NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Arabis mosaic virus (Arabis mosaic nepovirus) (ARMV00)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):
 
  
Pest category:
 
Viruses and viroids **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):
 
Austria (2014); Belgium (2007); Bulgaria (1995); Croatia (2012); Czech Republic (2007); Denmark (1993); Finland (2011); France (2000); Germany (2009); Hungary (2009); Ireland (1997); Italy (2007); Latvia (1990); Lithuania (2006); Luxembourg (1996); Netherlands (2015); Poland (2012); Romania (2011); Slovenia (1996); Spain (2011); Sweden (1993); United Kingdom (1996); United Kingdom/England (2002); United Kingdom/Northern Ireland (1984); United Kingdom/Scotland (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/>).

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?**
 
Yes 
Conclusion:
 
Evaluation continues  
 
Justification (if necessary):
 
Experts proposed to continue the evaluation regarding the economic impact. **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:
 
Rose plants are a pathway for AMV and the virus is transmitted by Longidorus and Xiphinema virus vector nematodes in the soil. For certified material, testing of nuclear stock and precautions to prevent infection by AMV are included in the Rosa EPPO PM 4 Standard.  
The use of fields (or soil media) for planting uninfested by the vectors (or if present found free by testing), weed control and prevention of infested soil from entering the field or facility, would mean that infested plants for planting could then be the main source of infection by AMV. **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
Yes  
Justification:
 
AMV or SLRV apparently induced either symptomless infection in rose cultivars and Rosa spp., or leaf symptoms ranging from small chlorotic flecks to severe chlorotic mosaic and, occasionally, plant death. After 7 years in soil containing viruliferous nematodes, AMV and/or SLRV were transmitted to c. 80% of healthy plants. AMV and particularly SLRV were each damaging to field-grown maiden rose bushes. Diseased bushes were less vigorous and half of the AMV-infected bushes conformed to the British Standards Institution specifications for maiden bush roses (Thomas, 1984).  
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:
 
Experts of the SEWG stopped the evaluation, considering that a 'substantially free from' requirement (absence of visual symptoms on the traded material) should be sufficient for this pest/host combination. Later, experts of the coreHEWGplus considered that this pest could cause significant damage on Rosa. **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 combination was not identified by any EU MS in the RNQP Questionnaire as requiring a revision of current thresholds and or a revision of current management measures. This pest/host combination was not identified by the experts of the ornamental SEWG as being a candidate for the RNQP Status with specific tolerance levels and/or specific risk management measures. It was analysed by coherence with the other host plants analysed during the RNQP project, because of the listing of the pest in Annex IIA2 of Council Directive 2000/29/EC. Experts concluded that this pest/host/intended use combination meets all the criteria for RNQP status. However, the requirement for absence of visual symptoms on the traded material (current general 'Substantially free from' requirement in the EU) was 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:
 
No  
Proposed Risk management measure:
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