Scientific Panel on Plant Health
Minutes of the 63rd Plenary meeting

Held on 28-29 September, 2016, Parma (Italy)
(Agreed by written procedure on 21st October2016)

Participants

- Panel Members

  Claude Bragard, David Caffier, Thierry Candresse, Elisavet Chatzivassiliou, Katharina Dehnen-Schmutz, Gianni Gilioli, Michael Jeger, Alan MacLeod, Maria Navajas, Bjorn Niere, Stephen Parnell, Roel Potting, Trond Rafoss, Vittorio Rossi, Gregor Urek, Ariena Van Bruggen, Wopke Van Der Werf (via tele-conference), Stephan Winter, Jonathan West

- Hearing Experts:

  Gritta Schrader

- European Commission and/or Member States representatives:

  Marina Marini, Mylona Panagiota, Pasquale Di Rubbo

- EFSA:

  ALPHA Unit: Ciro Gardi, Gabor Hollo, Virag Kertesz, Svetla Kozelska, Maria Rosaria Mannino, Marco Pautasso, Giuseppe Stancanelli, Sybren Vos,

  RISKCOMMS Unit: Arthur Healy, Sharon Monti

  AMU Unit: Olaf Mosbach-Schulz

- Observers:

  Muriel Suffert (EPPO)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants to the 63rd plenary meeting of the EFSA Plant Health Panel.

Apologies were received from Jean-Claude Gregoire and Josep Jaques Miret.

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[1] and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest[2] , 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. No additional interest was declared.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 62nd Plenary meeting held on 29-30 June, 2016, Parma, Italy

The minutes of the 62nd plenary meeting held on 29-30 June, 2016, were agreed.

https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/160629-m.pdf

5. Report on written procedures since 62nd Plenary meeting

There were no written procedures since the 62nd plenary meeting.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for adoption/discussion

6.1 Presentation for discussion and possible adoption of Scientific advice on *Vitis*, *Citrus* and *Quercus* as hosts of *Xylella fastidiosa* (EFSA-Q-2016-00446)

Following a request from the European Commission, the EFSA Plant Health Panel analysed a dossier submitted by the Italian Authorities to reach a conclusion on the status of *Vitis* spp., *Citrus* spp. and *Quercus ilex* as hosts for *X. fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO. The Panel acknowledged the difficulty to provide compelling evidence for non-susceptibility of a particular plant species. In the case of *Vitis* spp., the Panel considered that convergent lines of evidence provide sufficient demonstration that the tested varieties (Cabernet Sauvignon, Negroamaro and Primitivo) do not support a systemic infection by the CoDiRO strain. The extension of this conclusion to other grapevine varieties and to *Vitis* species other than *Vitis vinifera*, is associated with significant uncertainties. The Panel therefore considers it premature to conclude that all *Vitis* species are

[1] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf
[2] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf

unable to support a CoDiRO systemic infection. In addition, although the local accumulation detected in the mechanical inoculation experiments may represent an artefact, the Panel considers it premature to conclude that the tested grapevine varieties are not able to support local multiplication of the CoDiRO strain. Further extension of this conclusion to other grapevine varieties and to non-*vinifera* species is also premature. For *Citrus* spp., the data available provide coherent and converging lines of evidence suggesting that sweet orange may be a non-systemic host of strain CoDiRO. However, given the limited scope of the data available on other species, the Panel considers it premature to reach a general conclusion for all *Citrus* species. The potential epidemiological consequences of non-systemic infections remain to be fully evaluated. In the case of *Quercus ilex*, the Panel concludes that the limited data available provides some evidence suggesting that it may not be a systemic host of the CoDiRO strain, but that it would be premature to consider this tentative conclusion as firmly established.

The draft opinion was adopted by the Panel.

