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Scientific name: Alopochen aegyptiacus  
Common names: Egyptian Goose  
Native distribution: Africa  
Date assessed: 7/1/2013  
Assessors: D. Adams  
Reviewers:  
Date Approved: Form version date: 3 January 2013

**New York Invasiveness Rank:** Moderate (Relative Maximum Score 50.00-69.99)

**Status of this species in each PRISM:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISM</th>
<th>Current Distribution</th>
<th>Invasiveness Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adirondack Park Invasive Program</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Capital/Mohawk</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Finger Lakes</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Long Island Invasive Species Management Area</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lower Hudson</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Western New York</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invasiveness Ranking Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total (Total Answered*)</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ecological impact</td>
<td>30 (30)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Biological characteristic and dispersal ability</td>
<td>30 (30)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ecological amplitude and distribution</td>
<td>30 (30)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Difficulty of control</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome score</strong></td>
<td>100 (100)$^a$</td>
<td>52$^a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ For questions answered “unknown” do not include point value in “Total Answered Points Possible.” If “Total Answered Points Possible” is less than 70.00 points, then the overall invasive rank should be listed as “Unknown.”

**Relative maximum score $^f$**

$^f$ Calculated as 100(a/b) to two decimal places.

**A. DISTRIBUTION (KNOWN/POTENTIAL): Summarized from individual PRISM forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1.1. Has this species been documented in NY?</th>
<th>(reliable source; voucher not required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes – continue to A1.2</td>
<td>☒ No – continue to A2.1; Yes ☒ NA; Yes ☒ USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1.2. In which PRISMs is it known (see inset map)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adirondack Park Invasive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Capital/Mohawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Finger Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Long Island Invasive Species Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lower Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Western New York*

**Documentation:**
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

A2.0. Is this species listed on the Federal Injurious Fish and Wildlife list?
- Yes – the species will automatically be listed as Prohibited, no further assessment required
- No – continue to A2.1

A2.1. What is the likelihood that this species will occur and persist given the climate in the following PRISMs? (obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form and/or Climatch score)
- Unlikely: Adirondack Park Invasive Program
- Moderately Likely: Capital/Mohawk
- Unlikely: Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership
- Moderately Likely: Finger Lakes
- Very Likely: Long Island Invasive Species Management Area
- Moderately Likely: Lower Hudson
- Moderately Likely: Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario
- Moderately Likely: Western New York

**Documentation:**
Sources of information (e.g.: distribution models, literature, expert opinions):
& Invasive Species Compendium

*If the species does not occur and is not likely to survive and reproduce within any of the PRISMs, then stop here as there is no need to assess the species.*

A2.2. What is the current distribution of the species in each PRISM? (obtain rank from PRISM invasiveness ranking forms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISM</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adirondack Park Invasive Program</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital/Mohawk</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island Invasive Species Management Area</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hudson</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western New York</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation:**
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

A2.3. Describe the potential or known suitable habitats within New York. Natural habitats include all habitats not under active human management. Managed habitats are indicated with an asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic Habitats</th>
<th>Wetland Habitats</th>
<th>Upland Habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Salt/brackish marshes</td>
<td>Cultivated*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt/brackish waters</td>
<td>Freshwater marshes</td>
<td>Grasslands/old fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater tidal</td>
<td>Peatlands</td>
<td>Shrublands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers/streams</td>
<td>Shrub swamps</td>
<td>Forests/woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural lakes and ponds</td>
<td>Forested wetlands/riparian</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal pools</td>
<td>Ditches*</td>
<td>Roadsides*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs/impoundments*</td>
<td>Beaches/or coastal dunes</td>
<td>Cultural*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York:
Favours a diversity of wetlands in open country, only shunning densely-wooded areas, also occurs on
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meadows and grasslands.

