NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Candidatus Phytoplasma pyri (Pear decline mycoplasm) (PHYPPY)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

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

Pear decline mycoplasm
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

**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 (1993); Belgium (2012); Croatia (2010); Czech Republic (2007); France (2003); Germany (2011); Greece (2011); Hungary (2009); Italy (2012); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2002); Portugal (2013); Slovakia (1997); Slovenia (2014); Spain (2014); United Kingdom (2011); United Kingdom/England (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/>). This pest is a candidate for the RNQP status according to the IIA2AWG

HOST PLANT N°1: Pyrus (1PYUG) 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?**

Yes
Conclusion:

Evaluation continues

Justification (if necessary):

Decision by the HEWG to continue the evaluation of Candidatus phytoplasma in view of the problematic of vector transmission. As Candidatus phytoplasma pyri is very similar and listed in EPPO PM 4/27 Standard, the same decision is proposed for this pest. **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:

Plants for planting can be a very efficient pathway, when propagated from infested plants. Vector transmission is also a pathway but it is considered less efficient than plants for planting. **5 - Economic impact:**
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?

No
Justification:

No information on impacts on ornamental plants.
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?

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?

Yes
Conclusion:

Candidate
Justification:

There is probably no economic impact for the ornamental use. However ornamental plants may be produced at the same place of production than plants for the fruit production. It may be necessary to take measures on ornamental plants, in view of the risk they pose to the fruit sector. **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:

candidate
Justification:

 **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 of possible indirect economic impacts for the fruit sector. **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:

(A) Derived from mother plants which have been inspected and found free from symptoms of 'Candidatus Phytoplasma pyri';
AND
(B) (a) Plants produced in areas known to be free from 'Candidatus Phytoplasma pyri';
or
(b) Site of production found free from the pest over the last complete growing season by visual inspection and any symptomatic plants in the immediate vicinity rogued out and destroyed immediately;
or
(c) No more than 2% of plants in the site of production showing symptoms during inspections at appropriate times during the last growing season, and those plants and any symptomatic plants in the immediate vicinity rogued out and destroyed immediately.
Justification (if necessary):

Experts recommended extrapolating measures from the fruit sector. Remark: ornamental Pyrus are usually not grafted. **REFERENCES:**
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