6.2 Presentation for discussion and possible adoption of Scientific advice on *Phoenix* as host of *Xylella* (EFSA-Q-2016-00447)

Following a request from the European Commission, the EFSA Plant Health Panel analysed a dossier submitted by Costa Rica Authorities to reach a conclusion on the host status of *Phoenix roebelenii* for *Xylella fastidiosa*. The Panel wishes to stress the difficulties faced providing compelling evidence for the non-susceptibility status of any particular plant species. The Panel acknowledges that the listing of *P. roebelenii* as a host of *X. fastidiosa* relies on a single report from California. Because an isolation of *X. fastidiosa* from some hosts can be difficult, the Panel considers that the failure to isolate *X. fastidiosa* from *P. roebelenii* cannot be used to totally ignore the detection of *X. fastidiosa* by ELISA and PCR. The Panel concludes that detection of *X. fastidiosa* using two independent techniques provides sufficient evidence, although not completely conclusive, to list *P. roebelenii* as a *X. fastidiosa* host plant. Concerning survey data provided in the Costa Rican dossier, the Panel wishes to stress that such surveys cannot demonstrate the non-host status but can only provide a probability bound, an upper estimate of the proportion of infected plants in the field. In the present case, and assuming all survey parameters to be optimal, the 95% confidence incidence threshold obtained is 0.2%, leaving the possibility that close to 25.000 *P. roebelenii* plants could be infected but undetected in the country. Accepting a scenario of local, non-systemic infection of *P. roebelenii* by *X. fastidiosa* would further increase uncertainties. In addition, the absence of data on the vector infection pressure further affects the ability to derive meaningful information on the *P. roebelenii* host status from the survey data. Appropriately conducted, mechanical and/or vector mediated

inoculation experiments are critical to reach a more solid conclusion on the status of *P. roebelenii* as a host of *X. fastidiosa.*

The draft opinion was adopted by the Panel.

6.3 Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Ditylenchus destructor* Thorne, (EFSA-Q-2015-00268)

Following a request from the European Commission, the Panel on Plant Health performed a pest risk assessment on *Ditylenchus destructor*, the potato rot nematode, for the EU. It focused the assessment of entry, establishment, spread and impact on two crop species: potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) and tulip (*Tulipa* spp.). The main pathways for entry of *D. destructor* into the EU and for spread of this nematode within the EU, are plants for planting, including seed potatoes and flower bulbs. These commodities are also the main targets for the assessment of the impact. A modelling approach was used to quantitatively estimate entry, spread and impact. Literature and expert judgement were used to estimate model parameters, taking into account uncertainty. A baseline scenario with current pest-specific phytosanitary regulations was compared with alternative scenarios without those specific regulations or with additional risk reduction options. Further information is provided on the host range of *D. destructor* and on survival of the nematode in soil in the absence of hosts. The Panel concludes that the entry of *D. destructor* with planting material from third countries is small compared to the yearly intra-EU spread of this nematode with planting material. Changes in pest specific regulations have little influence on entry of the pest since another non-specific regulation already leads to a good level of protection against the introduction of the nematode into the pest risk assessment area (PRA) area. It is also concluded that the whole PRA area is suitable for establishment of *D. destructor*, but there is insufficient information to make a statement on the persistence of newly introduced populations in the entire PRA area. Impacts of this nematode on the quantity and quality of potato are considered negligible. The impact on flower bulb production in the EU is considered as very low.

The draft opinion was adopted by the Panel.

6.4 Discussion on draft scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Ceratocystis platani* (Walter) Engelbrecht et Harrington, (EFSA-Q-2015-00265)

Following a request from the European Commission, the chair of the WG presented a summary of the WG progress. The opinion was circulated before the plenary among the panel members for possible adoption at this plenary and comments have then been received. Given that some comments were sent to the WG just before the plenary, the WG still needs to revise the opinion accordingly. The decision was thus taken to postpone the possible adoption of the opinion until the end of October 2016, using a written procedure. The discussion on a summary of the

comments received about this opinion was very helpful from a methodological point of view. The discussion was also useful for the other opinions which are using the new quantitative methodology.

6.5 Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Cryphonectria parasitica* (Murrill) Barr (EFSA-Q-2015-00266)

Following a request from the European Commission, the chair of the WG presented a summary of the WG progress. The opinion was circulated before the plenary among the panel members for consideration for adoption at this plenary and comments have then been received. Given that some comments were sent to the WG just before the plenary, the WG still needs some time to revise the opinion accordingly. The decision was thus taken to postpone the possible adoption of the opinion until the end of October 2016 using a written procedure. The discussion on a summary of the comments received on this opinion was very helpful from a methodological point of view. The discussion was also useful for the other opinions which are using the new quantitative methodology.