**Documentation:**
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

**B. INVASIVENESS RANKING**

1. **ECOLOGICAL IMPACT**

1.1. Impact on Ecosystem Processes and System-wide Parameters (e.g., energy cycle, nutrient and mineral dynamics, light availability, or geomorphological changes (erosion and sedimentation rates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No perceivable impact on ecosystem processes based on research studies, or the absence of impact information if a species is widespread (&gt;10 occurrences in minimally managed areas), has been well-studied (&gt;10 reports/publications), and has been present in the northeast for &gt;100 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Influences ecosystem processes to a minor degree, has a perceivable but mild influence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Forages mainly by grazing on pasture and arable land, also by dabbling on surface and with head submerged. Droppings may cause eutrophication of still waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Major, possibly irreversible, alteration or disruption of ecosystem processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation: Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Impact on Natural Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native habitat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Identify type of impact or alteration: Feeds on grass and seeds, leaves and stems of plants, vegetables, grains, shoots and potatoes, also some animal items such as worms and locusts. Large groups may cause physical damage to habitats through grazing or trampling. Sources of information: Handbook of the Birds of the World. 1992. Editors: Hyo, Elliot and Sargatal. &amp; Invasive Species Compendium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Influences natural habitat (e.g., reduces the stem density and height of one or more native species in core habitat)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Significantly alters natural habitat (e.g., produces a notable reduction in the population size of one or more native species in core habitat)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Causes major alteration in natural habitat (e.g., results in the extirpation of one or more native species, or changes the community composition in core habitat towards species exotic to the natural community)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. Impact on other species or species groups, including cumulative impact of this species on other organisms in the community it invades (e.g., interferes with native predator/prey dynamics; hybridizes with a native species; hosts a non-native disease which impacts a native species)
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A. Negligible perceived impact 0
B. Minor impact (e.g. 1 species, <20% population decline) 3
C. Moderate impact (e.g. 2-3 species and/or 20-29% population decline of any 1 species) 7
D. Severe impact on other species or species groups (e.g. >3 species and/or >30% population decline of any 1 species) 10
U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:
Identify type of impact or alteration:
Share feeding habitat with mallards, other ducks and coots and may compete with them for food or territories. Threat to native endemic flora and fauna on islands. Common to locally abundant with greatest numbers in S and E Africa. In parts of range regarded as agricultural pest. Populations have increased in S Africa during the present century due to building of dams and irrigation systems.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

Total Possible 30
Section One Total 13

2. BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND DISPERSAL ABILITY

2.1. Mode and rate of reproduction
A. No reproduction (e.g. sterile with no sexual or asexual reproduction) 0
B. Limited reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase <10%/ year) 1
C. Moderate reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase between 10-30%/ year) 2
D. Abundant reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase >30%/ year) 4
U. Unknown

Score 2

Documentation:
Describe key reproductive characteristics:
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.2. Migratory behavior
A. Always migratory in its native range 0
B. Non-migratory or facultative migrant in its native range 2
U. Unknown

Score 2

Documentation:
Describe migratory behavior:
Highly mobile locally. May migrate northward from the Nile Valley in its native range.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.3. Biological potential for colonization by long-distance dispersal/ movement.
A. No long-distance dispersal/ movement mechanisms 0
A. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, but studies report that most individuals (90%) establish territories within 10 miles of parent or within a distance twice the home range of 1
the parent, and tend not to cross major barriers such as rivers and major roads
B. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, movement and evidence that offspring often
disperse greater than 10 miles of parent or greater than twice the home range of parent and
will cross major barriers such as river and major roads
U. Unknown

Document  
Identify dispersal mechanisms:
While not breeding, it disperses somewhat, sometimes making longer migrations northward
from the Nile Valley.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.4. Practical potential to be spread by human activities, both directly and indirectly
(possible vectors include: commercial sales, deliberate stocking, translocation,
rehabilitation, pest control industry, agricultural escapes, pet abandonment and
release, etc.)
   A. Does not occur 0
   B. Low (human dispersal to new areas occurs almost exclusively by direct means and is
      infrequent or inefficient) 1
   C. Moderate (human dispersal to new areas occurs by direct and indirect means to a moderate
      extent) 2
   D. High (opportunities for human dispersal to new areas by direct and indirect means are
      numerous, frequent, and successful) 4
   U. Unknown

