

## Scientific Panel on Plant Health Minutes of the 60<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting

**Held on 16-17 March, 2016, Parma (Italy)  
(Agreed on 25 May 2016)**

### Participants

■ Panel Members

Claude Bragard, David Caffier, Thierry Candresse, Elisavet Chatzivassiliou, Gianni Gilioli, Jean-Claude Gregoire, Josep Anton Jaques Miret, Michael Jeger, Alan MacLeod, Maria Navajas, Bjorn Niere, Stephen Parnell, Roel Potting, Trond Rafoss (participated via web-conference), Vittorio Rossi, Gregor Urek, Ariena Van Bruggen, Wopke Van Der Werf, Jon West, Stephan Winter

■ Hearing Experts:

John Mumford

■ European Commission and/or Member States representatives:

Pasquale Di Rubbo (DG SANTE)  
Gema Vila Cambra (DG SANTE) (participated via web-conference)  
Roman Vagner (DG SANTE) (participated via web-conference)

■ EFSA:

ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Ciro Gardi, Gabor Hollo, Virag Kertesz, Ioannis Koufakis, Svetla Kozelska, Marco Pautasso, Gritta Schrader, Giuseppe Stancanelli, Sara Tramonti, Sybren Vos

PESTICIDES Unit: Jose Tarazona, Claudia Heppner

PTT Unit: Carsten Behring

■ Observers:

Muriel Suffert European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO)

### 1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from Katharina Dehnen-Schmutz. Alan MacLeod did not participate in the discussion of agenda point 8.2.1., due to a Conflict of Interest being identified for the agenda item.

### 2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

### **3. Declarations of Interest of Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel/ Members**

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>1</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest<sup>2</sup>, EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) and the Specific Declarations of Interest (SDoI) filled in by the Panel Members invited for the present meeting.

For further details on the outcome of the screening of the ADoI or the SDoI, please refer to Annex. Oral Declaration of Interest was asked at the beginning of the meeting and no additional interest was declared.

### **4. Hearing Experts**

Mr. John Mumford was invited to present the final results of the procurement on the development of probabilistic models for quantitative pathway analysis of plant pests introduction in the EU territory, with food commodities for the agenda point 8.2.1.

### **5. Agreement of the minutes of the 59<sup>th</sup> Plenary meeting held on 27-28 January, 2016, Parma, Italy**

The minutes of the 59<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting held on 27-28 January, 2016 were agreed (<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/events/event/160127a>).

### **6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and/or possible adoption or endorsement**

#### **6.1 Discussion and possible adoption of draft scientific opinion on statements on *Xylella fastidiosa* (new urgent mandate)**

- Urgent opinion in the field of plant health regarding *Xylella fastidiosa* (Well et al.), [EFSA-Q-2016-00180](#)
- Scientific advice in the field of plant health regarding *Xylella fastidiosa* (Well et al.) TOR 1, [EFSA-Q-2016-00182](#)
- Scientific advice in the field of plant health regarding *Xylella fastidiosa* (Well et al.) TOR 5, [EFSA-Q-2016-00183](#)

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf>

The current opinion ([EFSA-Q-2016-00180](#)) is the first output that the Panel was requested to produce in order to reply to the mandate. TOR 1 ([EFSA-Q-2016-00182](#)) and 5 ([EFSA-Q-2016-00183](#)) of the mandate will be provided with separate opinions at a later stage.

The Chair of the WG presented the first output for its adoption: Scientific opinion on four statements questioning the EU control strategy against *Xylella fastidiosa*. Last amendments to address the comments from panel were highlighted and further discussion was needed in order to improve clarity of certain parts.

The second day, 17 March, 2016, final version of the opinion was presented with all received feedback from the Panel and it was adopted.

