)  
401

## 402 *Theme 2: Efficacy of biosecurity interventions*

### 403 *Sub-theme 2.1: Does the intervention actually reduce the risk of non-native species?* 404

405 Participants expressed doubt over the effectiveness of a site-based approach to biosecurity,  
406 especially where the marina operates in a busy multi-use coastal environment:  
407

408 “[...] regardless of what we do and I suppose from listening to what protective things we  
409 could put in place, because we have commercial shipping in up to 100 liners a year coming in  
410 over the harbour. And they are the biggest at pumping out the ballast, they have to be the  
411  
412  
413

414 ones to target, initially, us helping as well. That's what most of this stuff must be coming  
415 from." Participant F  
416  
417  
418

419 Within the marina sector, participants noted that the biosecurity efforts invested by one marina  
420 may be offset by another connected marina that does not actively promote biosecurity  
421 awareness. Hence the proactive marina's risk of non-native species may not be reduced despite  
422 the implementation of biosecurity interventions:  
423

424 "Because some of your people on your waiting list are going to be neighbouring marinas  
425 waiting until they can get that position in your place if they've been completely negligent in  
426 another marina and they just come to you not aware of this, that's the only weakness I can  
427 see" Participant H  
428

429 Variation in the strength of evidence and the magnitude of the effect were seen as key  
430 weaknesses for specific biosecurity interventions, such as promoting native species and in-  
431 water cleaning. Interventions that were discussed as being effective at reducing risk were those  
432 that arguably are more easily evidenced, such as by causing mortality of visible biofouling. For  
433 example, although closed loop wash-down systems had many weaknesses, such as cost, the  
434 intervention was perceived to be effective at reducing the risk of non-native species:  
435

436 "Proven. It will work. It's going to have to be cost, where to find the money" Participant F  
437 (referencing closed loop wash down system)  
438

439 In contrast, participants expressed scepticism around those inventions that were more  
440 preventative, such as raising biosecurity awareness, suggesting more evidence for their  
441 effectiveness is required or that existing evidence should be better communicated:  
442

443 In many of the examples, and in the overall discussion of the interventions, effectiveness was  
444 constantly linked to cost and financial resource, suggesting participants considered there to be  
445 a trade-off between these two aspects of an intervention. One participant highlighted the  
446 importance of demonstrating cost effectiveness to the corporate side of the business:  
447

448 "[...] actually being able to sell, um, you know, a cost effectiveness position on a corporate  
449 level so this isn't that we can adopt a policy about, as corporate entity that we accept that  
450 there is a risk here." Participant I  
451

452 *Sub-theme 2.2: Is the intervention easy to implement alongside normal operations?*

453 Participants raised doubts about whether some of the prototype stage interventions would  
454 function in the marina environment, regardless of their effectiveness at reducing the risk of  
455 non-native species. For example, participants discussed whether rotating pontoon floats would  
456 be feasible in a marina owing to the number of moving parts susceptible to breakage and  
457 concern over the robustness of the design in large swell conditions:  
458

459 "It would damage robustness. I mean, Storm Ophelia and all that goes with that" Participant  
460 C (referring to the potential for rotating pontoon floats to be damaged by large storms)  
461

462 Where interventions were perceived to mismatch with expected vessel owner behaviour, they  
463 were considered harder to implement. For example, the quarantine berth was unlikely to be  
464 viewed positively by boat owners because it does not visibly clean the hull, removing  
465 biofouling, and therefore a haul out would still be required. Similarly, it was argued that  
466 enforced haul out should not be required for those vessels that have cruised long distances  
467 and may harbour new non-native species. The hulls of such vessels are likely to be maintained  
468 in very clean condition to maximise efficiency, and therefore, probably have overall hull  
469 fouling below limits that would trigger a haul-out.  
470  
471  
472

473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531

Positive comments around ease of implementation came where participants perceived the operation as easily fitting in with existing operations, such as rotating pontoon floats negating the need to manually scrub fixed floats (Table 3):

“[...] but I can see an advantage to it. We go out and manually scrub out blocks during the summer months when we get a lot of growth. We obviously can't get the undersides so we've got a labour input anyway so.” Participant C (referring to pontoon floats)

Participants also identified methods of incorporating some interventions relatively easily, such as using the quarantine berth as a shared portable resource among several marinas in an area:

“Well presumably you could contract that. If you had a group of marinas within your locality, they would be able to pool the resources like that or if they could contract they would be able to call on the contractors and say “look we've got this boat in”.” Participant H

In several cases, marinas had already considered or partially implemented some of the interventions for other purposes. For example, one participant highlighted that their marina had been considering the installation of a holding tank for washing down vessel hulls:

“All our boats would be lifted, we have 2 cranes left and right. And we're considering about putting a holding tank under our, under where the crane is.” Participant G

For some of the interventions, participants identified entirely new secondary purposes for the interventions, such as identifying that the quarantine berth could also be used as an oil or fuel leak containment system and highlighted this as a strength:

“If in an emergency, say a diesel or an oil leak, that's come from under the water, containment, you can put the boat into it, zip it up.” Participant G

