Scientific Panel on Plant Health
Minutes of the 65th
Plenary meeting

Held on 25-26 January, 2017, Parma (Italy)
(Agreed by written procedure on 3rd of February 2017)

Participants

- Panel Members

  Claude Bragard, Candresse Thierry, David Caffier, Elisavet Chatzivassiliou, Gianni Gilioli, Jean-Claude Gregoire, Josep Jaques Miret, 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, Jonathan West, Stephan Winter

- Hearing Experts:

  Camille Picard (EPPO)

- European Commission and/or Member States representatives:

  Harry Arijs, Gema Villa Franca (DG SANTE), by video conference

- EFSA:

  ALPHA Unit: Nikolaus Križ, Giuseppe Stancanelli, Svetla Kozelska, Filippo Bergeretti, Alice Delbianco, Sofie Dhollander, Ciro Gardi, Gabor Hollo, Virag Kertesz, Ioannis Koufakis; Maria Rosaria Mannino, Marco Pautasso, Sybren Vos, Niklas Bjorklund (visiting scientist in ALPHA Unit from Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences)

  RASA Dept.: Verhagen Hans

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants to the 65th plenary meeting of the EFSA Plant Health Panel.

Apologies were received from Katharina Dehnen-Schmutz.

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. Presentation of new rules for open plenaries

The new rules for open plenaries were presented by the Head of RASA department focusing on the new aspects for open plenaries introduced in 2017 such as the location of all EFSA open plenaries in Parma and the increase of transparency due to the possibility of web-streaming the open plenary meetings. The next PLH Panel plenary meeting in March 2017 will be an open plenary following the new rules.

5. Report on written procedures since 64th Plenary meeting

5.1 Agreement of the minutes of the 64th Plenary meeting held on 23 November, 2016, Parma, Italy

The minutes of the 64th Plenary meeting held on 23 November, 2016 were agreed on 25 January 2017
www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/event/161123-m.pdf

6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion

6.1 Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Atropellis* spp (EFSA-Q-2016-00490)

The Working Group (WG) chair presented the progress of the *Atropellis* WG, as well as the WG composition (https://ess.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/wg/682970).

The WG has made a progress in discussing the Terms of Reference (ToR), identifying the main pathways of entry (*Pinus* plants, wood and isolated

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

bark) and developing the scenarios (A0 = current regulatory situation; A1 = removal of the specific *Atropellis* requirements; A2 = further risk reduction options) for the risk assessment, which were presented for review and agreement by the Panel.

Despite the lack of recent publications on this quarantine pathogen, it was possible to retrieve some papers not yet found during the *Atropellis* pest categorisation (https://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/efsajournal/pub/3926), which will be useful to clarify the host range and further study the pest impacts, as required by the ToR. The plant health legislation relative to *Atropellis* spp. and *Pinus* spp. and the trade patterns of coniferous plants for planting and wood for the European non-EU countries have been analysed in detail. The deadline for delivering the *Atropellis* Risk Assessment is May 2017. The Panel agreed on the proposed working plan.

6.2 Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Diaporthe vaccinii* Shaer, (EFSA-Q-2015-00267)

The WG chair presented the progress status of the *Diaporthe* WG. The WG presented to the Panel for review and agreement the interpretation of Term of Reference (ToR), as discussed with the EC DG SANTE liaison officer. The composition of the WG and the expertise of the members and the roles and the contributions of the hearing experts were presented. The importance of the identification methods was stressed for the validation of the presence of *Diaporthe vaccinii*. The only third countries where the presence of the pest is validated with molecular detection methods are USA, Canada and China. Within the EU it has been reported in Latvia and, based on a recently published paper, in Poland. In the neighbouring countries, *D. vaccini*, is reported (based on morphological methods) in Russia and Belarus, but not in Ukraine. The chronological progress of *D. vaccinii* in Europe was presented. The main pathways identified are: plants for planting, fruits (blueberry and cranberry), natural spread (ascospores, conidia, birds). Potential establishment was evaluated based on two different habitat suitability models (MMF and MaxEnt). The natural spread from the eastern part of Europe to western part has been, so far, assessed as negligible. The 27 studies on fungicide treatments on blueberry and cranberry were used to evaluate the impact on berry production. The deadline for delivering the opinion is May 2017.