## 6.2 Discussion on draft scientific opinion on Citrus black spot ([EFSA-Q-2015-00601](#)) and update by PLH Panel Working Group on work progress (first reading)

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

Richard Baker will be added to the working group as an external reviewer of the opinion based on his experience with the former EFSA opinions on CBS. The written adoption of the opinion is intended for end of April. Deadline for publications assessment as a part of the opinion is 23 March 2016. In addition to the two papers concretely mentioned in the mandate, about 24 papers from January 2014 to now were analysed. The criteria was established to determine which information is or is not relevant in this context. Preliminary conclusions were presented. The timeline for further meetings was presented. It is intended to send the draft opinion to the Panel on 8 April 2016 for comments and then on 21 April 2016 for written adoption. It was discussed that uncertainty could be reduced by having better knowledge of presence of CBS in South Africa. Furthermore, the relevance of ascospores was discussed.

The WG chair mentioned that the current opinion is focussing on establishment, and as such, it is a much more limited evaluation than a full risk assessment. On this basis, currently an update of the CBS opinion from 2014 is not deemed to be necessary.

The Commission requested the WG to explain clearly in the conclusions the reason why the Magarey et al. 2015 paper, stating that CBS is less likely to establish in Europe than it was concluded in the EFSA 2014 opinion, does not trigger the need for an update of the opinion. Also, the Commission asked for clearer and better understandable maps to see as well as possible where the models differ and the area which is considered suitable for establishment. These two points are also important for the discussion of management of CBS. The WG chair replied that these points will be addressed.

6.3 Discussion on draft scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Ditylenchus destructor* Thome, ([EFSA-Q-2015-00268](#)) and update by PLH Panel Working on work progress (first reading)

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The WG Chair focused his explanation on the pathways, scenarios and specifically on the risk reduction options identified by the WG. Two WG members provided detailed information regarding i) specifications on the host range of *Ditylenchus destructor* (which is one of the specific questions in the terms of reference) and ii) calculation approach and results for the seed potato pathway. A discussion followed on the specific pathway of soil with respect to sugar beet processing and the exclusion criteria for the host range. The issues of estimation and justification of values and presentation and interpretation of quantitative results in the opinion were discussed as well.

6.4 Discussion on draft scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Ceratocystis platani* (Walter) Engelbrecht et Harrington, ([EFSA-Q-2015-00265](#)) and update by PLH Panel Working Group on work progress (first reading)

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The WG chair explained that the WG focused so far on the A0 scenario, without additional risk reduction options (RROs). There will be a physical meeting on Friday 18 March, 2016 dedicated to the RROs. Various pathways of entry were defined and estimates for the various ratings were provided, but the WG still needs to discuss the results of the risk calculations. A discussion followed on the importance of extreme values vs. median values. The issue of providing justifications for the estimated quantiles (arbitrary or subjective) was mentioned.

6.5 Discussion on draft scientific opinion on risk assessment of Grapevine *Flavescence dorée* ([EFSA-Q-2015-00271](#)) and update by PLH Panel Working Group on work progress (first reading)

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The WG Chair presented the recent work progress of the WG on *Flavescence dorée*. The challenges of working on a pilot case while the methodology is being developed in parallel and the importance of reciprocal feedback among the other groups has been highlighted. The WG interpretation of the terms of reference was summarized and

followed by an approach focusing on spread, impact and risk reduction options. The proposed scenarios were schematically demonstrated. General difficulties of setting the quantiles were noted. The WG found it particularly problematic to justify figures that are estimated. A key question arose regarding how to be transparent and how to explain the uncertainties. It was stressed that the work goes more slowly than planned and continuous support from the Methodology WG is needed. Possible request for extension of the deadline was signalled. Future meeting plan was also presented. Based on the discussions, it became clear that other pilot projects are experiencing similar problems related to the new methodology. The Panel agreed that a harmonized way to approach the quantifications and justify the choices is needed.