### *Theme 3: Valuing the environment as a driver to engage in biosecurity*

A “good environment” was identified as one of the most important drivers of biosecurity in consensus discussions and an indicator of good practice. For example, some biosecurity practices were seen as fulfilling an environmental responsibility:

“I suppose the strengths are that if you've disposed of it properly you've done your bit for the environment.” Participant F (referring to enforced haul out)

“It's showing awareness of the environment. We work and live with the environment, it's important to protect the environment.” Participant D (referring to biosecurity planning)

Environment was clearly considered in a very holistic sense. Participants demonstrated a connection to the ecological environment, particularly within one discussion about the variable environmental impact of chemicals (such as sodium hypochlorite used in the quarantine berth) in different marina scenarios, e.g. closed coast to open coast. However, environment also had a wider meaning, comprising both the ecological environment and the general environment in the marina. One participant identified the importance of this holistic environment to their business through the following statement:

“And whatever they do, whether they just go down and sit and read the paper, put the kettle on, that's their place. So it is very important to keep the environment right, in all ways, you know noise, everything” Participant D

Customer engagement with the environment, and the link between the environment and biosecurity, was a common topic. Discussion primarily focused on how participants perceived the role of education in leading to effective action. Participants discussed how behavioural

532  
533  
534 change in their customer base could occur through the sharing of insights and demonstration  
535 of direct personal impacts of non-native species. However, there was also recognition that  
536 education, although a good starting point, was not always effective. Participants considered  
537 that education could not work in isolation, but could potentially lower barriers to behavioural  
538 change and reduce the level of enforcement needed:  
539

540 “[...] if you can bring them with you from an educational point of view it’s the best way to do  
541 it. With the legislation coming in the background, just sitting there you have to use it [the  
542 legislation].” Participant C  
543

544 Participants raised examples of where environmental issues have risen to prominence in  
545 society, such as the media focus on marine litter, and highlighted these as examples of where  
546 individual behaviour change has occurred:  
547

548 “If you just look at plastics in the environment at the moment, with the micro plastics and the  
549 microbeads. That has exploded, purely because of Facebook and the whole social media  
550 platform that it’s on. It is phenomenal.” Participant I  
551

552 This suggests that participants are aware of the need to change the societal context  
553 surrounding an issue in order to drive behavioural change.  
554

#### 555 4. Discussion

556 This study identified drivers and barriers to implementing biosecurity within the commercial  
557 marina sector by engaging with marina operators and exploring their perceptions of biosecurity  
558 interventions. The three overarching themes arising from focus groups were the impact of  
559 adopting biosecurity on marina businesses, the efficacy of biosecurity tools, and valuing the  
560 environment as a driver of behavioural change in the marina sector. Financial cost was  
561 consistently put forward as the key weakness or barrier to the implementation of biosecurity  
562 interventions while compliance with good practice and the maintenance of a good environment  
563 were seen as the main drivers for implementation of biosecurity measures. The findings of this  
564 study demonstrate a range of perceptions about biosecurity in the marina sector that both  
565 conform and contradict with findings in other sectors that practise biosecurity on a voluntary  
566 basis.  
567

568 Resources, financial and other, were a core cross-cutting theme across all discussions, with  
569 high resource cost referred to exclusively as a weakness or barrier for implementing  
570 biosecurity. The focus on resource cost suggests the marina sector conforms to the low-cost  
571 hypothesis of environmental behaviour, where the investment of resource into environmental  
572 behaviours occurs primarily in scenarios associated with low resource cost [43].  
573 Unsurprisingly, financial resources were a constant theme across all discussions. Similar to  
574 previous studies across wider stakeholder networks, it was often considered in relation to the  
575 perceived effectiveness of interventions [44]. Where marina operators perceived the  
576 intervention to be effective, investment of financial resource was considered as more  
577 worthwhile, preventing potential costly management or eradication procedures. Resource  
578 investment in biosecurity is also likely to be influenced by current economic conditions in the  
579 sector. Both the UK and Ireland have faced economic downturns in the past decade with  
580 associated drops in disposable income [45,46]. As a consequence, the significant cost of  
581 recreational boating has led to an aging customer base with fewer new, younger customers and  
582 downsizing of vessels and berths [47,48]. Voluntary uptake of costly biosecurity interventions  
583 without external financial support is likely to be minimal while the industry faces these  
584 economic challenges. However, the resource cost of biosecurity should not be considered in  
585 isolation, as economically rational decisions are likely to be heavily linked with, and  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590

591  
592  
593 confounded by, social and behavioural drivers, such as reputation and accepted normal  
594 practises [49,50].  
595

