NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Opogona sacchari (OPOGSC)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Insecta **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: Fruits (including hops) sector

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

* Candidate: Fruits (including hops) sector

Justification (if necessary):
 
Remark:  
- fruit sector: O. sacchari has a wide host range with species in many different plant families. Musa (banana) and Ananas comosus (pine apple) crops are within the endangered area but are grown on a very limited scale in the PRA area with the exception of Madeira and Azores where the pest is already present. Apart from these host plants, impacts are only foreseen on ornamentals.  
- ornamental sector: The list of ornamental hosts includes species from the families and genera of Cactaceae, Arecaceae (Palmae), Yucca, Dracaena, Beaucarnea, Pachira, Ficus, and various other plant species (mainly with “fleshy” stems) like Strelitzia, Bougainvillea, Sansevieria, Musa, Philodendron, Begonia, Dahlia, etc. (Van der Gaag et al., 2013). Although Capsicum annuum and/or Solanum melongena, which can also be marketed as ornamentals, have been suspected as hosts, no original sources were found reporting these species as natural host plants. Therefore, they were not included as hosts (Van der Gaag et al., 2013). Regulating 'all ornamental plants' would appear to be excessive, because most individual plant species are not known as host plants. It is suggested to regulate those ornamentals on which at least two interceptions have been made (and notified in Europhyt) at the genus level plus Musa. Plants of several genera of the Arecaceae (Palmae) family have been intercepted twice or more (Areca = Dypsis lutescens, Cycas, Howea, Ravenea, Washingtonia) and, to simplify matters, it is proposed to include this family as a whole. This results in the following list of host plants: Arecaceae (Palmae), Beaucarnea, Bougainvillea, Crassula, Crinum, Dracaena, Ficus, Musa, Pachira, Sansevieria and Yucca. **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):
 
Germany (2005); Italy (1992); Netherlands (2015); Poland (1992); Portugal (2008); Portugal/Azores (2005); Portugal/Madeira (2008); Spain (1996); Spain/Islas Canárias (1994)  
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: All plants () for the Fruits (including hops) 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:
 
Moths probably stay within a range of 100 m and possibly a much shorter range from the plants they emerged. Natural spread between greenhouses in areas where the pest cannot establish outdoors has not been documented. Trade of infested planting material is the main pathway for long-distance spread (van der Gaag et al., 2013). **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
Yes  
Justification:
 
Generally, little information has been published on the economic impact of O. sacchari. For banana, pine apple and papaya, minor impacts were observed on the Canary Islands because it is controlled by insecticide sprays targeted against other pests. Impact also seems minor on Madeira. The impact is probably major on Hawaii. From other areas in the world, information on the impact under commercial conditions is very limited. Major impacts are observed on ornamental species, especially in areas with a more tropical climate (warm and humid) such as Hawaii and southern China (van der Gaag et al., 2013).  
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?
 
No  
Conclusion:
 
Not candidate  
Justification:
 
Experts concluded that it is not an important pest for the fruit production and proposed to keep this pest only for discussions during the ornamental SEWG. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Disqualified: Experts concluded that it is not an important pest for the fruit production and proposed to keep this pest only for discussions during the ornamental SEWG. **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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