

The Rufford Small Grants Foundation Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Small Grants Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Andrew Yoak
Project title	The Emerging Threat of Disease to Wildlife from Feral Dogs
RSG reference	9587-1
Reporting period	Final Report
Amount of grant	£6,000
Your email address	Yoak.4@osu.edu
Date of this report	January 10th, 2012

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project's original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Disease Surveillance in ABC Cities			X	Survey was performed easily with the assistance of local dog ABC groups
Disease Surveillance in Non-ABC City			X	Survey overcame local difficulties and local dogs were captured humanely.
Vaccinate Surveyed Dogs for Rabies			X	We vaccinated 100 dogs and supplies local veterinarians with 150 more.
Set up Rabies Testing Lab		X		A diagnostic lab was established in Jaipur, however some materials were destroyed in travel so testing has been delayed.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

3.

The materials for this study were purchased in the USA, Israel, and India requiring travel across international borders with differing customs policies. Goods were detained while entering both Israel and India. Several refrigerated materials were ruined when held improperly in Israeli custody. Indian customs tried to hold up materials because of import taxes. We could have avoided these problems by not underestimating the Indian availability of advanced medical equipment and purchasing more equipment in country.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

First, this was the first survey that tested for so many diseases in the same street dog. This work allows others to more finely tune their protocols in the future, saving money and identifying other areas of study. Of special interest are those diseases that have a significant potential for zoonotic spread in endangered wildlife.

Second, we established the relationship between animal birth control programmes and the prevalence of diseases in the dog populations they service. This has been postulated but this work is the first to empirically show the link.

Third, this work established a low-cost animal rabies identification lab with the help of the Jaipur dog clinic, Help in Suffering. To our knowledge, this is the first lab of its kind outside of southern India.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefited from the project (if relevant).

In the two cities with a dog control programmes already in place, the residents have been exposed to many years of outreach and education programmes. These programmes have significantly reduced the incidence of rabies, reducing the risk of death and property loss. In the third city, local residents were not familiar with any dog control programmes but they responded positively to our activities. In addition to the dogs in the survey that were vaccinated directly, we provided rabies vaccines to the local government veterinarian which were used to hold a several day long free rabies vaccine and education camp.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

We are currently analysing our data collected from this trip will determine if additional questions can be asked shortly. The work was complex and at times difficult, but local assistance was critical and would be far easier now that those relationships are in place.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

The raw data and initial results and recommendations have already been distributed to all involved partners. We are currently processing our work and will be the submitting results spread over two or three papers in scientific journals.

7. Timescale: Over what period was the RSG used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

All funds were used in the period of July 2011 and October 5th, 2011. The seroprevalence survey took place starting August 26th and October 5th, 2011.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

9.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Micropipette supplies	124.7	124.7	0	
Rabies testing supplies	505.5	565.5	60	Some supplies were destroyed in travel.
Multiple disease testing kits	3739.5	3779.5	0	
Leishmaniasis Testing Kits	909.6	0	-909.6	This test was removed because it was not anticipated to produce informative data.
Flights	1247.7	1554.78	307.09	
Extra Baggage Fees	0	1453.89	1453.89	Cheaper shipping options did not materialise.
Import Taxes	0	153.66	153.66	This import was supposed to be tax free.
Visa	124.6	124.6	0	

Rent	1246.5	840	-406.5	ABC groups provided cheap housing
Field Help Compensation	2495.5	307.32	2188.18	Much of local aid was provided free
Field Car Rental	1246.5	614.64	-631.86	Most travel was with ABC groups.
Blood Collection Supplies	301.5	301.5	0	
Food	467.4	467.4	0	
Total	12409	10287.49	2214.86	

1 pound sterling to 81.349 Indian rupees/ 5.8852 Israeli shekels/ 1.5498 US dollars.

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

In order to spread the beneficial effects we found, the dog control programmes must be expanded to other cities, particularly those on the periphery of important wildlife areas. While it may seem simple to target these areas, this work exists at the intersection of animal welfare and wildlife conservation, two areas that have separate goals and primary issues. To move forward, these two groups need to come together to financially support the wildlife conserving improvements to animal welfare.

10. Did you use the RSGF logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

We used the Rufford logo on materials presenting our results to local collaborators and on when presenting this work at university academic colloquium. In the future, we plan to use the Rufford logo or name on presentations including the Hayes Graduate Research Forum and the Ecological Society of America annual meeting. All papers submitted to scientific journals will list RSGF as the primary contributor.

11. Any other comments?

We would like to thank the Rufford Small Grants Foundation as well as our local collaborators. Without the assistance of both groups this work would have been impossible.