596 This study has revealed that marina operators place a high level of importance on perceived  
597 effectiveness when considering biosecurity interventions, suggesting that voluntary investment  
598 of resource is likely to be aligned with the perceived effectiveness of an intervention. Those  
599 interventions that were easy to evidence through visible effects, such as killing organisms often  
600 had effectiveness assumed, where as those interventions that were more preventative, such as  
601 raising biosecurity awareness and risk assessments were less associated with effectiveness.  
602 Previous research has also demonstrated that practitioners require accessible and well-  
603 communicated evidence of effectiveness, in order to move away from experience-based  
604 conservation decisions and adopt evidence-based interventions [51,52]. Unfortunately, the  
605 preventative nature of many aspects of biosecurity means that it is almost impossible to  
606 evidence the effectiveness of actions in clear and tangible terms, such as direct measures of  
607 percent mortality. Furthermore, biosecurity primarily operates on a precautionary principle,  
608 where the impact of a potential incursion is relatively unknown, yet a small percentage of  
609 incursions could result in serious ecological and economic impacts [53]. As such, highlighting  
610 those case studies that demonstrate clear ecological and economic costs of non-native species  
611 incursions to marina businesses, such as the introduction and attempted eradication of  
612 *Didemnum vexillum* at Holyhead Marina [7], combined with a clear outline of the mechanisms  
613 by which the intervention lowers the risk of non-native species may increase the perceived  
614 effectiveness and uptake of biosecurity.  
615  
616

617 The results from the workshop revealed the importance of incorporating biosecurity into  
618 normal practice in the marina sector, yet also identified major barriers to moving past the  
619 perception of biosecurity as an additional burden. Although participants identified biosecurity  
620 as good practice, it was clear that managing biosecurity issues was perceived as above and  
621 beyond normal marina operations. The importance of leadership and pioneering change was  
622 mentioned, but the majority of participants were concerned about the reputational damage and  
623 loss of business that could occur if individual marinas, rather than the entire sector, adopted  
624 more rigorous biosecurity practices. Interventions that place additional burdens on the  
625 customers or marina staff pose a threat to reputation if not introduced universally across the  
626 sector and, as such, are unlikely to be adopted in a voluntary scenario. Within the agricultural  
627 sector, greater knowledge of biosecurity by the individual decision makers has been shown to  
628 be a stronger driver of the adoption of biosecurity practices than economic factors [40,50].  
629 Increasing knowledge and understanding of non-native species could also increase voluntary  
630 uptake because it may generate approval from within the sector or from customers [54,55]. As  
631 such, generating greater non-native species and biosecurity awareness in marina operators  
632 could be crucial for integrating biosecurity into normal practices. Although some marina  
633 operators are aware of tools to improve knowledge, the discussions in the workshop highlighted  
634 issues with accessibility and the level of expertise needed to implement effective biosecurity.  
635 More conscious and proactive engagement of marina operators by researchers during non-  
636 native species research and biosecurity tool development could be one potential avenue of  
637 increasing knowledge and awareness within the sector, especially as research within marinas  
638 is relatively common around the UK and Ireland.  
639  
640

641 Bottom up or top down drivers may stimulate behavioural change across the marina sector and  
642 disrupt established normal practices [49]. Bottom up drivers that may lead to greater adoption  
643 of biosecurity measures could include the increased biosecurity awareness of customers. Our  
644 data suggests marina operators perceive the value of the environment to customers and marina  
645 businesses could have a role in breaking down barriers to biosecurity. However, the role of  
646  
647  
648  
649

650  
651  
652 raising awareness of the threat of non-native species as a method for biosecurity was a  
653 contentious point. Firstly, workshop participants expressed scepticism in the effectiveness of  
654 traditional biosecurity awareness raising initiatives among their customers. Indeed, this is  
655 supported by evidence from New Zealand where, despite a much greater national awareness  
656 and emphasis on biosecurity than in the UK and Republic of Ireland, many marine users were  
657 unclear on biosecurity messages they had been exposed to through education campaigns [33].  
658 Workshop participants also highlighted a concern that awareness raising initiatives may risk  
659 reputational damage to individual marinas. This suggests biosecurity messages need to be  
660 framed carefully and delivered using neutral sources. Currently, biosecurity messages are  
661 framed primarily around potential negative impact and fear [56]. Limited evidence from the  
662 freshwater boating community has shown negative messaging framed around regulatory  
663 penalties can affect intended biosecurity practices more than messages associated with  
664 normative behaviour [57]. Yet it is unknown what impact positive messaging could have on  
665 the adoption of biosecurity practices. Evidence from communicating climate change messages  
666 suggests shifting discourse towards that which outlines the positive changes for the individual  
667 associated with biosecurity actions may be more effective [58]. Developing more effective  
668 strategies for communicating conservation science, such as biosecurity, is a growing field of  
669 research and follows increasing acknowledgement that changing environmentally damaging  
670 behaviours is highly dependent on environmental literacy [59]. Future research should aim to  
671 identify how to use effective science communication strategies to communicate biosecurity  
672 messages and increase non-native species awareness without compromising marinas'  
673 reputations.  
674  
675

