NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae (PSDMPE)

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?
 
Yes  
Conclusion:

* Candidate: Ornamental sector

Justification (if necessary):
 
It is suggested that P. s. pv. persicae, a distinct genetic clade, is responsible for bacterial die-back (EFSA PLH, 2014). **2 – Status in the EU:**
   
Is this pest already a quarantine pest for the whole EU?
 
No  
Presence in the EU:
 
Yes  
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/>). The pest occurs in Portugal, France, Germany, and it has been found in Croatia, France and UK (EU COM, 2014). Remark: There is a moderate uncertainty about the distribution of P. s. pv. persicae in the EU because of the limited number of surveys, the lack of rapid detection tools, and the non specific symptoms (cf. similar symptoms caused by the other Pseudomonas). It may be much more widespread than officially reported (EU COM, 2014).

HOST PLANT N°1: Prunus salicina (PRNSC) 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:
 
Plants for planting are a pathway for introduction and spread of this pest. Long-distance spread is expected to occur via infected planting material. Short-distance dispersal of epiphytic populations of P. s. pv. persicae may occur via splash dispersal and in wind-driven rain, in particular during autumn when population densities on leaves are high. It is likely that short-distance spread can occur during pruning (EFSA, 2014). **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
No  
Justification:
 
No impacts are reported for an ornamental use.  
What is the likely economic impact of the pest irrespective of its infestation source in the absence of phytosanitary measures? (= official measures)
 
Minimal  
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:
 
Experts concluded that ornamentals could have an indirect economic impact on fruit crops produced at the same place of production. **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:**
 
Recommended for listing as an RNQP, based on potential indirect economic impacts on fruit crops at the same place of production. **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
Yes  
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) Plants produced in areas known to be free from Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae;  
or  
(b) Site of production found free from the Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae 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 lot 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. **REFERENCES:**

* EU COM (2014) Recommendation of the Working Group on the Annexes of the Council Directive 2000/29/EC – Section II – Listing of Harmful Organisms as regards the future listing of Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae;
* EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH) (2014) Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of Pseudomonas syringae pv. persicae (Prunier et al.) Young et al. EFSA Journal 2014;12(10):3855, 26 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3855". <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3855.pdf>;