


## Fire risk report for *Ischaemum ciliare*

<b>Full Species Name</b> <i>Ischaemum ciliare</i> Retz.
<b>Family:</b> Poaceae
<b>Common names:</b>
<b>Synonyms:</b> <i>Ischaemum indicum</i>
Known occurrences (as of 2020) 
Year first documented as naturalized in Hawai'i: 1995
This species has not yet been ranked by the Hawai'i Weed Risk Assessment program as of 2020.
<a href="#">View photos on Starr Environmental</a>
<a href="#">View on Wikipedia</a>
<a href="#">View occurrences on iNaturalist</a>
<a href="#">View at Plants of Hawaii</a>
<a href="#">View photos on Flickr</a>

0                      .5                      1  
Lowest risk                      Highest risk

This species is likely a **high** fire risk in Hawai'i with a fire risk score of **0.70**.

This species was ranked by our machine learning algorithm using the data presented on the next page. A predicted score of > .34 suggests the plant is a high fire risk.

Summary of Fire ecology	
Native habitat fire proneness	Fire-prone
Fire promoting plant in its native range	Yes
Fire promoting plant in its introduced range*	No
Regenerates after fire	No Data
Promoted by fire	No Data
Reported flammable*	High
Relative is flammable*	No

\*These values were used by the model to predict fire risk

## Detailed summary of Fire Ecology

Native habitat fire proneness (In any part of the plant's native range is its habitat described as fire prone due to natural or human caused fires?)	Fire-prone	"The area is good in terms of extent, abundance of food species and the number of cliffs. It is not much disturbed but for cattle grazing in some portions and the fire in summer [preceding table lists <i>Ischaemum indicum</i> as present in this area]" <a href="http://docs.kfri.res.in/KFRI-RR/KFRI-RR242.pdf">http://docs.kfri.res.in/KFRI-RR/KFRI-RR242.pdf</a> Easa, P. S., & Sivaram, M. (2002). Habitat suitability index model for Nilgiri tahr in Eravikulam National Park (No. 242). KFRI research report.
Fire promoting plant in its native range (Does the species act as a major fuel source, increase fire severity, frequency, or modify fuel bed characteristics within its native range?)	Yes	"Of these, 77 have been recorded in the predominant grassland type in our site (Srinivasan 2011). <i>Dichanthium polytychum</i> A.Camus, <i>Themeda tremula</i> Hack., <i>Ischaemum indicum</i> (Houtt.) Merr. and <i>Eulalia phaeothrix</i> Kuntze were the most abundant grasses" ... "Our study site was burned by a wildfire 6 months prior to the experiment. Like many grasslands of the world, the montane grasslands of the Nilgiris experience periodic anthropogenic fires, with some patches experiencing a burn cycle of less than 3 years. I" <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhu_Srinivasan4/publication/262972936_Short-term_impacts_of_nitrogen_fertilization_on_a_montane_grassland_ecosystem_in_a_South_Asian_biodiversity_hotspot/links/546a33d30cf2f5eb18077806.pdf">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhu_Srinivasan4/publication/262972936_Short-term_impacts_of_nitrogen_fertilization_on_a_montane_grassland_ecosystem_in_a_South_Asian_biodiversity_hotspot/links/546a33d30cf2f5eb18077806.pdf</a> Srinivasan, M. P., Gleeson, S. K., & Arthur, M. A. (2012). Short-term impacts of nitrogen fertilization on a montane grassland ecosystem in a South Asian biodiversity hotspot. <i>Plant Ecology &amp; Diversity</i> , 5(3), 289-299. # that this paper doesn't specifically say that this species promotes fire, but it is dominant in a clearly fire prone habitat
Fire promoting plant in its introduced range (Same as Fire Promoting Native but within the species introduced range)	No	
Regenerates after fire (Does the plant regrow after fire by any means? This includes	No Data	