676 Marina operators also identified the need for top down drivers provided by clear and  
677 coordinated legislation and guidance from authorities. Over recent years there has been an  
678 increased regulatory focus on biosecurity. At an international level, the full implementation of  
679 the EU regulations on invasive alien species occurs in 2021 [38], suggests more biosecurity  
680 regulations are likely to filter down to the day-to-day operations of marinas and ports over  
681 coming years. Our findings support the premise that environmental regulations should match  
682 the needs of the local stakeholders and regulatory action should empower managers to make  
683 decisions that are able to take into account local context [60]. For example, discussions during  
684 the workshop about the ease of implementing biosecurity often focused on local issues, such  
685 as space to install infrastructure. Effective environmental regulation can also be achieved  
686 through empowering stakeholders to influence policy, providing expectations are managed and  
687 suitable frameworks are in place [61]. One method of empowering marina operators would be  
688 through the development of stakeholder groups, a method that is viewed as effective for  
689 communication and consultation [44]. Although our workshop attracted only a proportion of  
690 marina operators in the study region, their attendance and active participation in discussions  
691 demonstrates willingness within the sector to engage with the issue. Recent developments in  
692 marine biosecurity planning in the UK has focussed on developing regional plans in  
693 consultation with local stakeholders (e.g. Solway Firth Partnership 2018). This regional  
694 approach may address concerns about overall impact of biosecurity measures in the wider  
695 coastal usage environment, alongside empowering marina operators to input into local and  
696 regional policy.  
697  
698

699 By using qualitative techniques, this study has moved beyond assessing current practices or  
700 attitudes to biosecurity, and takes a step towards understanding motivations that could increase  
701 the uptake of biosecurity measures. We recommend that developers of biosecurity  
702 interventions should consider the potential impact of the intervention on marina businesses  
703 from an early stage in the research process. By giving consideration to the potential motivations  
704 for marinas to adopt interventions, and ensuring intervention efficacy is well evidenced,  
705  
706  
707  
708

709  
710  
711 appropriately communicated and can integrate with current operations, innovative  
712 interventions are more likely to move beyond the science community and be adopted by  
713 industry. Furthermore, by focusing on effective dialogue with marina operators, researchers  
714 may help to streamline the pathway between the research and development of biosecurity  
715 interventions and their implementation within the marina sector, where these interventions  
716 could make a real impact on limiting the spread of non-native species.  
717

#### 718 5. *Acknowledgements*

719  
720 The authors would like to acknowledge all participants in the workshop, and those who assisted  
721 with the running of the workshop: Sarah Brown, Gabrielle Wyn, Kate Griffith, Rohan Holt,  
722 Hannah Earp, Bryan Thompson, Aoife Coracon and Sonya Agnew, and two anonymous  
723 reviewers whose comments improved the manuscript. This research was funded by the  
724 Ecostructure project which is part-funded by the European Regional Development Fund  
725 through the Ireland Wales Cooperation Programme 2014-2020.  
726

#### 727 *References*

- 728  
729 [1] N. Bax, A. Williamson, M. Agüero, E. Gonzalez, W. Geeves, Marine invasive alien  
730 species: a threat to global biodiversity, *Mar. Policy*. 27 (2003) 313–323.  
731  
732 [2] O.E. Sala, F.S. Chapin, J.J. Armesto, E. Berlow, J. Bloomfield, R. Dirzo, E. Huber-  
733 Sanwald, L.F. Huenneke, R.B. Jackson, A. Kinzig, R. Leemans, D.M. Lodge, H.A.  
734 Mooney, M. Oesterheld, N.L. Poff, M.T. Sykes, B.H. Walker, M. Walker, D.H. Wall,  
735 Biodiversity - Global biodiversity scenarios for the year 2100, *Science*. 287 (2000)  
736 1770–1774.  
737  
738 [3] J.L. Molnar, R.L. Gamboa, C. Revenga, M.D. Spalding, Assessing the global threat of  
739 invasive species to marine biodiversity, *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 6 (2008) 485–492.  
740 <https://doi.org/10.1890/070064>.  
741  
742 [4] J.A. Crooks, Characterizing ecosystem-level consequences of biological invasions: the  
743 role of ecosystem engineers, *Oikos*. 97 (2002) 153–166.  
744  
745 [5] F. Williams, R. Eschen, A. Harris, D. Djeddour, C. Pratt, R.S. Shaw, S. Varia, J.  
746 Lamontagne-Godwin, S.E. Thomas, S.T. Murphy, The economic cost of invasive non-  
747 native species on Great Britain, C.A.B.I, 2010.  
748  
749 [6] D. Pimentel, R. Zuniga, D. Morrison, Environmental and economic costs associated  
750 with non-indigenous species in the United States, *Bioscience*. 50 (2000) 53–65.  
751  
752 [7] K. Sambrook, R.H.F. Holt, R. Sharp, K. Griffith, R.C. Roche, R.G. Newstead, G.  
753 Wyn, S.R. Jenkins, Capacity, capability and cross-border challenges associated with  
754 marine eradication programmes in Europe: The attempted eradication of an invasive  
755 non-native ascidian, *Didemnum vexillum* in Wales, United Kingdom, *Mar. Policy*. 48  
756 (2014) 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.03.018>.  
757  
758 [8] P. Genovesi, Eradications of invasive alien species in Europe: a review, *Biol.*  
759 *Invasions*. 7 (2005) 127–133.  
760  
761 [9] A. Locke, Rapid response to non-indigenous species. 1. Goals and history of rapid  
762 response in the marine environment, *Aquat. Invasions*. 4 (2009) 237–247.  
763 <https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2009.4.1.24>.  
764  
765 [10] M.L. Campbell, An Overview of Risk Assessment in a Marine Biosecurity Context,  
766 *Ecol. Stud.* (2009) 353–373.  
767