6.6 Discussion of draft scientific opinion on risk assessment of Grapevine Flavescence dorée (EFSA-Q-2015-00271)

Following a request from the European Commission, the EFSA Plant Health Panel performed a quantitative analysis of the risk posed by the Flavescence Doree phytoplasma (FDp) in the EU territory. Three scenarios are analysed, one with current measures in place (scenario A0), one designed to improve grapevine propagation material phytosanitary status (A1) and one with reinforced eradication and containment (A2). The potential for entry is limited, FDp being almost non-existent outside the EU. FDp and its major vector, *Scaphoideus titanus*, have already established over large parts of the EU and have the potential to establish in a large fraction of the currently unaffected EU territory. With the current measures in place (A0), spread of FDp is predicted to continue with a progression of between a few and ca. 20 newly contaminated NUTS 2 regions during the next 10 years, illustrating the limitations of the current control measures against the spread. FDp spread is predicted to be roughly similar between scenarios A1 and A2, but more restricted than under A0. However, even with reinforced control scenarios, stabilization or reduction of the number of contaminated NUTS 2 regions has only relatively low probability. Under scenario A0, FDp has a 0.5 to 1% impact on the overall EU grapes and wine production, reflecting the effectiveness of the current control measures against impact. Under both scenarios A1 and A2, FDp impact is predicted to be reduced, by approximately one third (A1) to two-thirds (A2) as compared to A0, but the associated uncertainties are large. The generalized use of hot water treatment for planting material produced in contaminated zones has the most important contribution to FDp reduction in scenario A1 and has high feasibility. Both

increased eradication and containment measures contribute to impact reduction under scenario A2 but the overall feasibility is lower.

The draft opinion was adopted by the Panel.

7 New Mandates

No new mandates were presented.

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

8.1. 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 risk reduction options including work-plan for public consultation

The state of the art of the quantitative risk assessment methodology for pest risk analysis was presented by the Chair of the WG. The development process, the main problems and short comings of the new methodology were summarised, pointing out the difficulties and advantages of being transparent. The presentation of the new risk assessment methodology followed the three pillars approach (i) adaptive: plan and adapt the assessment, (ii) mechanistic and population based and (iii) quantitative. A new fourth pillar on communication strategy was presented as well. The workflow including a proposal for feedback loops, was explained and available tools listed. The importance of respecting basic requirements for the risk assessment output for specific steps was stressed out.

Only four basic requirements:

For Entry to assess the number of potential founder populations

For Establishment to assess the number of established populations

For Spread to assess the area or spatial units newly occupied

For Impact to assess the change in crop output or quality

In the follow-up discussion the Commission representative confirmed the possibility to have a feedback loop with the Commission providing enough time (ca two weeks) are granted to provide the feedback.

The participants asked for further simplification of the methodology and possibility to decide case by case how to present (e.g. level of details) the quantitative results in the opinions.

With regards to the risk reducing options, the progress of the working group was presented. The different tools that have been developed for assisting the risk assessors in the identification and evaluation of the RROs have been briefly presented namely (i) guidance for developing RRO scenario (from the phytosanitary protection strategy to the RRO components of a scenario); (ii) guidance for evaluation of the effectiveness of the RRO scenario for each pathway and each sub-step of the risk assessment; (iii) the RRO fiches and the repository of fiches.

Interaction with the pilot WGs and their feedback were summarised. It was stressed that the RRO scenarios have to be considered very early in the process (i.e. when analysing the ToR) and that clear RRO guidance is needed for pilot step 2 WGs (*Radopholus similis, Eotetranychus lewisi, Diaporthe vaccini Atropellis spp)* to design scenarios and to better integrate them when drafting opinions. Moreover full integration of RROs in the risk assessment process is suggested.

