Scientific Panel on Plant Health

Minutes of the 5th meeting of the Working Group on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO

Held on 13 November 2015, Brussels (Belgium)

(Agreed on 7 December 2015)

Participants

- **Working Group Members:**
  Claude Bragard, Stephan Winter (Chair)

- **EFSA:**
  ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Sara Tramontini

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Leonardo De La Fuente and Elizabeth Rogers could not participate via teleconference due to technical constraints.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Working Groups 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 Declaration of

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

Interest and the Specific Declaration of Interest filled in by the working group members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Scientific topic for discussion

4.1. Pathogenicity tests on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO[3]

The comments received from the PLH Panel members via email were integrated in the draft opinion in preparation to the discussion and potential adoption of the opinion during the 58th PLH Plenary meeting.

[3] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-00547

Scientific Panel on Plant Health

Minutes of the 4th meeting of the Working Group on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO

Held by WEB-conference, 30 October – 4 November 2015

(Agreed on 7 December 2015)

Participants

- **Working Group Members:**

  Claude Bragard, Leonardo De La Fuente, Elizabeth Rogers, Stephan Winter (Chair) have participated via WEB-conference
- **Hearing experts:**

  Donato Boscia and Maria Saponari have participated via WEB-conference during the hearing organised on the 4 of November
- **EFSA:**

  ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Sara Tramontini

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Working Groups members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes[1] and the Decision of the Executive Director on

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

Declarations of Interest[2], EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of Interest and the Specific Declaration of Interest filled in by the working group members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Scientific topic for discussion

4.1. Pathogenicity tests on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO[3]

During the first day meeting the draft of the document was updated with the contributions prepared by the WG members. The list of questions for the hearing was revised and shared with the authors of the Italian report in preparation to the hearing.

During the second day meeting the authors of the Italian report provided to the WG members presentations on the current status of the *X. fastidiosa* outbreak in Apulia, listing all recent findings on additional symptomatic and asymptomatic hosts (i.e. *Grevillea juniperina*, *Westringia glabra*, *Cistus creticus*, *Euphorbia terracina*, *Asparagus acutifolius*, *Laurus nobilis*, *Dodonaea viscosa purpurea*, *Lavandula angustifolia*, *Myoporum insulare*). The authors replied to questions and provide clarifications on the methodology applied in the trials and surveys mentioned in the report, supported by pictures and data. The replies to the questions are listed in the next paragraph of the minutes.

After the hearing, the WG could revise the draft opinion in accordance with the received information and draft the conclusions.

Further tasks were distributed among the WG members in order to finalize the opinion for the commenting phase agreed with the Panel (planned from 6 to 12 November 2015).

4.2. Hearing with the authors of the Italia report: questions and answers

4.2.1. Field surveys

4.2.1.1. SAMPLES

1. We found the descriptive fiches provided with survey data of September 2015 very helpful. Do you have similar data for previous sampling campaigns in 2013, 2014, including position of infected trees in the surrounding of the sampling places?

[2] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf
[3] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-00547

In 2013, the surveys were conducted in vineyards located in the first outbreak of Xylella fastidiosa (Gallipoli municipality) (Annex 1A)

The surveys made in early 2015 were performed in the same area as shown in Annex 1B. In this case, to select the grapes to be sampled, it was considered that:

- if olive and grapes were consociated then the grapes selected were those next to the olive trees;

- if there was no olives found in the vicinity , sampling was performed on the external rows.

- If there were grapes (cultivated or wild) on the border of the roads, they were also sampled.

2. In the report it is said that surveyed vineyards were close to symptomatic olive trees. According to the specific descriptive sheets it was not always the case. Could you please explain?

Yes, this is the case of 17 of the surveyed vineyards. Whereas, WPT38 is located in a heavily contaminated district, even if not surrounded by olive groves; indeed, it is very close to WPT39 and WPT47. The seven vineyards (WPT55, 56, 67, 68, 69, 70 and 71) included the stock mother plants (either for rootstocks or scions), located in the district of the grapevine nursery industry, therefore object of particular concern for this topic.

3. The yellow dots in the maps reported in the descriptive fiches indicated where *X. fastidiosa* was found on olives or also on other plant species?

Yes, they indicate olive trees.

4. Concerning visual inspections, how did u distinguish between *X. fastidiosa* symptoms and normal senescence?

Inspections were aimed at discovering typical symptoms of PD: (i) leaf scorching that typically begins at the margins of the leaves and moves inwards, and often consisting in banding pattern of red and orange colours; (ii) leaf blades that drop off leaving "match stick" petioles; (iii) canes with alternating patterns of green islands and mature (brown) wood; (iv) distribution of the putative symptoms within a grape plant (one cordon or even a cane).