- 768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826
- [11] A. Dahlstrom, C.L. Hewitt, M.L. Campbell, A review of international, regional and national biosecurity risk assessment frameworks, *Mar. Policy*. 35 (2010) 208–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.001>.
  - [12] G.M. Ruiz, P. Fofonoff, A.H. Hines, E.D. Grosholz, Non-indigenous species as stressors in estuarine and marine communities: Assessing invasion impacts and interactions, *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 44 (1999) 950–972.
  - [13] J. Firestone, J.J. Corbett, Coastal and Port Environments: International Legal and Policy Responses to Reduce Ballast Water Introductions of Potentially Invasive Species, *Ocean Dev. Int. Law*. 36 (2005) 291–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320591004469>.
  - [14] C.L. Hewitt, R.A. Everett, N. Parker, Examples of Current International, Regional and National Regulatory Frameworks for Preventing and Managing Marine Bioinvasions, in: *Biol. Invasions Mar. Ecosyst.*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009: pp. 335–352. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79236-9\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79236-9_19).
  - [15] C. Clarke Murray, E.A. Pakhomov, T.W. Therriault, C.C. Murray, E.A. Pakhomov, T.W. Therriault, Recreational boating: a large unregulated vector transporting marine invasive species, *Divers. Distrib.* 17 (2011) 1161–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00798.x>.
  - [16] I.C. Davidson, C.J. Zabin, A.L. Chang, C.W. Brown, M. Sytsma, Recreational Boats as Potential Vectors of Marine Organisms at an Invasion Hotspot, *Aquat Biol.* 11 (2010) 179–191.
  - [17] N. Bax, K. Hayes, A. Marshall, D. Parry, R. Thresher, Man-made marinas as sheltered islands for alien marine organisms: Establishment and eradication of an alien invasive marine species, in: C.R. Veitch, M.N. Clout (Eds.), *Turn. Tide Erad. Invasive Species*, IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK., 2000: pp. 26–39. <https://doi.org/10.1366/0003702991946064>.
  - [18] K. Griffith, S. Mowat, R.H.F. Holt, K. Ramsay, J.D.D. Bishop, G. Lambert, S.R. Jenkins, First records in Great Britain of the invasive colonial ascidian *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 2002, *Aquat. Invasions*. 4 (2009) 581–590.
  - [19] J.E. Byers, R.S. Smith, J.M. Pringle, G.F. Clark, P.E. Gribben, C.L. Hewitt, G.J. Inglis, E.L. Johnston, G.M. Ruiz, J.J. Stachowicz, M.J. Bishop, Invasion Expansion: Time since introduction best predicts global ranges of marine invaders, *Sci. Rep.* 5 (2015) 12436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep12436>.
  - [20] R.C. Roche, J.M. Monnington, R.G. Newstead, K. Sambrook, K. Griffith, R.H.F. Holt, S.R. Jenkins, Recreational vessels as a vector for marine non-natives: developing biosecurity measures and managing risk through an in-water encapsulation system, *Hydrobiologia*. 750 (2015) 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-014-2131-y>.
  - [21] C.L. Hewitt, M.L. Campbell, Mechanisms for the prevention of marine bioinvasions for better biosecurity, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 55 (2007) 395–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MARPOLBUL.2007.01.005>.
  - [22] G. Ashton, I. Davidson, G. Ruiz, Transient small boats as a long-distance coastal vector for dispersal of biofouling organisms, *Estuaries and Coasts*. 37 (2014) 1572–1581.