- Lessons learnt by the WGs from the first pilot step

A presentation was given summarising the lessons learnt during implementation of the new method applying the quantitative description of the risk, quantitative description of the uncertainties and integrative handling of RRO and using new terminology of quantification, uncertainty and of RROs. A direct comparison of outcomes of qualitative and quantitative risk assessment was provided and discussed. Next steps (e.g. taking into account the requirements of PROMETHEUS project, increased use of empirical data, testing the EFSA Guidance and standardising the RRO approach) and proposals for future collaboration (e.g. PLH internal training, support by AMU and by PROMETHEUS project) were presented and supported by the Panel.

- Discussion of the approach and work plan for the remaining pilot opinions including interactions

The Panel chair nominated Vittorio Rossi as chair of the new WG on *Atropellis spp.*

The chairs of the 2nd pilot WGs presented a very short update of the work plan.

The participants supported the proposal of having training on new risk assessment methodology for the new pilot WG members. Based on the replies received through a doodle query it was decided to organise the training in Parma on 21-22 November, 2016 as two full days training (for both days from 9.00 till 18.00). Detailed training programme will be developed by the WG Methods which will be providing the training together with support of the EFSA AMU Unit and an external expert member of the EFSA Uncertainty Working Group.

8.2 Scientific Committee and its Working Groups

No information regarding Scientific Committee and its Working Groups was provided during the meeting

8.3 EFSA including its Working Groups/Task Forces

8.3.1 New mandate on updates of the *Xylella fastidiosa* host plants database (EFSA-Q-2016-00445)

EFSA is requested to further specify and update its host plants database of *X. fastidiosa*, taking into account different subspecies and strains. Information on non-susceptible host plants and varieties, as well as negative results of diagnostic tests, where available, will also be included. The deadline of the update is April 2017.

8.3.2 New mandate on Insecticide protocol (EFSA-Q-2016-00378)

New mandate to develop a protocol on "Consideration of evidence that the application of an active substance (insecticide) is necessary to control a serious danger to plant health which cannot he contained by other available means including non-chemical methods (EFSA-Q-2016-00378)" was presented. As this output is not directly related to the panel activity, no endorsement of the technical report will be required. However the panel will be informed on the progress and on the content of this report (Insecticide Protocol).

8.3.3 Report 10th Meeting of the International Pest Risk Research Group (IPRRG), 23-26 August 2016, Parma, Italy

A brief presentation, showing the main figures and achievement of the 10th Meeting of the International Pest Risk Research Group (IPRRG), was done.

8.3.4 Report from Better Training for Safer Food Workshop on new and emerging risks to plant health risk and surveillance, 5-7 July 2016, Grange, Ireland

European Commission organised this workshop in order to share and discuss with NPPO representatives, EFSA and EPPO information gathered in several audits carried out in UE Member States. EFSA staff and a PLH panel member presented current EFSA activities in the field of Emerging Risks. The discussion underlined the means of improvement of the system in place including possible areas of future activities for EFSA (horizon scanning, preparation of survey guidelines, crisis preparedness).

8.4 European Commission

No further information was presented by the Commission representatives.

9. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

9.1 Discussion on the proposal of Self task projects

An update was provided on the possible self-tasks by PLH Panel. It was noted that for some topics mandates from Commission are expected

10. Any other business

10.1 Update on the EFSA-EPPO Workshop, 12-14 December 2016, Parma, Italy

Registration is open until 24 October for the EFSA-EPPO Workshop on modeling in plant health. The main objective of the workshop is to explore the application of models in plant health risk assessment and how risk assessment models may support decision-making in plant health.

10.2 New rules on authorship

New rules on authorship of scientific output were presented and subsequent questions clarified by EFSA staff. The new rules on authorship apply for scientific opinions adopted after 15 September 2016.

10.3 Twitter account

Sharon Monti, from the Communication Unit, briefly introduced the first thematic Twitter account of EFSA called: @Plants_EFSA. It was launched in August 2016 and reached more than 250 followers in less than two months. The account will promote the visibility of EFSA PLH activities and promote networking and exchange of information with other institutions and organizations operating on the same topics.

10.4 Heathy B

Adoption of the Scientific opinion on health of honey bee colonies by the AHAW Panel was announced. A short presentation of the final output will be made at the November Plenary meeting.

The next PLH Plenary meeting will be held in Parma on 23 November 2016 (one day meeting).