NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Erwinia amylovora (ERWIAM)

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: 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):

Fire blight has been described in nearly 200 plant species, mostly within the family Rosaceae, and within the subfamily Maloideae. The most frequent host genera are Chaenomeles, Cotoneaster, Crataegus, Cydonia, Eriobotrya, Malus, Mespilus, Pyrus, Photinia, Pyracantha, Sorbus and Stranvaesia (EFSA PLH, 2014). This is justified to continue the evaluation of E. amylovora on host plants listed at the genus level. **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 (2012); Croatia (2007); Cyprus (1990); Czech Republic (2013); Denmark (1987); Estonia (2013); Finland (2014); France (2011); Germany (2013); Greece (2000); Greece/Kriti (1990); Hungary (2012); Ireland (2010); Italy (2013); Italy/Sicilia (1992); Latvia (2014); Lithuania (2010); Luxembourg (1984); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2001); Romania (2011); Slovakia (2005); Slovenia (2003); Spain (2016); Sweden (2008); United Kingdom (2014); United Kingdom/England (2014); United Kingdom/Northern Ireland (2014); United Kingdom/Scotland (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: Amelanchier (1AMEG) 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:

The main risk of introduction and spread of fire blight over medium and long distances is through plant material contaminated with E. amylovora, and mainly through plant nursery materials, because the pathogen can live as an epiphyte or an endophyte in buds and shoots. Once infections have taken place, rain and wind (especially thunderstorms) play an important role in the transport of inoculum over short distances and probably also over medium to long distances (aero currents). Insect pollinators are efficient carriers over short and medium distances. Workers in orchards can serve as an efficient system of disseminating E. amylovora, especially over short to medium distances, by means of hands, clothing, pruning and spraying tools (EFSA PLH, 2014). To conclude, if the pest is present on the plants for planting, it may be easily spread over the place of production and no curative measure will be available. Taking preventive measures into account (e.g. spraying of copper compounds), plants for planting are considered to be a significant pathway compared to others. It is justified to regulate this pathway. **5 - Economic impact:**
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?

Yes
Justification:

Many publications list the genera as an ornamental host of E. amylovora. In the first case in Bulgaria, many Amelanchier sp. shrubs had severely blighted flowers, fruitlets, shoots and branches, and dried, amber ooze droplets on the shoots (Bobev et al., 2007). Remark: Losses are more important on pear, apple and quince (EFSA PLH, 2014). Artificial inoculations on immature pear fruits and young shoots of Maloideae and Ruboideae showed a restricted pathogenicity for the strains from Rubus and Amelanchier, with the latter inciting blight symptoms only on Amelanchier (Giorgi & Scortichini, 2005).
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)

Medium
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:

 **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?**

Yes

Conclusion:

candidate
Justification:

Existing control is mainly based on prevention and exclusion. The use of chemical or biological products can prevent infection, and sanitation methods applied to infected plants can control the disease to a certain extent. No curative chemical control agents are available to eradicate E. amylovora (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. **9 - Risk management measures:**
Is there a need to change the Risk management measure:

Yes
Proposed Risk management measure:

The proposed measures are without prejudice to additional measures needed to provide the appropriate level of assurance in relation to plants moving into the protected zone or other areas where Erwinia amylovora is recognised as a quarantine organism:
(a) Plants produced in areas known to be free from Erwinia amylovora;
or
(b) The production site has been inspected at an appropriate time during the last growing season and plants showing symptoms, and any surrounding host plants, have been immediately rogued out and destroyed.
Justification (if necessary):

Plants grown in buffer zones for passporting for movement into the protected zone, if this measure is maintained, would meet the requirements of either the first or the second option for movements within the rest of the EU. **REFERENCES:**
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