Document  
Identify dispersal mechanisms:
Benefits from human association. Introduced to Britain in the 17th century, feral populations
exist including Florida and New Zealand.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.5. Non-living chemical and physical characteristics that increase competitive
advantage (e.g., tolerance to various extremes, pH, temperature, fill vacant niche,
charismatic species)
   A. Possesses no characteristics that increase competitive advantage 0
   B. Possesses one characteristic that increases competitive advantage 4
   C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 8
   U. Unknown

Document  
Evidence of competitive ability:
Raised for food and extensively bred in parts of Africa since domesticated by the Egyptians.
Small feral populations have become established in western Europe from chiefly
ornamental birds. Will nest in a wide variety of situations.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.6. Biological characteristics that increase competitive advantage (e.g., high
fecundity, generalist, highly evolved defense mechanisms, behavioral adaptations)
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A. Possesses no characteristics that increase competitive advantage 0
B. Possesses one characteristic that increases competitive advantage 4
C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 8
U. Unknown

Score 8

Documentation:
Evidence of competitive ability:
Aggressively territorial towards their own species when breeding. Both parents take turns incubating eggs. Pair for life. Care for young until they are old enough to care for themselves.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

2.7. Other species in the family and/ or genus invasive in New York or elsewhere?
A. No 0
B. Yes 2
U. Unknown

Score 0

Documentation:
Identify species:

Total Possible 30
Section Two Total 23

3. ECOLOGICAL AMPLITUDE AND DISTRIBUTION

3.1. Current introduced distribution of established populations in the northern latitudes of USA and southern latitude of Canada (e.g., between 35 and 55 degrees)
A. Not known from the northern US or southern Canada 0
B. Established as a non-native in 1 northern USA state and/or southern Canadian province 1
C. Established as a non-native in 2 or 3 northern USA states and/or southern Canadian provinces 2
D. Established as a non-native in 4 or more northern USA states and/or southern Canadian provinces, and/or categorized as a problem species (e.g., “Invasive”) in 1 northern state or southern Canadian province 3
U. Unknown

Score 0

Documentation:
Identify states and provinces:
Current populations in US limited to FL.
Sources of information:
- See known introduced range at www.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.
& Invasive Species Compendium

3.2. Current introduced distribution of established populations of the species in natural areas in the eight New York State PRISMs (Partnerships for Regional Invasive Species Management)
A. Established in none of the PRISMs 0
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Established in 1 PRISM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Established in 2 or 3 PRISMs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Established in 4 or more PRISMs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 0

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

---

### 3.3. Number of known, or potential (each individual possessed by a vendor or consumer is a potential release), individual releases and/or release events (propagule pressure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Few releases (e.g., &lt;10 annually)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Widely domesticated, ornamental species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Regular, small scale releases (e.g., 10-99 annually)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Multiple, large scale (e.g., ≥100 annually)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 2

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

---

### 3.4. Current introduced population density in northern USA and/or southern Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No known populations established</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Low to moderate population density (e.g., ≤1/4 or &lt; to 1/2 native population density)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. High or irruptive population density (e.g., ≥1/2 native population density)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 0

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

---

### 3.5. Number of habitats the species may invade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Not known to invade any natural habitats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Known to occur in 2/3 habitats, with at least 1/2 natural habitat(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Known to occur in 4 or more habitats, with at least 3 natural habitats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 2

**Documentation:**

---
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Identify type of habitats where it occurs and degree/type of impacts:
Favors a diversity of wetlands in open country.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6. Role of anthropogenic (human related) features in establishment (e.g. buildings, roads, agricultural fields, etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Requires anthropogenic disturbances to establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. May occasionally establish in undisturbed areas but can readily establish in areas with natural or anthropogenic disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Can establish independent of any known natural or anthropogenic disturbances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documentation:
Identify anthropogenic features:
Benefits from cultivation. In parts of its range considered an agricultural pest.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7. Climate in native range (e.g., med. to high, &gt;5, Climatch score; within 35 to 55 degree latitude; etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Native range does not include climates similar to New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Native range possibly includes climates similar to portions of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Native range includes climates similar to those in New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documentation:
Describe known climate similarities: 54 degrees N to 34 degrees S. Established in Britain.
Sources of information:
& Invasive Species Compendium

