NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Aculops fuchsiae (ACUPFU)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Acari **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):
 
The Fuchsia gall mite -Aculops fuchsiae (Arachnida: Acarina: Eriophyidae) is a distinct taxonomic entity, with clear diagnostic criteria for identification (EFSA, 2014). **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):
 
France (2011); United Kingdom (2015); United Kingdom/England (2014)  
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/>). This pest is a candidate for the RNQP status according to the IIA2AWG.

HOST PLANT N°1: Fuchsia (1FUCG) 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?**
 
No 
Conclusion:
 
Evaluation continues **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:
 
Fuchsia spp is the only reported hosts of A. fuchsiae and is a widely-grown ornamental of economic value. More than 100 fuchsia species are known currently and according the Euro-Fuchsia association about 15 000 hybrids exist in the world (Euro-Fuchsia, 2016). Fuchsia is mostly traded as cuttings or rooted plants and more than 55 million units are traded in 2010 (EPPO, 2012). Experts concluded that, though already widespread in some areas, when A. fuchsiae is not present in a place of production, plants for planting will remain the main pathway. **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
Yes  
Justification:
 
The quality loss on fuchsia plants has been described in the EU but no quantitative data of these losses have been reported yet. The impact of the mite over the last years in California has led a number of gardeners to give up growing fuchsias entirely (EFSA, 2014).  
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)
 
Major  
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?
 
No  
Conclusion:
 
Candidate  
Justification:
 
The potential economic impact of A. fuchsiae is rated as major because the quality losses are considerable; targeted controls are frequently needed and the treatment is costly. **6 - Are there feasible and effective measures available to prevent the presence of the pest on the plants for planting at an incidence above a certain threshold (including zero) to avoid an unacceptable economic impact as regards the relevant host plants?**
 
 
Conclusion:
 
  
Justification:
 
There is currently no single effective treatment against A. fuchsiae. In California, control attempts over the last 20 years have failed. Further expansion of A. fuchsiae could seriously complicate European fuchsia trade and production (EFSA, 2014). **7- Is the quality of the data sufficient to recommend the pest to be listed as a RNQP?**
 
Yes
 
Conclusion:
 
Candidate  
Justification:
 
 **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Recommended for listing as an RNQP, based on data. **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
No  
Proposed Tolerance levels:
 
Zero tolerance based on visual examination and/or treatment. **9 - Risk management measures:**  
Is there a need to change the Risk management measure:
 
Yes  
Proposed Risk management measure:
 
(a) Plants produced in areas known to be free from Aculops fuchsiae;  
or  
(b) No symptoms seen on the plants, or the mother plants from which they were derived, during inspections at the site of production during the previous growing season;  
or  
(c) Appropriate chemical or physical treatment before dispatch, following which the plants have been inspected and no symptoms seen.  
Justification (if necessary):
 
Some area are still free from the pest (e.g. in France outside littoral area). Some hybrids are more suceptible (with clearer symptoms) than others. Experts commented that chemical treatment may not provide an effective control if mother plants are infested; moreover repeat treatments are needed (e.g. 3 sprays with 4 days interval) and difficulties were noted in their effective application. However the treatment option was proposed as an option if accompanied along with an additional inspection. **REFERENCES:**
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