## 7. New Mandates

See point 6.1

## 8. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission

8.1 Scientific Committee and/or Scientific Panel(s) including their Working Groups

8.1.1. Request from the European Commission to complete the Pest Risk Assessment (step 2) of 7 regulated pests: update by PLH Panel Working Groups on work progress

- PLH Panel Working Group "Directive 2000/29 Methods": development of fit for purpose risk assessment methodologies and process to update EU listing of regulated plant pests ([EFSA-Q-2014-00351](#))
  - Presentation and discussion on methodology and template for pest risk assessment and update on WG progresses

The template has been further developed and clarified. An update of the testing of the template was given and the state of play of the database that had been developed for risk assessments for apples was presented. The main current problem is the explanation/justification of chosen values and the lack of detailed explanations of the mathematical part of the work. PLH colleagues will get training in @risk software to better support working groups.

- Presentation and discussion on methodology and template for risk reduction options (RROs) and update on WG progresses

Different tools are under development to assist the panel with identification and evaluation of RROs. Timeline of the work plan and definitions of several terms were provided. Guidance for evaluation of RROs was presented in a 7 step plan, including a specific example of a possible scenario.

- Update of work plan for *Cryphonectria parasitica* (Murrill) Barr ([EFSA-Q-2015-00266](#))

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The current situation of the opinion on the causal agent of chestnut blight was presented. The composition of the WG was described (same as for *C. platani*, but with additional pathogen experts: Anna Maria Vettraino (Univ. of Tuscia, Italy), Giorgio Maresi (Fondazione Edmund Mach, Italy) and Simone Prospero (WSL, Switzerland). The possibility of a conditional risk assessment given the already widespread presence of the pathogen in the risk assessment area was mentioned. However, assessing the risk of entry, establishment and spread would still be important given the harmful effect that the introduction of additional vegetative compatibility types would have on the currently effective biological control of chestnut blight.

- Update of work plan for *Diaporthe vaccinii* Shaer, ([EFSA-Q-2015-00267](#))

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

In the update the following activities and data collection were listed:

1) Pathway analysis (qualitative); 2) Climate suitability modelling of *D. vaccinii*; 3) Interception data; 4) Berries production data; 5) Plants for planting trade (based on Isefor database). A plan for the upcoming activities was presented, such as the analysis of *Vaccinium* species distribution in Europe (including mapping at NUTS2 level), and further collection of data and analysis on plants for planting.

- Update on work plan on risk assessment of *Eotetranychus lewisi* (McGregor), ([EFSA-Q-2015-00270](#))

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

Future plan of the WG activities was presented. Recommendation for pest categorization from SCOPAFF was presented as well. Data collection related to this WG will be completed by September 2016 and prior to the data collection finalization the WG plans to define scenarios and perform risk assessment. Once the data collection is available, the WG will identify

and evaluate single measures and combinations of measures, for example: pest free area, pest free production or site or removal of diseased plants and appropriate treatments.

- Update on work plan on risk assessment of *Radopholus similis* ([EFSA-Q-2015-00269](#))

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The WG Chair informed the Panel that the WG is currently focusing on the development of *Ditylenchus destructor* draft opinion and the work on *Radopholus similis* draft will initiate in autumn 2016. It was also mentioned that there is a need to invite an additional external expert to the WG.

#### 8.1.2. Update from Scientific Committee and its Working Groups

The Panel chair provided updated information regarding the EFSA WG on uncertainty and piloting the EFSA Guidance on uncertainties by the PLH Panel. The PLH Panel is supposed to demonstrate that the guidance was used and an overall assessment of uncertainties at the end-point of the risk assessment was provided. The application and use of the guidance will be monitored by EFSA. An update of the WG's on revisions of opinions and on environmental risk was provided by the Panel chair as well.