- 827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885
- [23] J.D.D. Bishop, C.A. Wood, A.L.E. Yunnice, C.A. Griffiths, Unheralded arrivals: non-native sessile invertebrates in marinas on the English coast, *Aquat. Invasions*. 10 (2015) 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.3391/ai.2015.10.3.01>.
- [24] F. Azmi, C.L. Hewitt, M.L. Campbell, A hub and spoke network model to analyse the secondary dispersal of introduced marine species in Indonesia, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 72 (2015) 1069–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsu150>.
- [25] C. Zabin, Small boats provide connectivity for nonindigenous marine species between a highly invaded international port and nearby coastal harbors, *Manag. Biol. Invasions*. 5 (2014) 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2014.5.2.03>.
- [26] M.L. Brennan, R.M. Christley, Cattle producers’ perceptions of biosecurity., *BMC Vet. Res.* 9 (2013) 71. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1746-6148-9-71>.
- [27] R.J. Shucksmith, R.L. Shelmerdine, A risk based approach to non-native species management and biosecurity planning, *Mar. Policy*. 59 (2015) 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MARPOL.2015.05.001>.
- [28] R.D. Payne, E.J. Cook, A. Macleod, S. Brown, Marine biosecurity planning guidance for producing site and operation-based plans for preventing the introduction and spread of invasive non-native species in England and Wales, 2015.
- [29] N. Simard, M. Pelletier-Rousseau, C. Clarke Murray, C.W. McKindsey, T.W. Therriault, A. Lacoursière-Roussel, R. Bernier, D. Sephton, D. Drolet, A. Locke, J.L. Martin, D.A.R. Drake, C.H. Mckenzie, National risk assessment of recreational boating as a vector for marine non-indigenous, *Can. Sci. Advis. Secr. Res. Doc.* (2017).
- [30] G. Ashton, K. Boos, R. Shucksmith, E. Cook, Risk assessment of hull fouling as a vector for marine non-natives in Scotland, *Aquat. Invasions*. 1 (2006) 214–218.
- [31] J. Ferrario, S. Caronni, A. Occhipinti-Ambrogi, A. Marchini, Role of commercial harbours and recreational marinas in the spread of non-indigenous fouling species, *Biofouling*. 33 (2017) 651–660. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08927014.2017.1351958>.
- [32] V. Foster, R.J. Giesler, A.M.W. Wilson, C.R. Nall, E.J. Cook, Identifying the physical features of marina infrastructure associated with the presence of non-native species in the UK, *Mar. Biol.* 163 (2016) 173. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-016-2941-8>.
- [33] M.L. Campbell, D.E.P. Bryant, C.L. Hewitt, Biosecurity messages are lost in translation to citizens: Implications for devolving management to citizens, *PLoS One*. 12 (2017) e0175439. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175439>.
- [34] K.A. Dafforn, Eco-engineering and management strategies for marine infrastructure to reduce establishment and dispersal of non-indigenous species, *Manag. Biol. Invasions*. 8 (2017) 153–16119. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2017.8.2.03>.
- [35] I. Fazey, J.A. Fazey, J.G. Salisbury, B.D. Lindenmayer, S. Dovers, The nature and role of experiential knowledge for environmental conservation, *Environ. Conserv.* 33 (2006) 1. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S037689290600275X>.
- [36] RYA, Identifying Recreational Cruising Routes, Sailing and Racing Areas within the SEA 6 Area A Report for the Department of Trade and Industry By the Royal Yachting Association, 2005.

- 886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944
- [37] IMO, International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM), 2004.
  - [38] EU, 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, 2014.
  - [39] U. Flick, Introduction to qualitative research, 6th Editio, Sage Publications Limited, 2018.
  - [40] A.P. Barnes, A.P. Moxey, B.V. Ahmadi, F.A. Borthwick, The effect of animal health compensation on “positive” behaviours towards exotic disease reporting and implementing biosecurity: A review, a synthesis and a research agenda, *Prev. Vet. Med.* 122 (2015) 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2015.09.003>.
  - [41] S. Hinchliffe, K.J. Ward, Geographies of folded life: How immunity reframes biosecurity, *Geoforum.* 53 (2014) 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GEOFORUM.2014.03.002>.
  - [42] L. Ayres, Thematic Coding and Analysis, in: SAGE Encycl. Qual. Res. Methods, SAGE Publications, Inc., 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States, 2008: pp. 876–868. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n451>.
  - [43] A. Diekmann, P. Preisendorfer, Green and greenback: the behavioural effects of environmental attitudes in low cost and high cost situations, *Ration. Soc.* 15 (2003) 441–472.
  - [44] C. Sutcliffe, C.H. Quinn, C. Shannon, A. Glover, A.M. Dunn, Exploring the attitudes to and uptake of biosecurity practices for invasive non-native species: views amongst stakeholder organisations working in UK natural environments, *Biol. Invasions.* 20 (2018) 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1541-y>.
  - [45] O. Bargain, T. Callan, K. Doorley, C. Keane, Changes in Income Distributions and the Role of Tax-Benefit Policy During the Great Recession: An International Perspective, *Fisc. Stud.* 38 (2017) 143–5671.
  - [46] T. Callan, B. Nolan, C. Keane, M. Savage, J.R. Walsh, Crisis, response and distributional impact: the case of Ireland, *IZA J. Eur. Labor Stud.* 3 (2014) 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-9012-3-9>.
  - [47] E. Mckinley, Marina 2020: A Vision for the Future Sustainability of Channel/ Arc Manche Marinas: Industry Report Recommendations For Best Practice, 2013.
  - [48] ECSIP Consortium, Study on the competitiveness of the recreational boating sector, (2015) 144.
  - [49] N. Dandy, Woodland neglect as social practice, *Environ. Plan. A.* 48 (2016) 1750–1766. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16651266>.
  - [50] L. Toma, A.W. Stott, C. Heffernan, S. Ringrose, G.J. Gunn, Determinants of biosecurity behaviour of British cattle and sheep farmers—A behavioural economics analysis, *Prev. Vet. Med.* 108 (2013) 321–333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2012.11.009>.
  - [51] A.S. Pullin, T.M. Knight, D.A. Stone, K. Charman, Do conservation managers use scientific evidence to support their decision-making?, *Biol. Conserv.* 119 (2004) 245–