4. DIFFICULTY OF CONTROL

4.1. Re-establishment potential, nearby propagule source, known vectors of re-introduction in vicinity (e.g. biological supplies, pets, game farms, zoos, shooting preserves, connecting corridors, mechanized transportation)

| A. No known vectors/propagule source for re-establishment following removal | 0 |
| B. Possible re-establishment from 1 vector/propagule source following removal | 1 |
| C. Likely to re-establish from 2-3 vectors/propagule sources following removal | 2 |
| D. Strong potential for re-establishment from 4 or more vectors/propagule sources following removal | 3 |
| U. Unknown | Score 1 |

Documentation:
Identify source/ vectors:
Widely domesticated, ornamental species.
Sources of information:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Four Total</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2. Status of monitoring and/or management protocols for species
- **A.** Standardized protocols appropriate to New York State are available **0**
- **B.** Scientific protocols are available from other countries, regions or states **1**
- **C.** No known protocols exist **2**
- **U.** Unknown **Score** 1

**Documentation:**
Describe protocols:

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

#### 4.3. Status of monitoring and/or management resources (e.g. tools, manpower, travel, traps, lures, ID keys, taxonomic specialists, etc.)
- **A.** Established resources are available including commercial and/or research tools **0**
- **B.** Monitoring resources may be available (e.g. partnerships, NGOs, etc) **1**
- **C.** No known monitoring resources are available **2**
- **U.** Unknown **Score** 1

**Documentation:**
Describe resources:

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

#### 4.4. Level of effort required.
- **A.** Management is not required (e.g., species does not persist without repeated human mediated action) **0**
- **B.** Management is relatively easy and inexpensive; invasive species can be maintained at low abundance causing little or no ecological harm (e.g., 10 or fewer person-hours of manual effort can eradicate a local population in 1 year) **1**
- **C.** Management requires a major short-term investment, and is logistically and politically challenging; eradication is difficult, but possible (e.g., 100 or fewer person-hours/year of manual effort, or up to 10 person-hours/year for 2-5 years to suppress a local population) **2**
- **D.** Management requires a major investment and is logistically and politically difficult; eradication may be impossible (e.g., more than 100 person-hours/ year of manual effort, or more than 10 person hours/year for more than 5 years to suppress a local population) **3**
- **U.** Unknown **Score** 2

**Documentation:**
Identify types of control methods and time required:
Populations in the US currently limited to Florida.

**Sources of information:**
& Invasive Species Compendium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section Four Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for 4 sections Possible** 100
C. STATUS OF GENETIC VARIANTS AND HYBRIDS:

At the present time there is no protocol or criteria for assessing the invasiveness of genetic variants independent of the species to which they belong. Such a protocol is needed, and individuals with the appropriate expertise should address this issue in the future. Such a protocol will likely require data on cultivar fertility and identification in both experimental and natural settings.

Genetic variants of the species known to exist: A. aegyptiacus is the only extant member of the genus Alopochen.

Hybrids (crosses between different parent species) should be assessed individually and separately from the parent species wherever taxonomically possible, since their invasiveness may differ from that of the parent species. An exception should be made if the taxonomy of the species and hybrids are uncertain, and species and hybrids can not be clearly distinguished in the field. In such cases it is not feasible to distinguish species and hybrids, and they can only be assessed as a single unit.

Hybrids of uncertain origin known to exist: Hybridization has occurred between A. aegyptiaca and the Orinoco goose Neochen jubata in captivity, and apparent hybrids with mallard Anas platyrhynchos, ruddy shelduck Tadorna ferruginea, Canada goose Branta canadensis and domestic geese.

References for species assessment:
Invasive Species Compendium. www.cabi.org/isc/
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