NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Ditylenchus destructor (DITYDE)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Nematoda **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):
 
Listing of hosts at the genus level is coherent because D. destructor is highly polyphagous. **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 (2007); Bulgaria (2001); Czech Republic (2001); Estonia (2008); France (2001); Germany (2014); Greece (2001); Hungary (1992); Ireland (1998); Latvia (1998); Luxembourg (2001); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2012); Romania (2011); Slovakia (1996); Sweden (1992); United Kingdom (2001); United Kingdom/England (2014); United Kingdom/Scotland (2014)  
Conclusion:
 
candidate  
Justification (if necessary):
 
The Standing Committee agreed in February 2015 to request EFSA for a complete Pest Risk Assessment before taking a decision about the future regulatory status of this pest in the EU (EU COM, 2015). This complete PRA was published in 2016 (EFSA-PLH 2016). Data of the presence of this pest on the EU territory are available in EPPO Global Database (<https://gd.eppo.int/>). The nematode is sporadically present in the majority of EU Member States (EFSA, 2014).

HOST PLANT N°1: Gladiolus (1GLAG) for the Ornamental sector.

Origin of the listing:
 
IIA2AWG  
Plants for planting:
 
Miniature cultivars and their hybrids intended for planting **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:
 
D. destructor attacks a wide range of ornamental and vegetable species, however EFSA quotes only two references, one suggesting the nematodes from Gladiolus were probably feeding on fungi rather than the roots, and the other that there was inconclusive evidence as a host and D. destructor was able to multiply after bulb storage, but maybe on Botrytis. The conclusion was of unclear status but Gladiolus is most likely not a host plant (EFSA-PLH 2016). However experts reported information from the NL inspection services saying that Gladiolus, especially Gladiolus nanus and Gladiolus x colvillei, is a host plant. **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
Yes  
Justification:
 
The reproductive potential of D. destructor is high. It can be assumed that even a small population of D. destructor, present in the soil at the beginning of the growing season, could develop into a very large population causing severe damage to infested host plant. D. destructor can cause significant damage to the below-ground parts (roots, tubers, bulbs) of host crops such as potato and several ornamental plants. It reduces harvest yields of host crops and causes additional damage during storage. In recent years, potato tuber nematodes have caused serious problems on iris and garlic crops in Japan (EFSA, 2014). Experts reported experience from the NL inspection service indicating that Gladiolus are impacted, and considered that it is sufficient to justify the RNQP listing of this pest/host combination. However, D. destructor cannot survive dessication which may be one of the reasons why this species is much less of a problem than D. dipsaci.  
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?
 
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:
 
 **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:**
 
Not recommended for listing as an RNQP: This pest/host/intended use combination meets all the criteria for RNQP status but the requirement for absence of visual symptoms on the traded material (current general 'Substantially free from' requirement in the EU) is considered to be sufficient. **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
No  
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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