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# Part 1: categorization

## Background

The purpose of this categorization is to determine whether *Scientific name* (common name) has the potential to satisfy the criteria in the definition for a quarantine pest[[1]](#footnote-1). The method used by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to initiate and conduct this categorization is consistent with international guidelines ([IPPC 2015](#_ENREF_1)). Please note that this document has been prepared by the CFIA for phytosanitary purposes only.

This is a request for a categorization of the plant species itself. If the plant itself is not a concern, then a future request may be made to identify potential pests associated with plants or seeds from a specified source.

**Initiation Point(s):** This categorization was initiated by *(select from 1.1 of ISPM 11, e.g. “the identification of a pest that may require phytosanitary measures”).*

**Brief History of Request:** *(include details from PRA request)*

**Identification of the PRA Area:** The PRA area is *(all of Canada or part of Canada).*

**Information:** There has been no previous risk assessment prepared by CFIA for *Scientific name* *(List PRAs and/or related materials in Canada and other countries if relevant)*.There has been no previous fact sheet prepared by CFIA for *Scientific name*.

**Current Regulatory Status:** *Scientific name* is (not) currently regulated as a pest in Canada, either federally or provincially *(if the species is listed in the Plant Protection Act, Weed Seeds Order, or any provincial weed legislation, include details)*. *Scientific name* is *(/is not)* regulated as a federal noxious weed in the U.S. *[see http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant\_health/plant\_pest\_info/weeds/downloads/weedlist.pdf]* and is also *(/not)* regulated in the following *(/any)* states: *[see http://www.ars-grin.gov/cgi-bin/npgs/html/tax\_search.pl and/or* [*http://plants.usda.gov/java/*](http://plants.usda.gov/java/)*]*.

## Identity of Organism

Name: *Scientific name* Author(Family) *(use USDA-ARS GRIN database wherever possible: https://npgsweb.ars-grin.gov/gringlobal/taxon/taxonomysimple.aspx)*.

Synonyms:

English common names:

French common names:

1. Is the organism clearly a single taxonomic entity and can it be adequately distinguished from other entities of the same rank? (*highlight answer in bold*)

 If yes Go to 2
If no Go to 11

*Brief description of species.*

*Note: The taxonomic unit for the organism is generally the species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by a scientifically sound rationale.*

## Presence / Absence in the PRA Area

1. Does the organism occur[[2]](#footnote-2) in the PRA area?

 If yes Go to 3
 If no Go to 5

3. Is the organism widely distributed[[3]](#footnote-3) in the PRA area?

 If yes Go to 11
If no Go to 4

*Brief description of presence/absence/distribution in the PRA area.*

*For presence/absence describe native/naturalised records separately from cultivation/sale/research; for ‘widely distributed’ determine whether the plant is widespread in all provinces where it could grow, based on hardiness zones.*

## Regulatory Status

1. Is the organism under official control[[4]](#footnote-4) in the PRA area or is it a potential candidate for official control?

 If yes Go to 5
 If no Go to 11

*Brief statement (e.g.* Scientific name *is not currently regulated as a pest in Canada, but is a potential candidate for official control in the future).*

*Note: For example, a pest that is harmful in Canada or its native range and is not expected to rapidly disperse through natural means could be addressed by official control. The final determination of whether or not it is expected to be under official control, however, is subject to considerations beyond those provided by this categorization.*

## potential for establishment and spread in the pra area

5. Does the PRA area have climatic conditions suitable for establishment and spread of the organism?

 If yes Go to 6
If no Go to 11

6. Does the PRA area have ecological conditions suitable for establishment and spread of the organism? *(consider host plant species for parasitic plants)*

If yes Go to 7
If no Go to 11

*Brief description of species’ native range, introduced range, potential range in the PRA area, habitat preferences and suitability in the PRA area, and any other relevant information. If the plant can grow anywhere in Canada, include a map of the potential range.*

*For species hardy to USDA NAPPFAST zones 8-9, consider if habitat is limiting. If it can live in any part of those zones, answer “yes” for questions 5 and 6.*

*Consider potential effects of climate change on establishment and spread in the PRA area.*

