NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Xylophilus ampelinus (XANTAM)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Bacteria **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: Vine sector

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

* Candidate: Vine 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):
 
France (1995); Greece (1996); Greece/Kriti (1994); Italy (1992); Italy/Sicilia (1994); Italy/Sardegna (1994); Slovenia (2005)  
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: Vitis vinifera (Vitis) (1VITG) for the Vine 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:
 
Qualified  
 
Justification (if necessary):
 
X. ampelinus affects only V. vinifera (EFSA 2014). Evaluation is therefore only proposed for V. vinifera. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Recommended for listing as an RNQP - based on EPPO PM 4 Standard. **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
No  
Proposed Tolerance levels:
 
Zero tolerance on the basis of visual inspections at appropriate times during the last growing season and sampling and testing of plants showing symptoms. **9 - Risk management measures:**  
Is there a need to change the Risk management measure:
 
Yes  
Proposed Risk management measure:
 
Based on visual examination carried out at least once during the last growing season at appropriate times for the expression of symptoms.  
- Non-certified plants (‘standard’):  
(a) Plants produced in areas known to be free from Xylophilus ampelinus;  
or  
(b) Place of production found free from Xylophilus ampelinus;  
or  
(c) Any plants showing symptoms have been uprooted and destroyed and appropriate hygiene measures taken to avoid spread within the nursery.  
  
- Pre-basic (‘initial’), basic and certified:  
Additional measures could include treatment after pruning with a bactericide, and restriction to first two options above.  
Justification (if necessary):
 
Asymptomatic testing is not relevant because symptoms are very clear. The pest can be transmitted with pruning equipment. More stringent measures can be defined at national level. **REFERENCES:**
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