6.3. Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Eotetranychus lewisi* (McGregor), (EFSA-Q-2015-00270)

An update on the progress of the assessment of the risk posed by *E. lewisi* to the EU territory was provided by the members of the WG.

After presenting the background and the ToR of the request, the Chair of the WG indicated that the data extraction and appraisal activity from the literature was done in line with the EFSA PROMETHEUS guidelines and is now completed.

The scenarios for risk assessment and pathways under scrutiny by the WG, as discussed with the DG SANTE desk officer, were presented to the Panel for review and agreement. The conceptual models for the different steps of the risk assessment were also briefly discussed. Regarding the assessment of entry of the Lewis spider mite on the poinsettia pathway, the trade data under analyses by the WG were presented mentioning the need for finding more up to date data. Feedback was provided on the progress made by the WG on the systematic identification of the risk reduction options for each step of the risk assessment. The Portuguese NPPO provided information on production and trade from Madeira to the rest of the EU for four hosts relevant for E. lewisi, which provides arguments to explain the absence of *E. lewisi* in the EU (excluding Madeira). Finally, the work calendar and activities planned by the WG were presented. The deadline for delivering the opinion is May 2017.

6.4. Discussion of scientific opinion on risk assessment of *Radopholus similis* (EFSA-Q-2015-00269)

The WG members presented first a short overview of (i) the relevant biology aspects of *R. similis,* (ii) the ToR, (iii) scenarios, (A0, A1, A2, A3), and (iv) relevant pathways. The presentation focussed on the draft model outline, for review and agreement by the Panel. The proposed models for Entry, Establishment, Spread (including the shift from greenhouse into open field conditions and production systems) and Impact including relevant data needed for each step were presented. The challenges and next steps were outlined.

The preliminary results regarding potential for establishment in the field in the EU based on climatic and temperature study were presented in detail. In the follow-up discussion, the possible use of soil temperature maps and more recent climatic data were mentioned. The complexity of modelling the soil temperatures was stressed. The potential role of root stock resistance/tolerance status for establishment was mentioned. The complexity of the risk assessment and the need for simplification specifically regarding the relevant pathways were mentioned. The deadline for delivering the opinion is May 2017.

7. New Mandates

7.1 Request to provide a scientific and technical assistance on a horizon scanning exercise in view to crisis preparedness on plant health for the EU territory

The mandate on horizon scanning for plant pests, received in December 2016 from the European Commission DG SANTE, was presented. It is a mandate to EFSA to provide scientific and technical assistance based on Art. 31 of Reg. 178/2002, with the target to enhance prevention and risk targeting in plant health by horizon scanning for new emerging plant health threats through gathering information from media articles and scientific literature. Based on the achievements of the previous

collaboration on media monitoring of plant pests with the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission, the new work planned includes three parts: 1. finalisation of the automated media monitoring for plant pests using the MediSys platform; 2. development of an automated scientific literature monitoring in MediSys, 3. development of a methodology for pest ranking to be used in this exercise. These activities will concern known (listed) and unknown (not listed) pests. Two kinds of outputs will be produced for the attention of the EC and Member states: monthly newsletters and periodical reports on the main results from media and literature monitoring. The opportunity for collaboration with similar activities carried out by the EU MS and international organisations was underlined. Cooperation with EPPO in this area has already started with the previous media monitoring project.

7.2 Request to provide a scientific opinion on the risk of *Citrus junos* fruits for the introduction of citrus canker

The request to provide a scientific opinion on the risk of *Citrus junos* fruits for the introduction of citrus canker, received in December 2016, was presented by the Commission. In the ToR, EFSA is requested to prepare a scientific opinion to clarify the host status of *C. junos* with regard to *Xanthomonas citri* pv. *citri* and *X. citri* pv. *aurantifolii* or citrus canker and to indicate if *C. junos* fruits could represent a pathway for introduction of citrus canker into the Union. The deadline to deliver the opinion is June 2017. A preliminary review of literature available on *C. junos* host status with regard to citrus canker was also presented to the Panel. It was agreed that a new WG should be established to develop the above scientific opinion. Claude Bragard was nominated as Chair of the new WG by the Panel chair.

