Opinion of the

Scientific Steering Committee

on the

GEOGRAPHICAL RISK OF BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY (GBR) in

KENYA

Adopted on 11/05/2001

Opinion of the Scientific Steering Committee on the GEOGRAPHICAL RISK OF BOVINE SPONGIFORM ENCEPHALOPATHY (GBR) in Kenya

THE QUESTION

The Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) was asked by the Commission to express its scientific opinion on the Geographical BSE-Risk (GBR), i.e. the likelihood of the presence of one or more cattle being infected with BSE, pre-clinically as well as clinically, at a given point in time, in a number of Third Countries.

This opinion addresses the GBR of Kenya.

THE BACKGROUND

In December 1997 the SSC expressed its first opinion on Specified Risk Materials where it stated, inter alia, that the list of SRM could probably be modulated in the light of the species, the age and the geographical origin of the animals in question.

In June 2000 the European Commission adopted a Decision on SRM (2000/418/EC), prohibiting the import of SRM from all Third Countries that have not been "satisfactorily" assessed with regard to their BSE-Risk.

In July 2000 the SSC adopted its final opinion on "the Geographical Risk of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (GBR)", which described a method and a process for the assessment of the GBR and summarised the outcome of its application to 23 countries. Detailed reports on the GBR-assessment were published on the Internet for each of these countries.

In September 2000 the Commission invited Third Countries, which are authorised to export products to the EU that are listed in annex II to the above mentioned SRM-Decision, to provide a dossier for the assessment of their GBR. Until today 46 dossiers have been received, 28 are already assessed and 18 are in different states of assessment.

This opinion concerns only one country, Kenya. It is recommended to read the opinion and the detailed report on the GBR of Kenya in the context of the GBR-opinion of July 2000.

The Commission requested this SSC opinion on the GBR of this, and of all Third Countries that decided to provide the necessary information, as input into its Decision concerning the treatment of exports from these countries in view of BSE in general and SRM in particular.

The SSC is concerned that the available information was not confirmed by inspection missions as they are performed by the FVO in the Member States. It recommends that BSE-related aspects are included in the program of future inspection missions, as far as feasible.

THE ANALYSIS

Kenya was exposed to a **moderate** external challenge in 1980/81 and from 1994 to 1999. From 1982 to 86 it was **low, high** between 1987 and 1990, and **negligible** from 1991 to 1993. According to EUROSTAT 129 animals were exported from the UK to Kenya (108 according to the Country dossier, 152 according to the UK export statistics) all before 1987 except 15 (CD) that were imported to Kenya in 1989/90. A total of 52 animals were imported from other BSE-affected countries (DE, BE, IT, NL and DK) before 1989 (Country Dossier). Kenya insists that no MBM was imported to Kenya from the UK but EUROSTAT data indicate that 522 tonnes were exported from UK to Kenya between 1987-1990 and then again 895 tonnes since 1996, the latter most probably of non-mammalian origin as after 3/1996 it was illegal to export mammalian MBM from UK. In addition EUROSTAT states that 1,910 tonnes were exported to Kenya from FR, BE, NL, IT and DK between 1980 and 1999. DK (105t) and UK have confirmed their exports but Kenya has not commented on this confirmation. The registered external challenge makes it likely that the BSE agent entered the country, most likely via MBM and cattle imports from UK in the late 80s but possibly also via MBM imports from BE, NL IT or DK in 1996/96.

The BSE/cattle system of Kenya was **very unstable** between 1980-1991, **stable** between 1992-1999 and is **very stable** since 2000. Feeding MBM to cattle was legally possible until November 1999. Until 1992, when one rendering plant was in operation in the country, domestic MBM might have reached cattle. Thereafter the only possible source was imported MBM. Since 1996 MBM imports are prohibited and feed mills were advised to replace mammalian MBM in cattle feed by other ingredients. However, no information was provided on controls, also not after the feed ban of 1999. One rendering plant was in operation in the country until 1992 when it was closed down for economic reasons. Heat treatment was supposedly adequate to reduce BSE infectivity but no data on controls were provided. There is no SRM-ban and SRM and part of fallen stock were rendered until 1992. Since the closing down of the only rendering plant of the country, recycling of the agent appears impossible. Offal and carcasses are either fed to carnivores or buried. BSE has been notifiable since 1/11/96. The existing passive surveillance is not sufficient to detect BSE cases and no active surveillance is in place. Cross-contamination, which is likely to occur in the many feed-mills of the country - no information was made available on measures taken to avoid it - would enable imported MBM reaching domestic cattle, even after 1996.