5. Characteristics of nursery plants: how old were they?

Grafted plants and/or rooted cuttings are generally 1 year old or even less.

6. How was the nursery screening conducted? Visual inspections only? How many plants tested by ELISA?

The screening in the nursery was based on ELISA and PCR tests (composite samples). More than 2000 samples, derived from more than 6000 plants, were processed. Samples consisted of pieces of canes (ca. 10 cm in length) recovered from dormant grafted plants mechanically pulverized using a "Granex 91". Three subsamples were taken from each batch of 25 (rooted rootstocks) or 50 plants (grafted plants).

7. Would it be possible to explain the sampling strategy?

    a. Spatially in Lecce province, in the vineyard, but also on the grapevine plant (what type of leaf was sampled? Top leaves, bottom leaves?).

It has to be stated that the province of Lecce is not uniformly affected by the epidemic spread of the bacterium; the area where the first outbreak was reported (Gallipoli-Alezio-Taviano-Parabita municipalities) has currently the highest incidence of affected olive groves (olive is the predominant crop but also the most susceptible host), throughout the entire province there is a number of recetn outbreaks ; each spot may consist of few trees to several hectares (in some cases hundreds of hectares) of olive groves affected by the olive quick decline and confirmed to harbour X. fastidiosa. The continuously increasing outbreaks (number and size)resulted in the delimitation as "Infected zone" of the whole Province of Lecce. Vineyards were selected in the area of Gallipoli characterized by the highest pressure of inoculum. This is also confirmed by the fact, that the majority of the novel hosts (with the exception of oleander) reported for the CoDiRO strain have been found almost exclusively in this area; and rarely in the other outbreaks recorded in the Province.

Samples consisted of mature leaves collected from the basal-medium part of the branches, a total of 5-10 leaves for plants were collected.

    b. Was sampling size enough (statistical sample size) to be sure to detect *X. fastidiosa* infections? Could infected vines have been missed?

Lacking any previous detection of the strain in grapevine plants, the aim of the sampling was to further increase the number of analyses indicating the absence of infection of Vitis spp. plants with the CoDiRO strain of X. fastidiosa.

    c. Were always leaves in all the surveys (why not petioles or stems)? In the late autumn 2013 survey, what parts of the plant was used for the ELISA (as leaves are unlikely to be on the plant in that period of the year)?

Due to the mild temperatures of autumn 2013, the first sampling in late autumn 2013 was done on leaves (petioles included). Photos (Annex 1A) show the status of the plants at the time of the sampling.

Sampling of January 2015 consisted of mature portion of the branches and tests were performed on the xylem tissues. Test made in late summer 2014 and September 2015 consisted in leaves (5-10/plant) from which, as in the case of autumn 2013, the petioles were dissected and homogenized.

d. Were there 5 leaves/plant always?

No, ranging from 5 to 10.

e. In January 2015, the 130 samples were on woody canes. How were they extracted?

From each sample were recovered four 10cm-long pieces; and part of each pieces grinded with the "Granex 91" equipment (Annex II).

8. How were the samples treated before collecting, after sampling and prepared for extraction?

For leaves: 5-10 leaves were detached by hands from the branches and kept in plastic bags and stored in ice box till the arrival to the laboratory. Tests were conducted within one week after the leaves were harvested.

For canes: a minimum of 4 canes 15-20cm long (collected from different cordons) were harvested and stored in plastic bag.

For the propagating material: the entire grafted plants were taken for the laboratory tests.

Extraction: (i) from the leaves, after dissecting the petioles from 5-6 leaves, 0.5gr of tissues were transferred in the Bioreba bags, and homogenized in extraction buffer (1:10 w:v); (ii) from canes, xylem tissue was pulverized using the "Granex 91".

9. Which was the resolution of identification of isolates? Is it sure that all isolates are the same strain, all *X. fastidiosa* in Apulia is CODIRO?

A manuscript is going to be submitted in a few days to European Journal of Plant Pathology, reporting that in the epidemic area of Apulia, new foci as well as several host plant species positive with X. fastidiosa were found to be, according to MLST analysis, all infected with the same sequence type of this bacterium (ST53, or CoDiRO strain).