resprouters, reseeder, and recruiters which dispersed into the area within approximately one year post fire)		
Promoted by fire (Does the plant increase in abundance after a fire?)	No Data	
Reported flammable (Is the species described as being flammable, being a major wildfire fuel, or high fire risk?)	High	<p>"Of these, 77 have been recorded in the predominant grassland type in our site (Srinivasan 2011). <i>Dichanthium polytychum</i> A.Camus, <i>Themeda tremula</i> Hack., <i>Ischaemum indicum</i> (Houtt.) Merr. and <i>Eulalia phaeothrix</i> Kuntze were the most abundant grasses" ... "Our study site was burned by a wildfire 6 months prior to the experiment. Like many grasslands of the world, the montane grasslands of the Nilgiris experience periodic anthropogenic fires, with some patches experiencing a burn cycle of less than 3 years. I"</p> <p><a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhu_Srinivasan4/publication/262972936_Short-term_impacts_of_nitrogen_fertilization_on_a_montane_grassland_ecosystem_in_a_South_Asian_biodiversity_hotspot/links/546a33d30cf2f5eb18077806.pdf">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Madhu_Srinivasan4/publication/262972936_Short-term_impacts_of_nitrogen_fertilization_on_a_montane_grassland_ecosystem_in_a_South_Asian_biodiversity_hotspot/links/546a33d30cf2f5eb18077806.pdf</a></p> <p>Srinivasan, M. P., Gleeson, S. K., &amp; Arthur, M. A. (2012). Short-term impacts of nitrogen fertilization on a montane grassland ecosystem in a South Asian biodiversity hotspot. <i>Plant Ecology &amp; Diversity</i>, 5(3), 289-299.</p> <p># that this paper doesn't specifically say that this species promotes fire, but it is dominant in a clearly fire prone habitat</p>
Relative is flammable (Does a plant in the same genus meet the Reported Flammable criteria?)	No	

Text in quotes are direct quotes from the source

Text in square brackets was added by the assessor to clarify something or to summarize from a figure.

Text preceded by a “#” is comment from the assessor

---

The data presented were assembled from literature and database searches for each species using as much data as could be collected regarding the plant’s fire ecology under natural

conditions. Searches aimed to be exhaustive and consist of as much data as could be located in 2020. Our machine learning algorithm was trained on 49 species of plants which had their fire risk ranked by 49 managers in Hawai'i in November 2020. The model used a conditional random forest regression algorithm to predict scores for each species using the manager score as the response variable and the fire ecology traits of each plant as the predictor variables to generate a fire risk score. This trained model was then used to predict the fire risk for all species which were not ranked by managers. The model was calibrated such that it is 90% accurate at predicting high fire risk plants and 79% accurate at predicting low fire risk plants. This research and the resulting fire risk model has been published in the journal [Biological Invasions](#) by [Kevin Faccenda](#) and [Curt Daehler](#) (both at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa).

Note that the analysis doesn't account for a plant species' spatial distribution, population density, or distinct climate and ecosystem conditions (which can also influence fire risk). The fire risk of these species are mostly under "worst case" environmental conditions where the climate is dry enough to maintain fire, but wet enough to allow for plant growth and fuel accumulation. The fire risk ranking should not be taken as a stand-alone risk metric in prioritizing weed control efforts. Rather, this information may also be useful for determining if a newly discovered species poses a potential fire threat in wildland areas.

More general information on the weed risks and ecology of non-native plants in Hawai'i is available from the Hawai'i Invasive Species Committee's [Weed Risk Assessment database](#).

View more fact sheets at <https://www.pacificfireexchange.org/weed-fire-risk-assessments>

---

Fact sheet prepared by Kevin Faccenda ([faccenda@hawaii.edu](mailto:faccenda@hawaii.edu)) in November 2021. Data were prepared by Kevin Faccenda in 2020.

This research was funded by the Department of the Interior Pacific Islands Climate Adaptation Science Center. The project described in this publication was supported by Grant or Cooperative Agreement No.G20AC00073 to Curt Daehler from the United States Geological Survey. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Geological Survey. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement by the Pacific Islands Climate Adaptation Science Center or the National Climate Adaptation Science Center or the US Geological Survey.

