NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Cherry leaf roll virus (CLRV00)

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

Justification (if necessary):
 
CLRV is currently regulated in Council Directive 2000/29/EC on plants of Rubus spp. intended for planting. CLRV is also listed on Juglans regia L., Olea Europea L, Prunus avium L. and Prunus cerasus L. in the fruit marketing directive. CLRV is also included in EPPO PM 4 Standards for the following hosts: Rubus (PM 4/10), hops (PM 4/16) olive (PM 4/17), cherry (PM 4/29) and Sambuscus (PM 4/32). However, CLRV was detected in the following new host plants: grapevine (Herrera and Madariaga, 2001), Malus domestica (Woo et al., 2012), Vaccinium darrowii (Woo et al., 2012), Actinidia chinensis (Blouin et al., 2013) and Ribes rubrum (Woo and Pearson, 2014) in the last six years. These findings show that the CLRV host range is much wider than previously reported. At the moment CLRV is not listed in EPPO PM 4 Standards for grapevine, Malus, Vaccinium and Ribes, which Standards were approved before the CLRV was detected on these hosts. Malus, Hop, Vaccinium and Ribes are symptomless hosts of CLRV and therefore no economic impact has been recorded on these hosts. As economic damage has been recorded on grapevine and kiwifruits (Ipach et al. 2003; Komorowska et al., 2012; Martelli and Boudon-Padieu 2006; Blouin et al., 2013 ), these two hosts are analysed within the RNQP project.  
- Vitis: Based on analogy with other nepoviruses which are involved in the etiology of grapevine infective degeneration disease which affect Vitis vinifera and inter-species hybrid, as well as on insufficient study and data on the presence and prevalence of CLRV in grapevine rootstocks (inter-species hybrids mainly between Vitis rupestris, Vitis riparia and Vitis berlandieri) and other species of the genus Vitis, it is proposed to analyse the RNQP Status of CLRV on the entire Vitis genus.  
- Actinidia: Worldwide, the kiwifruit cultivation mainly involves two species: A. deliciosa, representing the vast majority of the commercial production and A. chinensis, which comprises most of the newest cultivars. CLRV has been detected on A. chinensis in New Zealand. There is a lack of information about presence of the virus on other species of Actinidia. This is why the analysis of the entire Actinidia genus is performed. CLRV can spread via pollen and seed in nature in many of the host plants, however, no information is available in the literature on this mode of transmission in Actinidia.  
- Rubus: experts recommended analysing the RNQP status for the whole genus. **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 (2015); Bulgaria (1996); Croatia (2011); Czech Republic (1992); Finland (2011); France (2016); France/Corse (2016); Germany (1997); Greece (2008); Hungary (1996); Italy (1996); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2013); Portugal (1997); Romania (1986); Slovakia (2000); Slovenia (1995); Spain (2011)  
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/>). CLRV was recorded on grapevine in Germany (Ipach et al., 2003) and Poland (Komorowska et al., 2012). No systematic surveys of CLRV were performed in the EU on many of its natural woody hosts, including Actinidia spp, therefore its presence on these hosts is probably underestimated.

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

Origin of the listing:
 
IIA2AWG  
Plants for planting:
 
Plants intended for planting **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. However as experts of the Fruit SEWG recommended to analyse more deeply the economic impact, evaluation continues for impact. **4 - Are the listed plants for planting the main\* pathway for the "pest/host/intended use" combination? (\*: significant compared to others):**
 
 
Conclusion:
 
  
 
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?
 
No impact  
Justification:
 
No specific documented references could be found for impacts on ornamental Rubus species as distinct from fruiting species so it is proposed to conclude they may react to the pest in a similar way.  
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?
 
  
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?
 
  
Conclusion:
 
Not candidate  
Justification:
 
Experts agreed that impact is acceptable on Rubus (usually latent on this host) and proposed to deregulate the pest on this host. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Disqualified: impact is acceptable on Rubus (usually latent on this host). **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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