NAME OF THE ORGANISM: Xylophilus ampelinus (XANTAM)

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: Vine sector, Ornamental sector

Is it justified that the pest is listed at a taxonomic rank below species level?
 
Not relevant  
Conclusion:

* Candidate: Vine sector, 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):
 
France (1995); Greece (1996); Greece/Kriti (1994); Italy (1992); Italy/Sicilia (1994); Italy/Sardegna (1994); Slovenia (2005)  
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: Vitis vinifera (Vitis) (1VITG) for the Vine 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:
 
Qualified  
 
Justification (if necessary):
 
X. ampelinus affects only V. vinifera (EFSA 2014). Evaluation is therefore only proposed for V. vinifera. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Recommended for listing as an RNQP - based on EPPO PM 4 Standard. **8 - Tolerance level:**  
Is there a need to change the Tolerance level:
 
No  
Proposed Tolerance levels:
 
Zero tolerance on the basis of visual inspections at appropriate times during the last growing season and sampling and testing of plants showing symptoms. **9 - Risk management measures:**  
Is there a need to change the Risk management measure:
 
Yes  
Proposed Risk management measure:
 
Based on visual examination carried out at least once during the last growing season at appropriate times for the expression of symptoms.  
- Non-certified plants (‘standard’):  
(a) Plants produced in areas known to be free from Xylophilus ampelinus;  
or  
(b) Place of production found free from Xylophilus ampelinus;  
or  
(c) Any plants showing symptoms have been uprooted and destroyed and appropriate hygiene measures taken to avoid spread within the nursery.  
  
- Pre-basic (‘initial’), basic and certified:  
Additional measures could include treatment after pruning with a bactericide, and restriction to first two options above.  
Justification (if necessary):
 
Asymptomatic testing is not relevant because symptoms are very clear. The pest can be transmitted with pruning equipment. More stringent measures can be defined at national level. **REFERENCES:**

* EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH) (2014) Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of Xylophilus ampelinus (Panagopoulos) Willems et al. EFSA Journal 2014;12(12):3921, 26 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3921 <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3921.pdf>;
* EU COM (2016) 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 Xylophilus ampelinus (Panagopoulos) Willems et al.;

HOST PLANT N°2: Vitis vinifera (Vitis) (1VITG) 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):
 
Grapevine is occasonially grown as an ornamental plant e.g. Roger's Red, an interspecific hybrid between wild grape (Vitis californica) and the V. vinifera cv. Alicante Bouschet, and Claret Vine (V. vinifera cv. Purpurea Nana) in North America and ornamental vine Vitis coignetiae in Europe. However X. ampelinus affects only V. vinifera (EFSA 2014). Evaluation is therefore only proposed for V. vinifera. Experts recommended performing a specific evaluation on this pest/host combination for the ornamental use, even though the pest is listed in PM 4/8. **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:
 
No specific references of X. ampelinus in ornamental cvs could be found, so it is not known how any hybrids would react.  
X. ampelinus is transmitted locally by rain, wind, overhead sprinkler irrigation and human activity within vineyards, and by plants for planting material over long distances, especially as infected planting material is, most of the time, asymptomatic. In affected vineyards, X. ampelinus overwinters in woody cankers present on trunks, branches or twigs, and in infected asymptomatic plants (EFSA 2014). **5 - Economic impact:**  
Are there documented reports of any economic impact on the host?
 
?  
Justification:
 
No specific references of X. ampelinus in ornamental cvs could be found.  
Significant losses are reported in many countries depending on agro-climatic conditions and susceptibility of grapevine varieties of V. vinifera (EFSA-PLH 2014), how significant these would be with plants of this species and hybrids grown for ornamental purposes is not available.  
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:
 
Ornamental Vitis species being produced at the same place of production as Vitis vinifera for fruit production must be inspected in order to comply with the measures set out for the fruit sector. Otherwise substantial freedom is considered to be sufficient. **CONCLUSION ON THE STATUS:**
 
Disqualified: No specific data for the ornamental sector. Ornamental Vitis produced at the same place of production as Vitis vinifera for fruit production must be inspected to comply with the measures set out for the fruit production. **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:
 
Delisting. **REFERENCES:**

* EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH) (2014) Scientific Opinion on the pest categorisation of Xylophilus ampelinus (Panagopoulos) Willems et al. EFSA Journal 2014;12(12):3921, 26 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3921 <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3921.pdf>;
* EU COM (2016) 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 Xylophilus ampelinus (Panagopoulos) Willems et al.;