7.3 Other expected mandates on pest categorisations and risk assessment

The European Commission gave a brief introduction to a mandate that is under preparation to be sent to EFSA soon. The mandate is to support the update of the technical annexes of the plant health legislation by preparing pest categorisations for those quarantine pests for which a recent PRA or categorisation is not available. While for a large number of organisms the pest categorisations will be prepared at species level, there will be some taxonomic groups which will be addressed at the group level. Discussions focused on the methodology that EFSA is planning to use for this exercise, as well as the timeline and possible ways to organise the large amount of work in the most efficient way.

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

8.1 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)

The Panel Chair introduced this topic by reminding the Panel that the quantitative methodology currently tested in the four ongoing risk assessments will be used in future risk assessments that the Panel will conduct. Therefore, a guidance document on the new methodology will need to go for public consultation after addressing issues raised during the ongoing risk assessments and after discussion and endorsement at the PLH Panel plenary in September 2017.

The WG chair in his presentation focused first on the following issues: (i) actions taken (update of the template, support to the working groups, finalisation of RRO tools, use of @Risk and web-tool, preparation of the Guidance document); (ii) novelties in the assessment (update of the template specifying the structure of the approach providing a new template guiding the Risk Assessment procedure); (iii) Template document on reporting results from the PRA for communication (will be available soon).

In the follow-up discussion it was agreed that the uncertainties for each specific step, sub-step or estimated parameter should be considered/listed together with evidence and assumptions in the relevant section.

The following use of the Risk assessment Template and Template on reporting results from the PRA for communication when preparing the final opinion was proposed. The Template for communication should be used as the main part of the final opinion, and the Template for the risk assessment as an appendix of the final opinion. In the discussion it was also stressed that flexibility is possible when presenting the data (in the main part of the opinion or in the appendix). A general request for a clear guidance was also mentioned. It was proposed that the final Guidance should integrate the current templates. It was stressed that the guidance needs to be understood as a flexible tool within each step of an assessment (e.g. conditional assessment, design of specific model, implementation of different mathematical models). In the future, the web-tool will also have to be flexible enough to be used in different assessments. The participants also commented on the proposed model notations, however without providing alternative proposals.

The importance of the language used in the opinions and the need of the feedback by the risk managers on the communication of the results were stressed out. First feedback is expected from the PAFF meeting on 26 January 2017 and later from the EC Annexes WG. It was suggested that a feedback questionnaire could be applied after the second group of opinions is published. It is important also to see how the risk managers understand the message in the already published opinions.

In the second part of his presentation, the WG chair explained on the proposed terminology. The follow-up discussion focused mainly on the level of detail and exactness of the values/number to be provided in the opinions (e.g. how to communicate small differences with high uncertainties between scenarios).

For the development of the final Guidance, the following long term plan was presented:

- September 2017: new Guidance where the two templates will be incorporated endorsed by the PLH Panel for public consultations,
- October/November 2017: public consultation
- January 2018: adoption of the new Guidance.

8.2 Scientific Committee and its Working Groups

The Panel chair informed the participants on the progress of the two Scientific Committee Working Groups:

- WG on Guidance is finalising the draft document for adoption. The principles relevant for PLH Panel (guidance on when and under which conditions to re-open a published EFSA opinion and guidance how to review EFSA Guidance every three years) were explained.
- WG on Uncertainties will meet next week. Update of the new PLH pilot working group approach how to use the Uncertainty Guidance will be provided to this meeting. On the other hand, the published PLH pilot opinions were submitted to the WG on Uncertainties and feedback is expected by next week.

8.3 EFSA including its Working Groups/Task Forces

8.3.1 Crisis preparedness

Since 2012, EFSA has organised five modules of training with the objective of improving the interactions between EFSA, Member states, European Commission and sister agencies to address urgent issues in the fields of food and feed. In the context of the enhancement of prevention and prioritisation of threats focused by the new plant health regime, this activity will be enlarged to plant health issues with the objective of exchanging experiences, promoting scientific cooperation and developing capacity on methodology for data collection and reporting during outbreak

investigations. The Plant Health Crisis Exercise will take place in Lisbon (PT) on 8-10 March 2017. The workshop will gather 18 participants from 7 Member states of South Europe (PT, ES, FR, IT, GR, CY and MT) and representatives of the European Commission and EPPO. The discussion underlined the importance of putting in place platforms for sharing diagnostic data as already done in other fields and other countries. The respective implication of both risk assessors and risk managers in crisis situations and in the related training strategy has been discussed

8.4 European Commission

The contribution of Commission was provided under the agenda point 7 New mandates.

