NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Phialophora cinerescens (PHIACI)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PEST

Name as submitted in the project specification (if different to the preferred name):

Pest category:

Fungi **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):

Belgium (2011); Croatia (2011); France (2011); Germany (2011); Greece (1996); Hungary (1992); Ireland (1992); Italy (1992); Poland (1992); Slovenia (2011); Spain (1996); United Kingdom (1996); United Kingdom/England (1994); United Kingdom/Northern Ireland (1994); 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: Dianthus (1DING) 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?**

Yes
Conclusion:

Evaluation continues

Justification (if necessary):

Although the pest is listed in EPPO PM 4/2 Standard, evaluation continues because the NL proposed deregulation of this pest/host combination in the replies to the RNQP questionnaire. **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:

Phialophora wilt of carnation infects host plants of Dianthus spp. and this can be of infection in cuttings that are used for production of plants for flowers or transplanting. Other sources are by natural spread via infested soil, which is possible but very slow, and by infested irrigation water. The pathogen is able to survive for years in infested soil, most likely as a saprophyte. Nevertheless, the production techniques used in recent decades (certification schemes for planting material including testing of original material, meristem culture, growing on raised benches, unused media or treated soil, pathogen-free water) have reduced the probability of infestation on cuttings of susceptible Dianthus spp. Plants for propagation (rooted and unrooted cuttings of host plants) are therefore considered as a major pathway (EFSA 2013). **5 - Economic impact:**
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?

Yes
Justification:

Impact of Phialophora cinerescens on the intended use of the plants for planting is concluded as high because this is the main source of infection, other mechanisms for introduction of the pest are unlikely under existing production systems (EU COM, 2016).
There are no recent reports on negative effects on currently grown carnation varieties under either natural or artificial inoculation conditions. Older work showed in an experiment carried out in naturally infested soil the proportion of infected plants at the end of the trial was 52.1 % in the control plots and 22.9 % in soil disinfested with dazomet, and the number of flowers produced per plant was 5.7 in control plots and 7.3 in disinfested plots (+ 21 %). In artificially inoculated soil, all the plants were killed at the end of the trial in the control plots; in plots drenched with 4 g/m2 of benomyl only 11.3 % of plants died.
The impact of P. cinerescens carnation wilt would be very high only if already infected rooted cuttings were imported on to a farm or nursery. The presence of the pathogen would have a significant impact on carnation production only in the absence of any control measures. In this case, the yield of each infected plant would be completely lost (EFSA PLH, 2013).
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?

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 considered that there is no added value for regulation. In professional production systems, the pest is not known anymore. Organism does not occur in the modern production system, because of the application of voluntary certification systems aimed at Fusarium prevention. The substantially free from requirement is considered to be sufficient. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**

Disqualified: little evidence of impact now, substantial freedom will suffice. **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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