4.2.1.2. LAB TESTS

1. Fields of September 2015 survey were visited twice for visual inspections and sampled once with 5 leaves/plant. ELISA test was run to all samples and qPCR only on 3 samples doubtful with ELISA.

Is it right? What was the proportion of qPCR during the previous surveys?

In the previous surveys (except for 76 samples) each sample was tested either with ELISA and PCR (using the primers RST31/33) or qPCR (using the protocol Harper et al., 2010 and Francis et al., 2006). Considering that the results obtained with both assays were 100% in agreement, for the survey conducted in September 2015, qPCR was performed only on samples which gave doubtful OD values (between 2X and 3x the values of the negative control).

2. Could you provide us with the details of the ELISA protocol used?

   a. Was it the one proposed by Loewe or was it adapted?

Yes, it was the one proposed by Loewe (antisera raised against an isolate of the subsp. fastidiosa). The protocols and the validation data are reported in Annex III and IV.

   b. Could you please explain how the difference is made between a negative or a doubtful result?

Samples are assigned as negative if the OD405 value is lower than 2X times the value of the negative control. Doubtful samples if the values are >2-< 3x the negative control.

   c. What is the procedure used to set up the positive threshold?

> 3X OD405 of the negative control.

   d. It's common for *X. fastidiosa* growing as an endophyte to be 100-1000x lower concentration than in a situation where *X. fastidiosa* causes disease?

   e. Would the ELISA assays have picked up endophyte levels of *X. fastidiosa* in the assayed grapevines?

We don't have the answer to these 2 questions, however besides the negative results in ELISA we never detected X. fastidiosa DNA traces by PCR or qPCR in these plants.

Analytical sensitivity tests showed that ELISA assays could detect as low as 104 CFU/ml. With artificial infected samples containing < 104 CFU/ml results were assigned as doubtful or negative.

3. What was the total number of false positive/false negative encountered with the test currently in use (both ELISA and PCR detection) during the 3 years surveys?

Comparative analysis of ELISA and qPCR showed that ELISA false negative (positive qPCR) were lower than 2%; and ELISA non-specific

reactions (false positive) were in the range of 4%, the latter mainly occurred when testing almond and oak tissues.

4. Did you run a positive control? Was it done using infected grapevine? How did you rule out the possibility of interference of plant extracts residues with the PCR, as reported by other authors?

As you can see in annex III and IV, we did performed a validation of all methods currently adopted by using artificial infected samples (spiked samples) for those matrices not available as natural infected plant materials (citrus, oak and grapes). Comparison of the OD values and Cq values showed no significant interference with the different matrices.

5. Was olive validation of ELISA used for testing grapevines? Validation of ELISA with qPCR?

See annex III and IV.

4.2.1.3. VECTORS

6. Do you have any information on the insecticide treatment(s) possibly applied in the vineyards sampled? If not, is the use of insecticide treatment common in that zone of Apuglia – When and what type of insecticide is commonly used?

The insecticide applications in the vineyards of the area generally refer to the control of Lobesia botrana. To this end, chlorpyrifos methyl, spinosad and chlorpyrifos ethyl are the most common products used. However, in some farms indoxacarb o chlorantraniprole or emamectina benzoate are also used. It is common to spray twice between middle June and first decade of July. Rarely there is a third application in late July-early August.

Indeed, it is becoming very common the use of the sexual confusion with pheromones.

4.2.2. Inoculation trials

1. How many plants/trial?

We used 15 plants/trials (10 inoculated with X. fastidiosa and 5 mocked inoculated). See annex V for the details of the procedures we used.

2. How did you run the triple cloning? Do you think that by using three serial passages of the bacterium prior to inoculation, you run the risk of the bacterium losing virulence?

Upon obtaining the colonies from the reference olive trees "De Donno", several single colonies were tripled cloned with 7-8 days subculturing period, at the end qPCR coupled with melt curve analysis was used to check the specificity and one colony was selected.

3. Do you think that symptoms expression can in some way be amplified or silenced by environmental conditions (e.g. water availability, temperature, season, etc)? How did you deal with this aspect?

Yes, of course this is an important aspect. We kept the plant at minimum supply of water and in small pots. However, the environmental conditions would have major effects on the development of symptoms in a susceptible host, not to the suitability of the host plant to be infected or not upon the inoculation (if this is done properly).

4. The WG is aware of the fact that the applied CFU is standard for this kind of bacterium, but considering the fact that you are dealing with a new pathosystem, did you ever try to quantify the inoculum by dilution plating (for culturable counts) and/or to repeat the inoculation to ensure a successful result?

