NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Dickeya dianthicola (Erwinia chrysanthemi pv. dianthicola) (ERWICD)

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

**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):

Belgium (2011); Bulgaria (2014); Finland (2011); France (2011); Germany (2011); Romania (2011); United Kingdom (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/>).

HOST PLANT N°1: Dianthus (1DING) 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):

Although the pest is listed in EPPO PM 4/2 Standard, evaluation continues because NL proposed deregulation of this pest/host combination (the industry already takes sufficient measures). **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:

Dickeya dianthicola has a world-wide distribution. Any strain may occur in temperate countries, where outdoor and glasshouse plants are produced. This pest is of particular concern in the EU for carnations, chrysanthemums, and, more recently, potatoes. The pathovar of Dickeya dianthicola involved here is only pathogenic on Dianthus.
Dianthus is mainly cultivated under a protected cropping system with strict sanitation processes that prevent infection from the surrounding environment or previous crops. Spread from outside a protected cropping system could potentially be by use of unclean equipment or tools, infected cut flowers, infested media or soil or non-disinfected irrigation water, but these are considered unlikely under present usage, and no examples of outbreaks arising from these were given (EFSA PLH, 2013). **5 - Economic impact:**
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?

Yes
Justification:

There are reports on the impact of Erwinia chrysanthemi on several crops (see EPPO datasheet). However, reports on the impact of D. dianthicola on Dianthus cannot be found. The lack of recent publications on this organism and the disease it causes indicates that its importance has now really decreased.
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)

Minor
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:

The industry already takes sufficient measures. It is not a problem thanks to voluntary certification schemes aimed at Fusarium prevention. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**

Disqualified: little evidence of impact now, substantial freedom will suffice. **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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