NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Pratylenchus (1PRATG)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
Pratylenchus spp.  
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?:
 
No  
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?

* Yes: 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):
 
In the replies to the RNQP Questionnaire for the 'Ornamental' Sector, no EU Member State supported a listing of the entire genus. However SE suggested to define specific Risk management measures for this entry on Rosa. Experts considers that P. penetrans and P. vulnus are the two main species on Rosa and proposed to continue the evaluation on these two specific species. **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):
 
The pest is present worldwide.

HOST PLANT N°1: Rosa (1ROSG) for the Ornamental sector.

Origin of the listing:
 
Commission Directive 93/49/EEC  
Plants for planting:
 
Plants intended for planting **3 - Is the pest already listed in a PM4 standard on the concerned host plant?**
 
No 
Conclusion:
 
Evaluation continues  
 
Justification (if necessary):
 
Remark: Three species Pratylenchus penetrans, P. thornei and P. vulnus are covered by the Rosa EPPO PM 4 Standard, so for certified material precautions to prevent infection by soil pests especially P. penetrans and P. vulnus are advised, plus soil testing. **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:
 
Three species Pratylenchus penetrans, P. thornei and P. vulnus are covered by the Rosa EPPO PM 4 Standard, so for certified material precautions to prevent infection by soil pests especially P. penetrans and P. vulnus are advised, plus soil testing. In conclusion, plants for planting are a pathway. The use of non-infested fields or soil media for planting, weed control and prevention of infested soil from entering the field or facility, would mean that infested plants for planting would then be the main source of infestation. **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
Yes  
Justification:
 
Santo & Lear (1975) demonstrated that Pratylenchus vulnus is involved in a disease of Rosa noisettiana 'Manetti' rose rootstock characterized by darkening of roots, death of feeder roots, and stunting of entire plants. The disease is more severe when plants are grown in silt loam soil than when they are grown in sandy loam soil.  
Roses are widely used in landscaping and rootstocks and species of Rosa vary in their tolerance to P. penetrans, affecting mortality, reducing numbers of leaves and roots and in fresh weights of shoots, roots and whole plants (Peng YunLiang & Moens, 2002). Similar reactions are found for other species.  
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?
 
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: P. penetrans and P. vulni on Rosa meet all the criteria for RNQP status. However phytosanitary products based on oxamyl can be used to suppress and manage the risk. No evidence is available on how widespread these two species are. Regarding the wide host range of these pests, the RNQP status on Rosa only would not be justified. Moreover 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 on this host. **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:
 
No  
Proposed Risk management measure:
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