Yes in order to set a correlation between the OD600 and the CFU/ml we have made several experiments of plate dilutions.

5. What was the age of the plant when the experiment was started? Did they have a dormant phase during winter months? Otherwise how could they have leaves in winter? How many leaves were left over? What were the greenhouse conditions all along the experiments?

Age: see Annex V

Dormant stage: no, we kept the plants at 28°C for the entire winter season (2014) and 30-32°C in summer (2015). The actual size of the plants is shown in Annex VI.

6. The inoculum was found only in the areas where the inoculation was done. There was no movement? Can we assume that this is DNA only and not biologically active *X. fastidiosa*?

The evidences are that (i) isolation failed; (ii) we could detect the bacteria only at the point of inoculation, with few exceptions in the petioles at the point of inoculations (most probably passive movement).

7. Is this a comprehensive experiment? Olive was used as a control and can we assume that the inoculation was effective in the control plants?

Yes, for additional data see Annex VII, which is the intermediate report of pilot project aimed at investigating the host range of the CoDiRO strain, where you can find more data on the controls.

8. What are the criteria to determine positive and negative reactions? Same as in insect work (Table 10) based on Cq threshold? How was

this criteria determined? Could you provide detailed data for each sample?

The cut off value for the qPCR assays is defined based on the laboratory condition tests. For the field olive trees, as general reference values we use the criteria reported in table 10. However, samples that produce Cq values and an exponential curve at values > 34, they are re-tested for confirmation and if results are confirmed a second sampling is requested. Within, the tests performed for the artificially inoculated plants, since the tests are repeated over the time, when a sample yield Cq value >34, the sample is classified as "undermined, to be confirmed with the additional sampling".

9. What is the smallest amount of *X. fastidiosa* you can reliably detect with the qPCR assay used here?

In our conditions using the protocol described by Harper et al. (2010), the limit of detection was 102 CFU/ml. See annex IV.

10. Have attempts to culture the bacterium from grapes have been conducted for Experiments C and D? For grapes studies only reported Negative isolation for 8 plants (Table 3 and 4, 3 plants treatment A, 5 plants Treatment B). The data presented shows that culturing CoDiRO from greenhouse experiments with olive plants (combined testing of 7 plants) was successful only in 1 plant for each 6 months (out of 3 plants) and 12 months (out of 3 plants) after inoculation ("Treatment O", Table 7); 1 plant (out of 1) at 9 months after inoculation (Treatment O1, Table 8), and there is no reports for culturing in the last experiment ("Treatment O2", Table 9). With the low success rate (3/7, ~40%) in culturing the bacterium from the greenhouse, will you think it will be useful to test more samples from grapevines for culturing?

Yes of course, however since the isolation from stems is a destructive test, we were considering the need to complete (cut back all the replicates) the experiment before this meeting. But as this requires time, it has not been complete yet.

11. Did you ever consider the possibility to use the avirulent EB92-1 strain in order to have a control on grapevine?

No, since we are dealing with several issues regarding the risks related to the introduction of exotic strain (even for research purposes), we did not start any procedure to import other X. fastidiosa strain(s) or isolate(s). However, we feel that the successful infections in the known susceptible hosts of the CoDiRO strain, serve as control of the grapevine tests.

4.2.3. Vectors transmission

1. You were dealing with insects which were not all equally infected (min 3 out of 5). What was the reason for reducing the amount of insects compared with your previous trials where you had 8-10 insects/plant (Saponari et al., 2014)?

The first experiment (Saponari et al., 2014) was performed without consolidated knowledge on the potential vector(s), further experiments have demonstrated that a single infective specimen is capable to transmit and cause infection in the recipient plants. A manuscript entitled "Insights into the role of spittlebugs as vectors of Xylella fastidiosa in Italy" is in publication about these results. The data indicate that differences in acquisition efficiency exist based on host plant species while no difference were recovered among host plants when inoculation was considered, as this was also previously observed with sharpshooter vectors.

2. How many plants/trial?

5 recipient plants for each host species.

3. What was the size of the grapevine plant?

See Annex VIII.

4. Was it a no-choice experiment? In our understanding there were 5 insects/cage and 5 plants of the same type /cage and the experiment was repeated 5 times (2 weeks in July, 2 in August and 1 in September) for a total of 25 grapevine plants, 25 periwinkle plants and 250 insects. Is this right?

Yes, a part for the plants: there was one plant/cage.