## potential for economic/environmental consequences in the pra area

7. Is the organism a known pest[[5]](#footnote-5) in its area of current distribution?

 If yes Go to 9
 If no Go to 8

8. Does the organism have intrinsic attributes that indicate that it could cause significant harm to plants?

For example:

*• Are other members of the genus or species considered weeds?*

*• Is the organism aggressively competitive (e.g. known to form dense thickets, stands or floating masses; has a climbing or smothering growth habit; known to be allelopathic or parasitic; capable of abundant, viable seed production; resistant to herbicides, or; tolerant of environmental stress)?*

*• Is it adaptable (e.g. known from a wide variety of habitats or known as a ruderal)?*

*• Does it lack natural controls (e.g. insect pests or diseases) in the PRA area?*

*• Does it cause detrimental changes to abiotic ecological processes (e.g. altering hydrological regimes, causing fire hazards)?*

 If yes Go to 9
 If no Go to 11

9. With specific reference to the plants or habitats which occur in the PRA area, could the organism by itself, or acting as a vector, cause significant damage or loss to plants leading to negative economic, environmental, societal or export market impacts?

If yes Go to 10
If no Go to 11

*List reports of weediness or invasiveness in other areas, any attributes normally associated with weediness, reports of economic consequences, etc. If there is a clear difference between the conditions for species survival vs. invasibility, this should also be described (e.g., plant can survive to PHZ 6 but reported invasive only in tropical areas).*

*Note: For a positive answer to question #9, there should be clear indications that the organism is likely to have an unacceptable economic impact in the PRA area. Unacceptable economic impact is described in ISPM No. 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms, Supplement No. 2: Guidelines on the understanding of potential economic importance and related terms. Species that are only reported to be weedy/invasive in tropical or subtropical areas, species that only survive to PHZ 8 and above, or species with a long history of introduction and very limited reports of weediness are unlikely to have an unacceptable economic impact in the PRA area, and the answer “no” should be selected. For species with marginal climate suitability, it should be noted that this conclusion is relevant “at this time” and may change with climate warming.*

## Conclusion of weed categorization

10. This organism has the potential to satisfy the definition of a quarantine pest.

11. This organism does not fulfill all of the criteria for a quarantine pest.

*Briefly summarise the main elements leading to the conclusion, including presence/absence in Canada, evidence of weediness/invasiveness, potential distribution (including USDA NAPPFAST plant hardiness zones). State whether or not PRA process should continue.*

*Notes:*

* *In the absence of sufficient information, make it clear in the conclusion and outline the uncertainties.*
* *If little is likely to be gained from a full WRA because a comprehensive literature search was already done for the categorization, it can be stated so in the conclusion.*
* *If there is clear evidence that the species could survive in the PRA area but is only weedy or invasive in NAPPFAST plant hardiness zones 10+, it should be recommended that the PRA process not continue.*
* *If you consider that it is a pest of quarantine significance but lack information to do a full risk assessment, discuss the possible pathways and uncertainties or other elements that haven’t been specifically addressed.*

*If the organism does not satisfy the definition of a quarantine pest for the PRA area, include the following text:*

Proceed to the categorization of organisms associated with this plant, if required.

**This concludes the categorization of this species as a potential quarantine pest for Canada.**
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1. A quarantine pest is a “pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled” (IPPC, 2015). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Occurrence is “the presence in an area of a pest officially recognized to be indigenous or introduced and/or not officially reported to have been eradicated” (IPPC 2015). This includes organisms which have been introduced intentionally and which are not subject to containment (e.g. cultivated plants). Organisms present for scientific purposes under adequate confinement (e.g. laboratory facilities) are not included. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A quarantine pest may be ‘present but not widely distributed’. This means that the pest has not reached the limits of its potential area of distribution either in the field or in protected conditions; it is not limited to its present distribution by climatic conditions or host-plant distribution. There should be evidence that, without phytosanitary measures, the pest would be capable of additional spread. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Official control is “the active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests” (IPPC 2015). Official control is discussed further in ISPM no. 5 Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. A pest is “any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products” (IPPC 2015) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)