The very unstable system of Kenya (1980-91) was faced with a low to high external challenge and it is likely that an internal challenge occurred in this period. However, since 1992 the recycling virtually stopped and the internal challenge decreased. The only source for new infection was MBM that according to Eurostat was exported from BSE affected countries to Kenya and cannot be excluded to have reached domestic cattle. Since 2000 this likelihood is further reduced because a feed ban was established.

It is therefore concluded that it is unlikely, but cannot be excluded that one or several cattle that are (pre-clinically or clinically) infected with the BSE agent are currently present in the domestic herd of Kenya **(GBR- II).**

A summary of the reasons for the current assessment is given in annex 1 to this opinion.

A detailed report on the assessment of the GBR of Kenya is published separately on the Internet. It was produced by the GBR-task force of the SSC-secretariat and peer reviewed by the GBR-Peer group. The country had two opportunities to comment on different drafts of the report before the SSC took both, the report and the comments, into account for producing this opinion. The SSC appreciates the good co-operation of the country's authorities.

Kenya – Summary of the GBR-Assessment, May 2001							
	EXTERNAL CHALLENGE		**STABILITY**				**INTERACTION of EXTERNAL CHALLENGE and STABILITY**
	1980-81: MODERATE; 1982-86: LOW; 1987-90: HIGH; 1991-93: NEGLIGIBLE; 1994-99: MODERATE.		**1980-91: VERY UNSTABLE; 1992-99: STABLE; SINCE 2000: VERY STABLE.**				The recorded external challenge that before 1992 met a very unstable system could have led to an internal challenge. However, after 1992 any BSE-infectivity that could already be present in the domestic cattle herd would not have been recycled any more because rendering ceased in that year. Therefore, the probably at that time existing internal challenge decreased. The only possible source for new infection were potentially contaminated MBM imports that apparently occurred and which might have reached domestic cattle. Since 11/99, with the feed ban installed, this risk became smaller.
GBR-Level	***Live Cattle imports***	***MBM imports***	***Feeding***	***Rendering***	***SRM-removal***	***Surveillance, cross-contamination***	
II	<u>UK:</u> according to Eurostat: 192, according to UK: 152, according to CD: 108. Mainly before 1986 but 17 animals in 1989/90 according to CD <u>Non UK:</u> Last imports in 1988. 52 according to CD from DE, BE, IT, NL and DK. According to EUROSTAT: 36 animals in total. Country dossier data differ slightly from EUROSTAT, though this would not modify the overall assessment.	<u>UK:</u> None according to Kenya. According to Eurostat 520 t between 87-90 and 776 t since 1996. <u>Non UK:</u> According to EUROSTAT: 80-85: 680 t from FR 86-90: 360 t from BE and 470 t from NL 91-93: 20 t from IT 94-99: 380 t from NL, DK, BE and IT. Exports from UK and DK confirmed by exporting countries.	**Not OK 1980-2000, Reasonably OK since 2000.** Feeding MBM to cattle could not be excluded until 1992 and was legally possible until 11/1999. No information on feed controls.	**Reasonably OK 1980-91, OK since 1992.** Rendering existed until 1992, when the sole plant closed down. The heat treatment was apparently adequate to reduce BSE infectivity but no data on controls.	**Not OK 80-91, OK since 1992.** There is no SRM-ban. SRM and part of fallen stock were rendered until 1992. Since the closure of the sole rendering plant they cannot enter any more in the feed cycle.	<u>BSE Surveillance</u>: BSE notifiable since 1/11/96. The existing passive surveillance is not sufficient to detect BSE cases if they exist and no active surveillance is in place. <u>Cross-contamination</u>: Likely to occur before and after the feed ban. No information on measures taken to avoid cross-contamination.	
GBR-trend							**INTERNAL CHALLENGE**
							Internal challenge likely present and growing during 1980-1991. Since 1992 likely present and decreasing towards unlikely presence since 2000.