5. Was a 48-96 hr inoculation access period sufficient? How do you know that each plant was fed on? Did you make observations on insects' activity? Were all 5 insects still alive at the end of the 48-96 hr tests?

It depends on the host plants, generally on oleander we did not have insects alive after 2 days, even if transmission occurred; similarly with GF677, insects were not alive but in this case transmission did not occur. Periwinkle, olive and grapes had a high rate of insect survival (3 to 5).

6. How long can P. spumarius survive without feeding?

This has not been experimentally assessed, the only evidence we can retrieve is from oleander.

7. What symptoms did you observe in olive?

Yes, leaf scorching but not consistently (Annex IX).

8. A minimum concentration of 104 CFU g-1 of plant tissue is necessary for *X. fastidiosa* to be acquired and transmitted by an

efficient sharpshooter vector on grape (Hill and Purcell 1997). Could you detect a titer that low in grapevine by qPCR?

Yes, 102 CFU/ml, Annex IV.

9. What was the titer of *X. fastidiosa* in the insects? Barely detectable (would equal low chance of infection) or much higher (with a much higher chance of infection)?

Report only states that 70-95% of insects were positive. When tested by quantitative assays, single infective insect yielded an overall Cq values comprised between 29-34. (Annex X).

10. The August replicates where only 1 or 2 out of 5 periwinkle plants (and 0 out of 5 olive plants) turned up positive makes it likely that the insects were not very infective at that point. What is your view on that?

The transmission experiments were done under field conditions. It could be that the temperature and the related status of the recipient plants (under the high temperature recorded in August) have affected the transmission rate.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting will take place on 13 November 2015, Brussels.

Scientific Panel on Plant Health

Minutes of the 3rd meeting of the Working Group on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO

Held by WEB-conference, 26-27 October 2015

(Agreed on 27 October 2015)

Participants

- **Working Group Members:**
  Stephan Winter (Chair)

- **EFSA:**
  ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Sara Tramontini

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Working Groups 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 Declaration of Interest and the Specific Declaration of Interest filled in by the working group member invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest

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

related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Scientific topic for discussion

4.1. Pathogenicity tests on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO[3]

The first draft of the document was prepared according to the contributions received from all the WG members. A list of questions was compiled in order to prepare the hearing with the authors of the Italian report.

Further tasks were distributed among the WG members in preparation to the next meeting.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting will take place on 30 October and 4 November 2015, WEB-conference.

[3] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-00547

Scientific Panel on Plant Health

Minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Working Group on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO

Held on 19-21 October 2015, Parma (Italy)

(Agreed on 21 October 2015)

Participants

- **Working Group Members:**

  Stephan Winter (Chair)

  Claude Bragard, Leonardo De La Fuente, Elizabeth Rogers have participated via teleconference

- **EFSA:**

  ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Sara Tramontini

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Working Groups 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 Declaration of

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

Interest and the Specific Declaration of Interest filled in by the working group members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Scientific topic for discussion

4.1. Pathogenicity tests on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO[3]

The terms of reference and activity plan were presented and discussed among the working group (WG) members. The structure of the document was prepared and the main uncertainties and information gaps requiring clarification identified.

Further tasks were distributed among the WG members in preparation to the next meeting and the hearing.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting will take place on 26-27 October 2015, WEB-conference.

[3] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-00547

Scientific Panel on Plant Health

Minutes of the 1st meeting of the Working Group on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO

Held by WEB-conference, 8-9 October 2015

(Agreed on 9 October 2015)

Participants

- **Working Group Members:**
  Stephan Winter (Chair) has participated via WEB-conference

- **EFSA:**
  ALPHA Unit: Miren Andueza, Sara Tramontini

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Working Groups 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 Declaration of Interest filled in by the working group member invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this

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

meeting have been identified during the screening process. Due to technical problems, the Specific Declaration of Interest was not assessed in the due time, however no Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Scientific topic for discussion

4.1. Pathogenicity tests on *Vitis* response to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO[3]

The activity plan was discussed and agreed, in order to reply to the urgent request by November concerning the information submitted by the Italian Authorities on the pathogenicity tests and analysis carried out to verify the susceptibility of *Vitis* sp. to *Xylella fastidiosa* strain CoDiRO (EFSA-Q-2015-00547)

A review of the available data from the literature was conducted and further references in support to the preparation of the opinion were identified.

Critical aspects requiring clarification were identified and task in preparation to the second meeting distributed among the participants.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting will take place on 19-21 October 2015, Parma.

[3] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-00547