



# Creation of EPPO codes in relation to import data

Fabienne Grousset

Webinar for EPPO codes users

5 March 2018



# Background

- List of over 2500 Latin names representing some imports of one EPPO Member, mostly ornamental plants
- Used as a pilot project in 2017 to...
  - ...evaluate the capacity of the EPPO Secretariat to answer large numbers of requests
  - ...to identify challenges if EPPO Codes were to be used in a global phytosanitary context (e.g. issuance of phytosanitary certificates).



# Content of the list

- Mostly plants, a few mushrooms
- > 570 Cactaceae
  - incl. > 130 *Mammillaria* spp.
- *Aloe* spp.: >120
- *Euphorbia* spp.: 140
- Many orchids, ferns



# Actions taken in GD

	2008 /2500+
1 code created	1564
Several codes (e.g. request linked to a species whose genus was not in GD)	193
Synonyms added (e.g. the request was a synonym of an existing code)	196
New preferred name	40
Correcting mistakes	15

# No change made to GD

357 /2500+

• Name misspelt in the request, code already existed	133
• Code existed (already created for another request)	93
• Code existed under another name	42
• Invalid genus (old genus, no longer in use)	20
• Horticultural var. of species in GD	18
• Requested name not found in the literature	22
• Insufficient data: requested name exists, but it could not be reliably attributed to a single species/subspecies	16
• Not in line with GD practice: entity not coded in GD (e.g. section or sub-genus, grouping of species)	13

## Positive side

- Sources are available to check most cases, including databases on the Internet:  
The Plant List, Tropicos, Kew database, orchids and ferns databases.
- Most requests are easy to solve, ...but not all.



# Specific challenges

- Name that does not exist (e.g. correct genus name with an incorrect epithet)
- Wrong name given in trade. e.g.
  - 1- name that looks Latin but is not;
  - 2- valid Latin name of a plant unlikely to be traded, but same name sometimes used (wrongly) for another species, which is traded.
- Insufficient data: name exists, but relates to several species - don't know which is traded
- Taxonomy of some groups very debated (morphological vs. molecular, etc.) and under constant revision: e.g. Cactaceae, Orchidaceae.



# Followed basic principles

- Codes are created for accepted taxon (e.g. species, genus, family).
- Normally stop at species level, unless valid reasons for infraspecific levels.
  - ▶ taxonomic (e.g. clearly identified entity whose name is valid) and agronomic justifications (e.g. widely used, traded)
- Requests at infraspecific levels are considered on a case-by-case basis. In most cases, final decision is not to create a code.



- Intraspecific levels in GD, e.g. for plants:
  - subsp. and var. (valid entities only)
  - forms (f.) normally not included
  - specific hybrids provided they have a valid scientific name and their parentage is clear.
  - groups of hybrids can be coded, where relevant.
  - outside the scope of GD: commercial cultivars, sections within a genus, subgroups within a genus based on non-taxonomic elements (e.g. flower forms)



# Conclusion

- Positive experience, with some challenges
- EPPO Secretariat believes it is important to continue populating GD with more plant and pest names to better answer the needs of all EPPO Codes users

## Next steps

- Adjusting EPPO IT system to manage long lists of requests in the GD interface (for administrators), and ensure traceability
- Analyze in 2018 a list of >3000 trees received from the EU (Tracability of EU trade)
- Look into lists of quarantine pests
- Other lists?

Thank you !