- 945  
946  
947 252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2003.11.007>.  
948
- 949 [52] R. Greiner, L. Patterson, O. Miller, Motivations, risk perceptions and adoption of  
950 conservation practices by farmers, *Agric. Syst.* 99 (2008) 86–104.  
951 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2008.10.003>.  
952
- 953 [53] D. Kriebel, J. Tickner, P. Epstein, J. Lemons, R. Levins, E.L. Loechler, M. Quinn, R.  
954 Rudel, T. Schettler, M. Stoto, The precautionary principle in environmental science.,  
955 *Environ. Health Perspect.* 109 (2001) 871–876. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.01109871>.  
956
- 957 [54] A. Mankad, Psychological influences on biosecurity control and farmer decision-  
958 making. A review, *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 36 (2016) 40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-016-0375-9>.  
959
- 960 [55] R.B. Cialdini, Crafting Normative Messages to Protect the Environment, *Curr. Dir.*  
961 *Psychol. Sci.* 12 (2003) 105–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.01242>.  
962
- 963 [56] P.H. Gobster, Invasive Species as Ecological Threat: Is Restoration an Alternative to  
964 Fear-based Resource Management?, *Ecol. Restor.* 23 (2005).  
965
- 966 [57] K.E. Wallen, G.T. Kyle, The efficacy of message frames on recreational boaters’  
967 aquatic invasive species mitigation behavioral intentions, *Hum. Dimens. Wildl.* 23  
968 (2018) 297–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871209.2018.1434705>.  
969
- 970 [58] R. Gifford, L.A. Comeau, Message framing influences perceived climate change  
971 competence, engagement, and behavioral intentions, *Glob. Environ. Chang.* 21 (2011)  
972 1301–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.GLOENVCHA.2011.06.004>.  
973
- 974 [59] D. Bickford, M.R.C. Posa, L. Qie, A. Campos-Arceiz, E.P. Kudavidanage, Science  
975 communication for biodiversity conservation, *Biol. Conserv.* 151 (2012) 74–76.  
976 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.12.016>.  
977
- 978 [60] E. Ostrom, Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms, *J. Econmic Perspect.*  
979 14 (2000).  
980
- 981 [61] M.S. Reed, Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature  
982 review, *Biol. Conserv.* 141 (2008) 2417–2431.  
983 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2008.07.014>.  
984
- 985 [62] Solway Firth Partnership, Marine Invasive Non-Native Species in the Solway Firth,  
986 2018.  
987
- 988 [63] R. Holt, Eradicating the non-native carpet sea squirt *Didemnum vexillum* from  
989 Holyhead harbour, North Wales. A Presentation for the Marine Alien Symposium,  
990 Countryside Council for Wales, 2011.  
991
- 992 [64] C.M.C. Woods, O. Floerl, L. Jones, Biosecurity risks associated with in-water and  
993 shore-based marine vessel hull cleaning operations, *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 64 (2012) 1392–  
994 1401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.MARPOLBUL.2012.04.019>.  
995
- 996 [65] Ministry of Primary Industries, Craft Risk Management Standard Biofouling on  
997 Vessels Arriving to New Zealand Craft Risk Management Standard : Biofouling on  
998 Vessels Arriving to New Zealand, 2014.  
999
- 1000 [66] Check, Clean, Dry - GB non-native species secretariat, (n.d.).  
1001 <http://www.nonnativespecies.org/checkcleandry/> (accessed March 18, 2019).  
1002  
1003

1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062

[67] D. Morrisey, C. Woods, In-water cleaning technologies: Review of information Prepared for Ministry for Primary Industries, 2015.

1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103

Intervention	Current status	Description	Reference
<b>In-water quarantine berth</b>	Prototype tested	A quarantine berth is an in-water encapsulation system. It allows hull fouling to be treated in water without the need for vessel haul out. In order to speed up treatment, a chemical (acetic acid or sodium hypochlorite) is added into the berth. The total time to drive the vessel in, treat it and drive out would be approximately an hour	[20]
<b>Rotating pontoon floats</b>	Prototype built	Pontoons are installed with cylindrical float that is operated on an axel system. The float is turned every one to two weeks, either manually, or through an automated system. The fouling on the part of the float out of the water is killed.	[63]
<b>Closed loop wash down system</b>	Systems commercially available and utilised.	A system that collects the water & biofouling from the wash down procedure and removes the particulates, such as paint flecks and biofouling. There are a number of systems that range in cost from £10,000 - £30,000. The systems normally come into 2 parts – a mat or lagoon that collects the runoff from the wash and a filtration system that cleans the water before discharge into drains or for reuse in other washings.	[64]
<b>Promoting native species</b>	In early development stage	A number of techniques can be used to promote native species and reduce non-natives by between 28-90%. These include: building with special concrete (e.g. EConcrete); reducing shading by adding light-penetrating features (e.g. metal grills in walkways etc.) reduces non-native species dominance through promoting native seaweed; “pre-seeding” structures with native fouling species; increasing native predator abundance by increasing connectivity to the seabed.	[34]
<b>Risk assessment</b>	Established practice across sectors	As vessels arrive in the marina, they are assessed by marina staff on their risk of introducing non-native species. This risk assessment includes things such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Port of last call</li> <li>➤ Anti-fouling regime</li> <li>➤ Long stationary periods</li> <li>➤ Obvious fouling</li> </ul> If they are designated as high risk, a number of actions could be taken, including: moving vessels that are stationary for long periods or which are from high risk areas to areas of the marina with freshwater inflow; or encouraging heavily fouled vessels to get a wash down / include biosecurity information in communications with vessel owners.	[11,28]
<b>Enforced haul-out</b>	In practise as described in New Zealand, however, restricted to certain arrival ports	Vessels without an acceptable standard of hull maintenance or that are deemed to be too heavily fouled (more than a slime layer on the hull) have to be hauled out and cleaned within 24 hours of arrival into the country. The vessel owner pays for the haul out and cleaning.	[65]

