NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Cryphonectria parasitica (ENDOPA)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):

Pest category:

Fungi **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: Forest reproductive material sector

Is it justified that the pest is listed at a taxonomic rank below species level?

Not relevant
Conclusion:

* Candidate: Forest reproductive material sector

Justification (if necessary):

Castanea: In the replies to the RNQP Questionnaire for the forestry sector, ENA only proposed the listing of Castanea sativa. However experts proposed a listing at a level higher than species since at least 8 Castanea spp. are identified as being natural or experimental host plants (EFSA, 2014). Experts of the fruit SEWG agreed with the evaluation proposed by the forestry SEWG on Castanea.
Quercus: In the replies to the RNQP Questionnaire for the forestry sector, ENA only proposed the listing of a defined list of species (Quercus suber, Q. rubra, Q. robur, Q. pubescens, Q. petraea, Q. ilex and Q. cerris). However experts proposed a listing at a level higher than species since at least 7 Quercus spp. are identified as being natural or experimental host plants (EFSA, 2014).
Remark: Although intraspecific variability is lower in Europe than in North America, there is great variability between different populations at the local and regional level and the result of subsequent sexual recombination produced by the contact of different populations. **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 (2016); Bulgaria (2013); Croatia (2012); France (2014); France/Corse (1999); Germany (2014); Greece (2016); Greece/Kriti (2006); Hungary (2012); Italy (2014); Italy/Sicilia (2006); Italy/Sardegna (2009); Portugal (2014); Portugal/Azores (2007); Portugal/Madeira (2007); Romania (2013); Slovakia (2014); Slovenia (2012); Spain (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/>).

HOST PLANT N°1: Quercus (1QUEG) for the Forest reproductive material 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):**

No
Conclusion:

Justification:

Experts considered that infection of oaks only occur in presence of high infection pressure. Because such infestation rates do not occur in nurseries, oak plants are not considered as a significant pathway. **5 - Economic impact:**
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?

Yes
Justification:

Most authors agree, that C. parasitica has much less severe effect on Quercus hosts than on Castanea. The size of the cankers on oaks are regularly smaller and its development is slower than on Castanea. Its finding in Hungary raised serious awareness in the beginning of the new millennium. According to a survey (Szabó et al., 2009) 2.14% (2003) and 2.76% (2004) mortality was recorded in the South West part of the country on Quercus. Since then no considerable damage was reported in Hungary.
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)

Minimal
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:

In absence of high infection pressure on Castanea, no significant damage is foreseen. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**

Disqualified: No significant damage (e.g. in France - very rarely seen, never seen in nurseries) except where there is high infection pressure on Castanea, oak plants are not a significant pathway. **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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