9 Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

9.1 Presentation on Vector Borne Disease activities in Animal Health

A presentation about the Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) team and AHAW Panel activities on animal vector borne diseases was given to the PLH Panel by Sofie Dhollander of ALPHA Unit. This kind of disease has been frequently the subject of AHAW opinions, where many methodologies are integrated in order to assess complex situations as for example the four mandates on Rift Valley Fever. AHAW could identify recurrent constraints concerning the preparation of opinion on animal vector borne diseases, in particular lack of population data (in terms of both distribution and density) for vectors and animals and missing harmonization among available data. To solve these two aspects AHAW has put in place several tools: DACRAH (DAta Collection for Risk Assessment on Animal health), story maps on ESRI, MintRisk (Model for INTegrated RISK assessments) and Vectornet[3]. Final considerations highlighted during the presentation and confirmed by the PLH Panel members concerned the potential synergies between AHAW and PLH methodologies to be applied for assessing vector borne diseases

9.2 Presentation about the work going on by EPPO on Regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQP)

The EPPO representative at the PLH plenary meeting provided a comprehensive overview of the current progress of the EPPO project on Regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQP) that is performed in the context of the revision of the pest status for the new plant health regulation, based on a contract with EC.

[3] Dacrah: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/sp.efsa.2017.EN-1171/abstract
ESRI: story map in progress
Mintrisk: http://www3.lei.wur.nl/mintrisk/
Vectornet: https://vectornet.ecdc.europa.eu/
http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/vectors/VectorNet/Pages/VectorNet.aspx
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/160803

The pests under scrutiny in this project are the ones listed in the EU marketing directives and the ones that are candidates RNQP pests originating from the Annex IIAII, for most of which EFSA has performed pest categorisations and risk assessments in the last 4 years.

The assessment of the status of these pests is done considering the pest taxonomy, hosts, end-uses, risk management measures and tolerance levels. On this basis 1400 host pest combinations have been identified and need to be further evaluated in the project.

The methodology that was developed by EPPO for this purpose was presented in detail, indicating the involvement of the member states and stakeholders in the data collection process. The structure of this project in terms of organisation was also briefly addressed.

The presentation was very well received by the Panel members that identified similarities with the EFSA expected mandate on pest categorisations.

9.3 Presentation of the EPPO risk assessment activities

The EPPO representative provided a brief overview of the recent, current and future EPPO risk assessment activities. The EPPO standard PM5 series was presented. Apart from risk analyses activities, also the activities on the review of the national PRAs and the commodity analyses (plants for planting, tomato fruit, woodchips and waste) were presented.

10 Any other business

10.1 Feedback from the EFSA-EPPO Workshop, 12-14 December 2016, Parma, Italy

Feedback from the Joint EFSA-EPPO Workshop on Modelling in Plant Health, which was held in 12-14 December 2016, was presented to the plenary.

Initially, some general information and the structure of the workshop were presented. The workshop was part of an extended collaboration between EFSA and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO). The interest for participation was high and approximately 150 scientists and stakeholders from 41 different countries attended this workshop. Then, the seven thematic sessions and the conclusive session were presented and briefly described. Finally, the social media activities during this workshop were presented and specifically the activity on twitter and the dedicated webpage on the EFSA website

10.2 Update on the *Xylella fastidiosa* November 2017 scientific conference

The second conference organised by EFSA on *X. fastidiosa* will take place in November 2017 (exact days and venue to be confirmed). The organizing committee includes representatives from EFSA, EUPHRESCO

(network for phytosanitary research coordination and funding), POnTE and XF-ACTORS (the two Horizon2020 projects dedicated to *X. fastidiosa*).
The scope will be to provide a platform to European scientists currently involved or interested on the topic to exchange on the most recent findings concerning the European outbreaks.
A preannouncement of the event will soon be published on the EFSA website

10.3 Meetings dates

The next PLH Plenary meeting will be held in Parma on 29-30 March, 2017 and it will be an OPEN plenary.