1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144

<b>Promoting biosecurity awareness</b>	Voluntary practise in the marina sector in Wales and RoI although region specific materials are readily available online. More commonly promoted by NGOs and user groups rather than marinas themselves currently	Marina staff promote biosecurity awareness through materials such as “Check, Clean, Dry” posters and materials, berth holders’ communications etc.	[66]
<b>In-water hull cleaning</b>	Subject of debate in biosecurity aware countries, such as New Zealand. Illegal in Wales but not enforced.	Promotion of in-water cleaning for lightly fouled vessels on a regular (i.e. monthly) basis. In-water cleaning is promoted by the provision of in-water cleaning tools.	[67]

1

2 Table 1: Example biosecurity interventions used in workshop

1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185

<b>Theme</b>	Impacts of biosecurity adoption on a marina business	Efficacy of biosecurity interventions	Valuing the environment as a driver to engage in biosecurity
<b>Sub-themes</b>	Intervention requires resource investment (time, money and information)	Does the intervention actually reduce the risk of non-native species?	No sub-themes
	Intervention can have an impact on how customers and peers within the sector perceive and interact with the marina.	Is the intervention easy to implement alongside normal operations?	

3

4 Table 2: Themes and subthemes drawn from the data.

1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226

<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
In-water quarantine berth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheaper option than hauling out the vessel and scrubbing.</li> <li>• Viewed as a successful biosecurity intervention.</li> <li>• A resource that could be shared amongst multiple marinas if portable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require risk assessment and decisions of vessels requiring treatment.</li> <li>• Takes up a berth while in operation or space if in storage.</li> <li>• Does not provide the additional benefit of removing fouling – vessels would still need a scrub after treatment.</li> </ul>
Rotating pontoon floats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier than scraping floats to rid them of fouling.</li> <li>• Could potentially be more stable than traditional pontoon floats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design may not be compatible with rough seas.</li> <li>• Expensive to install, especially to retrofit into existing marina.</li> <li>• Viewed as ineffective at controlling non-native species spread.</li> </ul>
Closed loop wash down system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective biosecurity intervention and also good for the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of the system .</li> <li>• Restrictions on land and the installation of a system.</li> </ul>
Promoting native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially cheap method.</li> <li>• Some of the suggested strategies could have secondary benefits, such as installation of light penetrating grilling would provide more grip while walking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very experimental with many unknowns at the moment.</li> <li>• Marina environments do not wish to encourage growth of any marine life.</li> </ul>
Risk assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relatively easy to implement and easy to make proportionate to each marinas situation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires training to implement and would be relatively subjective depending on assessor.</li> <li>• Appropriate procedures and guidance need to be in place to deal with high risk vessels.</li> </ul>
Enforced haul out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viewed as an effective biosecurity measure that can contribute to the overall goal of having a clean marina.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subjective approach that would have to be supported by legislation.</li> <li>• Likely to have negative impacts on customer relations .</li> <li>• Resource constraints such as the cost of disposal of waste and the land to install a system.</li> </ul>
Promoting biosecurity awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low cost intervention that requires minimal effort.</li> <li>• Could help overcome barriers to other biosecurity intervention.</li> <li>• Raises awareness with both staff and customers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not viewed as an effective biosecurity measure.</li> <li>• Potential for the raised profile of non-native species to cause reputational damage with knock on impacts for business.</li> </ul>
In-water cleaning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheap method that may promote customer engagement with biosecurity.</li> <li>• Would help as part of a routine maintenance regime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical ability and available time to regularly visit vessels would restrict the uptake of the intervention.</li> <li>• Viewed as an ineffective biosecurity practise as the waste remains in the water.</li> </ul>

5 Table 3: Summary of the strengths and weaknesses of example biosecurity interventions emerging from marina operators' discussions.



Author statement: Siobhan Vye: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Reviewing and Editing. Sophie Wynne-Jones: Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing – Reviewing and Editing. Patricia Masterson-Algar: Formal Analysis, Writing – Reviewing and Editing. Stuart Jenkins: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing – Reviewing and Editing, Funding Acquisition.