NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Arabis mosaic virus (ARMV00)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Viruses and viroids **1- Identity of the pest/Level of taxonomic listing:**  
Is the organism clearly a single taxonomic entity and can it be adequately distinguished from other entities of the same rank?
 
Yes  
Is the pest defined at the species level or lower?:
 
Yes  
Can listing of the pest at a taxonomic level higher than species be supported by scientific reasons or can species be identified within the taxonomic rank which are the (main) pests of concern?

* Not relevant: Ornamental sector

Is it justified that the pest is listed at a taxonomic rank below species level?
 
Not relevant  
Conclusion:

* Candidate: Ornamental sector

**2 – Status in the EU:**
   
Is this pest already a quarantine pest for the whole EU?
 
No  
Presence in the EU:
 
Yes  
List of countries (EPPO Global Database):
 
Austria (2014); Belgium (2007); Bulgaria (1995); Croatia (2012); Czech Republic (2007); Denmark (1993); Finland (2011); France (2000); Germany (2009); Hungary (2009); Ireland (1997); Italy (2007); Latvia (1990); Lithuania (2006); Luxembourg (1996); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2012); Romania (2011); Slovenia (1996); Spain (2011); Sweden (1993); United Kingdom (1996); United Kingdom/England (2002); United Kingdom/Northern Ireland (1984); United Kingdom/Scotland (1994)  
Conclusion:
 
candidate  
Justification (if necessary):
 
Data of the presence of this pest on the EU territory are available in EPPO Global Database (<https://gd.eppo.int/>).

HOST PLANT N°1: Rubus (1RUBG) for the Ornamental sector.

Origin of the listing:
 
IIA2AWG  
Plants for planting:
 
Plants intended for planting, other than seeds **3 - Is the pest already listed in a PM4 standard on the concerned host plant?**
 
Yes 
Conclusion:
 
Evaluation continues  
 
Justification (if necessary):
 
Rubus is covered by EPPO PM 4/10 Standard. There are at least 10 species of Rubus grown for ornamental purposes for different flower colours or foliage. Experts decided to continue the evaluation in regards to the economic impact. **4 - Are the listed plants for planting the main\* pathway for the "pest/host/intended use" combination? (\*: significant compared to others):**
 
Yes 
Conclusion:
 
Candidate  
 
Justification:
 
Usually propagated vegetatively and no references could be found to the susceptibility or resistance of ornamental Rubus as compared to the variation in normal Rubus cultivars, so it is proposed to conclude they would react to the pest in a similar way. **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
?  
Justification:
 
No specific documented references could be found for impacts on ornamental Rubus species as distinct from fruiting species.  
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)
 
  
Is the economic impact due to the presence of the pest on the named host plant for planting, acceptable to the propagation and end user sectors concerned?
 
Yes  
Is there unacceptable economic impact caused to other hosts (or the same host with a different intended use) produced at the same place of production due to the transfer of the pest from the named host plant for planting?
 
No  
Conclusion:
 
Not candidate  
Justification:
 
Specific evidence cannot be found of economic impact on ornamental rubus. Impacts on rubus for fruit production have been recorded. Experts concluded that ornamental strawberries should not be considered as a significant pathway to economic damage in fruit production (only one among many vegetatively propagated ornamental hosts). **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Disqualified: Experts considered that rubus grown as ornamentals are not a significant pathway to economic damage in fruit production (only one among many vegetatively propagated ornamental hosts). **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
Yes  
Proposed Tolerance levels:
 
Delisting. **9 - Risk management measures:**  
Is there a need to change the Risk management measure:
 
Yes  
Proposed Risk management measure:
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