### 8.2 EFSA including its Working Groups /Task Forces

#### 8.2.1 Presentation of the final results of the procurement on the development of probabilistic models for quantitative pathway analysis of plant pests introduction for the EU territory, with food commodities. CFT/EFSA/PLH/2011/05, ([EFSA-Q-2011-00396](#))

The Contractor demonstrated the way in which the probabilistic quantitative pathway analysis model can be used in risk assessment for plant pest introduction into EU territory on four commodities (apples, oranges, stone fruits and wheat). Two types of models have been developed: a general commodity model that simulates the distribution of an imported infested/infected commodity to and within the EU and a consignment model that simulates the movement and distribution of individual consignments from source countries to destinations in the EU. The two types of models were illustrated for the four commodities, with source countries selected on the basis of specific case-study pests. The output of the general pathway model is a distribution of estimated volumes of infested produce by NUTS2 region across the EU monthly or annually. The output of the consignment model is a volume of infested produce retained at each stage along the specific consignment trade

chain. Sensitivity analysis of parameters in the model demonstrates diverse risks in time, in space and by use-stream. The models offer opportunities to explore scenarios related to sources, infestation levels, trade volumes, timing, distribution patterns, and use-streams, and for management measures that might be employed on commodity pathways to mitigate risks. Following the presentation, the models have been debated in the panel and further practical suggestions were given in relation to their future applicability.

8.2.2 EFSA WG Prometheus “PROmoting METHods for Evidence Use in Scientific assessments”: review of the online survey to identify methodological needs

Due to time constraints the Panel decided to deal with this agenda point by e-mail.

8.2.3 Report on activities on plant health risk assessment of plant protection products: progress update on the Flumioxazin mandate ([EFSA-Q-2015-00570](#))

The [Composition of the WG](#) was presented.

The WG presented methodology that was proposed at the Pesticide Network Meeting, held in Parma on the March 10, 2016. There was a general consensus on the methodology proposed, although some refinement was agreed with the MS representatives. In particular it was agreed to leave the MS the role of: 1) providing the full list of active substances (AS) authorization for a given crop/use; 2) providing the short list of the alternative Active Substances (AS), providing supporting evidences for the AS, registered, but not shortlisted. The MS should also provide indication for the availability/non availability of non-chemical alternatives, providing also supporting evidence and justifications.

A revised version of the methodology will be circulated for comments among MS by the end of April 2016.

8.3 European Commission

The PLH Panel was informed about the developments regarding the expected extension of deadline for the seven pests under development and possible inclusion of *Atropellis* sp. in the current mandate.

8.4 Report back from Annexes WG, DG Sante, PAFF

On 24 February, 2016, the new methodology for risk assessment of the PLH panel was presented by the PLH team to the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF). In the discussion with the PAFF members it was clarified that, i) when data is lacking, expert judgment is used and the assessment can easily be updated when new information is available, ii) the quantitative method has international relevance and iii) it contributes to the needs for the new plant health regime.

## **9. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion**

### **9.1 Discussion on future PLH Panel self-tasks**

Due to lack of time, there was no discussion on this topic but a table with possible self-task topics was circulated.

### **9.2 Draft time schedule for PLH Panel plenary meetings in 2017**

The Panel agreed on following dates for its plenary meetings in 2017:  
25-26 January 2017, 29 -30 March 2017, 23-24 May 2017, 27-28 June 2017 (one day joined session with AHAW Panel), 27-28 September 2017, 22-23 November 2017

## **10. Any other business**

The Panel was reminded about the following upcoming activities:

- 23 – 26 August 2016 – 10th Meeting International Pest Risk Research Group, Parma, Italy
- 12-14 December 2016 – Joint EFSA-EPPO Workshop: Modelling in Plant Health – how can models support risk assessment of plant pests and decision making? Parma, Italy

Next PLH Plenary meeting will be an open Plenary held in Brussels on 25-26 May 2016.

## Annex

### **Interests and actions resulting from the screening of Specific Declarations of Interest (SDoI)**

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** In the SDoI filled for the present meeting Mr Alan MacLeod declared the following interest: "I was project researcher on this project - Development of probabilistic models for quantitative pathway analysis of plant pests introduction for the EU territory 2011/S 156-25883: Food pathways - a service contract for EFSA". In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes<sup>3</sup> and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest<sup>4</sup>, and taking into account the specific matters discussed at the meeting in question, the interest above was deemed to represent a Conflict of Interest.

This results in exclusion of the expert from any discussion, voting or other processing of item 8.2.1. by the concerned scientific group.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf>