

CONTROL AND ELIMINATION OF RABIES IN EUROPE: CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES FOR A RABIES-FREE EUROPE

T. Müller¹, C. M. Freuling¹, C. Stoffel² & G. Torres²

Original: English

Summary: *At the beginning of the 21st century, rabies, the oldest known zoonosis to mankind, is still a notoriously underreported and neglected disease in many parts of the world causing tens of thousands of human deaths annually. Together with WHO and FAO, the OIE has taken a leadership role in reducing the public health and economic burden of rabies by controlling and eliminating the disease at the animal source and by identifying the current epidemiological situation in the OIE Regions as well as by identifying the control measures and the challenges faced by the Veterinary Services of Member Countries in implementing the OIE guidelines and standards.*

During the 83rd General Session of the OIE World Assembly of Delegates held in Paris in May 2015, the OIE Regional Commission for Europe adopted 'Control and elimination of rabies in Europe: Challenges and strategies for a rabies-free Europe' as the Technical Item 1 (with questionnaire) to be presented during the 27th Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe (Lisbon, Portugal, 19–23 September 2016).

The questionnaire developed to address Technical Item 1 was sent to all Member Countries of the Region and resulted in 49 of 53 Member Countries responding (92% response rate). This response rate, being the highest from this OIE Region on a questionnaire related to a Technical Item to be presented in a Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe, indicates a high level of interest in this topic by the Member Countries. There was a range of responses across a variety of topics including epidemiological situation, rabies surveillance, diagnostic capacities and capabilities, reporting, legislation, use of guideline and standards, host reservoir, targeted rabies control programmes and related issues, stray dog population management, cross-border collaboration, intersectorial collaboration and the challenges ahead related to this disease.

The variability of responses reflects differences in epidemiological situations in the Region ranging from freedom of disease (51%) to endemic occurrence in either wildlife – or in both dog – and wildlife-mediated rabies (49%). In addition, the variability of responses demonstrates differences in challenges associated with disease surveillance and control, including public awareness and communication. Although 34% of endemic countries envisage elimination of rabies within the next five years, one third of responders (32%) indicated the desire for OIE to be more proactive and to provide guidance to Member Countries that would support Competent Authorities and Veterinary Services in their efforts of eliminating rabies from their countries. The greatest emphasis was placed on rabies surveillance, standardised and efficient rabies control measures (including training and facilitation of cross border activities), as well as adequate support in the design, financing, implementation and monitoring of stray dog population management programmes.

Keywords: *disease control – Europe – public veterinary health – rabies – World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) – zoonosis.*

1 Dr Thomas Müller, Dr Conrad M. Freuling: National/OIE Reference Laboratory for Rabies, Friedrich-Loeffler-Institut, Federal Research Institute for Animal Health, Greifswald-Insel Riems, Germany
2 Dr Carla Stoffel, Dr Gregorio Torres: Science and New Technologies Department, OIE, Paris, France

1. Introduction

During the 83rd General Session of the OIE World Assembly of Delegates held in Paris in May 2015, the OIE Regional Commission for Europe adopted 'Control and elimination of rabies in Europe: Challenges and strategies for a rabies-free Europe' as the Technical Item 1 (with questionnaire) to be presented during the 27th Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe (Lisbon, Portugal, 19–23 September 2016). This report covers the background of rabies control and elimination efforts in Europe as well as challenges associated with and strategies for a rabies-free Europe with a focus on the current statuses of Member Countries and Veterinary Services across the domains outlined in Technical Item 1 questionnaire and responses provided. A discussion on the results of the questionnaire is provided, including recommendations based on observations from the results.

2. Overview

It is a societal tragedy that in the 21st century, a zoonosis that is one hundred per cent preventable in humans and can be easily controlled in its domestic animal species reservoir is still neglected and continues to create a significant social and economic burden in many countries worldwide, in particular in low-income countries where awareness of the disease and access to appropriate preventive and post-exposure prophylaxis are limited or non-existent [1]. While wildlife mediated rabies prevails in the northern hemisphere [2], the dog is the main reservoir of rabies on a global level, responsible for nearly 95% of fatal rabies cases in humans [3]. Recent epidemiological studies, aimed at estimating the public health and economic burden of rabies circulating in domestic dog populations, showed that globally, canine rabies causes approximately 59,000 human deaths, over 3.7 million disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) and 8.6 billion USD economic losses annually [4]. In order to achieve worldwide elimination of rabies, the OIE is committed to supporting the efforts of the international community in attaining sustainable prevention of rabies at the animal source. Two regional conferences (Kiev in 2005 and Paris in 2007) and two Global Conferences (Seoul in 2011 and Geneva 2015) on rabies highlighted the need for intersectoral collaboration in line with the One Health Approach and supported by a consistent and a sustained political commitment and underpinned by robust public and veterinary health systems. As a consequence, the Tripartite Alliance, comprised of the FAO, the OIE, and the WHO, identified rabies as a priority disease and is committed to breaking the cycle of transmission of this devastating disease from animals to humans.

The last Global Conference on rabies, held in Geneva in 2015, was jointly organised by OIE and WHO in collaboration with FAO and supported by the Global Alliance for Rabies Control (GARC). The title of the conference was 'Global elimination of dog-mediated human rabies – the time is now'. Based on the consensus reached by the conference participants, a Global Framework was developed to provide a coordinated approach and vision for the global elimination of dog-mediated human rabies with the intention to harmonise interventions and to provide adaptable and achievable guidance for country and regional elimination strategies [3].

In Europe, although large parts of the Region are free from disease, thanks to intensive efforts to control and eliminate both dog- and wildlife-mediated rabies, complete elimination of rabies from the Region has not yet been achieved [5].

By developing guidelines and international standards, the OIE enhances the integration of rabies control into national and regional networks, promotes the health and welfare of animals, and safeguards human health through its work in the improvement of standards for diagnosis and for early detection, reporting and control of animal diseases and zoonoses. Chapter 8.13 of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code* (the *Terrestrial Code*) and Chapter 2.1.13 of the OIE *Manual of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals* (the *Terrestrial Manual*) set standards to be used by the Veterinary Authorities for *a*) early detection, reporting and control of rabies, to prevent its transfer via international trade of terrestrial animals and for *b*) adequate rabies diagnostic techniques and requirements for vaccines, respectively [6]. In addition, Chapter 7.7 of the *Terrestrial Code* provides recommendations on stray dog population management and control as an integral part of rabies control programmes.

During the 84th General Session of the World Assembly of the Delegates of the OIE (Paris 2016), all 180 Member Countries adopted resolution No. 26 on global elimination of dog-mediated

rabies. Member Countries committed to develop or refine their respective national and regional rabies elimination strategies with the aim of achieving the elimination of dog-mediated rabies by 2030.

This Technical Item explores the role of Veterinary Authorities in managing rabies control and elimination at the animal source and aims to build a shared vision in the Region on how to achieve sustainable control and elimination of rabies and on how to identify current achievements as well as challenges ahead in eliminating both dog- and wildlife-mediated rabies. The information presented draws on the experiences of Member Countries within the OIE Regional Commission for Europe.

3. Material and methods

The analysis of the responses is reported here and will be presented and discussed during the 27th Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe with the aim of building a shared vision in the Region addressing, in a sustainable manner, achievements as well as challenges ahead in eliminating both canine- and wildlife-mediated rabies.

In order to evaluate the rabies situation and the capacity of the Veterinary Services of the Member Countries of the European Region, a questionnaire was sent by e-mail to the Delegates of the 53 Member Countries of the Region. Members were asked to respond to a questionnaire that included 42 questions relating to three aspects of rabies surveillance and control, namely:

- a) epidemiological situation,
- b) control measures and
- c) challenges.

The responses to the questionnaire were collected in a database and analysed. The results, provided in tabular form, include both the number of responses and the correlating percentage of applicable responses (see [Annex 1](#)).

4. Results and discussion

There were 49 responding countries out of 53 countries queried (92% response rate); this is the highest response rate from this OIE Region on a questionnaire related to a Technical Item to be presented in a Conference of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe. The high response rate obtained indicates a strong interest in the topic by Member Countries of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe. The variability in the range of responses, including non-responses, as well as specific answers to the role of OIE, indicates the need for additional work required by countries and organisations to strengthen their efforts in rabies control.

4.1. Epidemiological situation

The variability of responses reflects differences in epidemiological situations in the Region ranging from freedom of disease to endemic occurrence. Less than half of the countries (38.8%) reported that terrestrial rabies caused by RABV³ is present in their countries. From a geographical point of view, however, this represents the far greater part of the Region. Rabies caused twenty one case fatalities in 2014 and twenty case fatalities in 2015, with the majority of fatalities being reported from Tajikistan and Russia.

Based on responses provided, 51.0% (N=25) have self-declared freedom from rabies. However, only a minority of the Member Countries followed the protocol for self-declaration based on the provisions of the *Terrestrial Code* Chapter 1.6 on procedures for self-declaration and for official recognition by the OIE. Member Countries wishing to self-declare free of rabies should inform the OIE of its fulfilment with the provisions of Article 8.13.3. on Rabies free country. In addition to those Member Countries that have already self-declared freedom from rabies, 17 Member Countries envisage eventual freedom from rabies, mostly (N=11) within the next five years. Bat rabies was reported to occur in 18 Member Countries.

3 RABV: classical rabies virus

Wildlife rabies is dominant in rabies endemic countries, with red foxes, the raccoon dogs and jackals as reservoir species. Slightly more than 40% of Member Countries responded that dogs are a reservoir in their country. Additionally, some Member Countries stated that rodents (rats) or wolves act as reservoirs. These answers may indicate insufficient knowledge on the epidemiology of the disease. Although wolves can contract the disease and transmit it to other animals including humans, their social behaviour does not support an independent transmission among wolves. Rodents do not play a role in rabies, neither as a reservoir nor as a transmitter.

In the majority of countries, the presence or absence of the disease is demonstrated by passive surveillance focused on the investigation of any suspect animal. Surveillance is also maintained by all except one Member Country that has gained rabies-free status. According to Article 8.13.3 of the *Terrestrial Code*, a prerequisite for becoming a rabies free country is to have an on-going system of disease surveillance in accordance with Chapter 1.4 in operation for at least the past two years.

Bats are included in rabies surveillance in only 40% of responding countries. The disease is universally detected using laboratory confirmation (100%), whereby a very high percentage (93%) of countries applies the OIE recommended fluorescent antibody test (FAT). As a confirmatory test, the majority of countries use virus isolation in cell culture (VIC, 31%), whereas 19% still use the mouse inoculation (MIT) test. As stated in the *Terrestrial Manual*, the latter confirmatory test should be phased out, as VIC is as sensitive as MIT, but does not necessitate the use of animals. Although molecular techniques are not yet regarded as standard tests for the diagnosis of rabies, nearly 90% of Member Countries have established PCR as a diagnostic tool. There are three OIE reference laboratories for rabies in the Region, i.e. ANSES, Nancy, France, APHA, Weybridge, United Kingdom, and FLI, Greifswald-Insel Riems, Germany, with the mandate to provide laboratory support or confirmation of results as needed upon request. All responding Member Countries comply with the requirements of reporting rabies surveillance data to the OIE WAHIS database. Some Member Countries also report data to The WHO Rabies Bulletin database and the EU Animal Disease Notification System (ADNS) system as well as to the EFSA for its report on zoonoses.

4.2. Control measures

Throughout the European Region, rabies appears to be an integral part of veterinary legislation, and in the vast majority of Member Countries (98%), rabies is notifiable based on a clear case definition. According to the OIE standards, Member Countries are obliged to classify rabies as a notifiable disease and regularly report the occurrence or absence of disease to the OIE. All but one Member Country affirmed that animal importation is in compliance with Chapter 8.13. of the *Terrestrial Code*. In the case of an outbreak or an increased risk of incursion, 38 Member Countries have a contingency plan. According to the OIE standards, Member Countries should have an ongoing early detection programme to ensure investigation and reporting of rabies suspect animals. Rabies control or elimination programmes are implemented in 33 Member Countries and target mainly red foxes (73.5%) and/or dogs (73.5%). Legislative frameworks (92%) and mass dog vaccination campaigns (76%) were reported as core components of dog rabies control programmes, while only 40% reported the use of communication plans or of evaluation of campaigns as core components of a control programme.

Experiences from many rabies control programmes have demonstrated that success depends on implementation of the five pillars of rabies elimination including increased communication, awareness and education. These pillars were laid down in the Global framework to eliminate dog-mediated human rabies by 2030 [3].

Unowned or stray dog (and cat) populations are considered a problem in 21 Member Countries (43%), and dog population control programmes are in place in some Member Countries that do not consider stray dog populations to be a problem of public health concern. Dog movement control (92%) and enforcement of responsible dog ownership (86%) through registration and identification are core components of these control programmes. Although there is scientific evidence to support the inefficacy of euthanasia as a method for rabies control, it is still used as a population control measure in 50% of all Member

Countries. Member Countries should consult Chapter 7.7. of the *Terrestrial Code* for dog population control methods that ensure the welfare of the animals. Member Countries should provide for a dog population census in order to identify a stray dog population problem and to tailor their dog population control measures. Unfortunately, not all Member Countries provide for a dog population census and therefore cannot identify a problem with stray dogs.

Anti-rabies vaccination of domestic animals is compulsory in 25 Member Countries, and it should be mandatory in those Member Countries where dog-mediated rabies is present. Compulsory vaccination together with mass dog vaccination should provide for the 70% vaccination coverage needed to interrupt the disease transmission cycle. All vaccines for parenteral use comply with the OIE quality standards as laid down in Chapter 2.1.13. of the *Terrestrial Manual*. Most Member Countries (82%) with endemic wildlife rabies applied oral rabies vaccination using one or two of five reported vaccine strains, i.e. ERA G333, SAD B 19, SAG2, VRG and SAD Bern, the latter being the most widely used strain at present.

Within the European Region, cross-border collaboration with neighbouring countries on rabies control is widely used. Veterinary Authorities share, in particular, ad hoc information on outbreaks or increased risks in border areas as well as surveillance data. All but one Member Country reported coordination between veterinary and human public health authorities. However, it appears that coordination between public health authorities is often limited to exchange of information and data. Close collaboration and coordination between human and animal health sectors and other stakeholders in line with the One Health approach has been demonstrated to be effective in rabies elimination [3].

4.3. Challenges

Based upon their prevailing epidemiological situation, Member Countries identified and ranked the biggest challenges to self-declaring free from rabies or to remaining free from rabies. For those Member Countries who have self-declared free from rabies, illegal importation of pet animals and reinfection from neighbouring infected areas are the biggest challenges. In contrast, rabies-endemic countries regarded the lack of funding and the constant risk of reinfection from neighbouring countries as the biggest challenges. Since rabies is a transboundary animal disease, regional coordination and collaboration is particularly needed in rabies-endemic countries.

While 80% of responders consider the work being carried out by the OIE as sufficient to make a difference in the elimination of both wildlife- and dog-mediated rabies in the Region, one third of responders (32%) indicated the desire for OIE to be more proactive and provide guidance to Member Countries. Specifically, support is needed in rabies surveillance, in standardised and efficient rabies control measures, including training, facilitation of cross border activities, as well as support in the design, financing, implementation, and monitoring of stray dog population management programmes.

References

1. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) (2012). – Rabies control – Towards sustainable prevention at the source (Fooks A.R. & Müller T., edit.). Compendium of the OIE Global Conference on Rabies Control, Incheon-Seoul, 7–9 September 2011, Republic of Korea. Paris: OIE.
2. Rupprecht C.E., Barrett J., Briggs D., Cliquet F., Fooks A.R., Lumlertdacha B., Meslin F.X., Müller T., Nel L.H., Schneider C., Tordo N. & Wandeler A.I. – Can rabies be eradicated? *Dev Biol.* 2008;131:95-121.
3. World Health Organization (WHO) & World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) (2016). – Global elimination of dog-mediated human rabies. Report of the Rabies Global Conference, Geneva, 10–11 December 2015, Switzerland, Geneva:WHO.
4. Hampson K., Coudeville L., Lembo T., Sambo M., Kieffer A., Attlan M., Barrat J., Blanton J., Briggs D., Cleaveland S., Costa P., Freuling C., Hiby E., Knopf L., Leanes F., Metlin A., Miranda M.E., Müller T., Nel L., Recuenco S., Rupprecht C., Schumacher C., Taylor L., Vigilato M., Zinstaag J. & Dushoff J. – Estimating the global burden of endemic canine rabies. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2015;9 (4):e0003709. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003709>.
5. Müller T., Demetriou P., Moynagh J., Cliquet F., Fooks A.R., Conraths F.J., Mettenleiter T.C. & Freuling C. – Rabies elimination in Europe – A success story. *In: Rabies control – Towards sustainable prevention at the*

source (Fooks A.R. & Müller T., edit.). Compendium of the OIE Global Conference on Rabies Control, Incheon-Seoul, 7–9 September 2011, Republic of Korea. Paris: OIE; 31-44.

6. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) (2016). – Chapter 8.13. Infection with rabies virus, *In: Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), Paris.

Responses to the questionnaire

Responding countries

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-----------------|
| 1 | Albania | 17 | Greece | 33 | Poland |
| 2 | Armenia | 18 | Hungary | 34 | Portugal |
| 3 | Austria | 19 | Iceland | 35 | Romania |
| 4 | Belarus | 20 | Ireland | 36 | Russia |
| 5 | Belgium | 21 | Israel | 37 | San Marino |
| 6 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | 22 | Italy | 38 | Serbia |
| 7 | Bulgaria | 23 | Kazakhstan | 39 | Slovakia |
| 8 | Croatia | 24 | Kyrgyzstan | 40 | Slovenia |
| 9 | Cyprus | 25 | Latvia | 41 | Spain |
| 10 | Czech Republic | 26 | Liechtenstein | 42 | Sweden |
| 11 | Denmark | 27 | Lithuania | 43 | Switzerland |
| 12 | Estonia | 28 | Luxembourg | 44 | Tajikistan |
| 13 | Finland | 29 | Macedonia (Former Yug. Rep. of) | 45 | The Netherlands |
| 14 | France | 30 | Malta | 46 | Turkey |
| 15 | Georgia | 31 | Montenegro | 47 | Turkmenistan |
| 16 | Germany | 32 | Norway | 48 | United Kingdom |
| | | | | 49 | Uzbekistan |

Non responding countries

- 1 Andorra
- 2 Azerbaijan
- 3 Moldova
- 4 Ukraine

1. Epidemiological situation

1.1 Is terrestrial rabies caused by the classical rabies virus (RABV) endemic in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 19 | 38.8% |
| No | 30 | 61.2% |

1.2 If the answer to 1.1 is yes, which are the reservoir species?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Red foxes | 17 | 89.5% |
| Raccoon dogs | 2 | 10.5% |
| Dogs | 8 | 42.1% |
| Other | 5 | 26.3% |
| Not applicable | 30 | 61.2% |

| Other | Reported |
|-----------|----------|
| Cat | 1 |
| Foxes | 1 |
| Jackals | 3 |
| Rats | 1 |
| Wolf | 1 |
| No answer | 1 |

1.3 Is bat rabies known to occur in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 18 | 36.7% |
| No | 31 | 63.3% |

1.4 If the answer to 1.1 or 1.3 is yes, what type of rabies surveillance is established in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------------|----------|------------|
| Passive surveillance | 31 | 91.2% |
| Active surveillance | 20 | 58.8% |
| Passive only | 13 | 38.2% |
| Active only | 2 | 5.9% |
| Both | 18 | 52.9% |
| None | 1 | 2.9% |
| Not applicable | 15 | 30.6% |

1.5 If your country has a rabies surveillance system, what animal species are included?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|
| Any suspect animal | 39 | 83.0% |
| Wildlife reservoir species | 34 | 72.3% |
| Owned dogs and cats | 24 | 51.1% |
| Other wildlife | 21 | 44.7% |
| Stray dogs and cats | 20 | 42.6% |
| Bats | 19 | 40.4% |
| Other domestic animals | 16 | 34.0% |
| Not applicable | 2 | 4.1% |

- 1.6 Based on the provisions of Article 8.13.3. of the *Terrestrial Code*, has your country self-declared freedom from rabies?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 25 | 51.0% |
| No | 24 | 49.0% |

- 1.7 If the answer to 1.6 is no, does your country envisage self-declaration of freedom from rabies according to Article 8.13.13. of the *Terrestrial Code*?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 17 | 68.0% |
| No | 8 | 32.0% |
| Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |

- 1.8 If the answer to 1.7 is yes, when do you envisage elimination of rabies in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|--------------------------|----------|------------|
| Yes with year | 16 | 94.1% |
| Within 5 years/ By 2020 | 11 | 64.7% |
| Within 10 years/ By 2025 | 2 | 11.8% |
| Within 15 years/ By 2030 | 3 | 17.6% |
| Yes, year not known | 1 | 5.9% |
| Not applicable | 32 | 65.3% |

- 1.9 If your country has gained a rabies free status according to Article 8.13.3. of the *Terrestrial Code*, is rabies surveillance being maintained?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 25 | 96.2% |
| No | 1 | 3.8% |
| Not applicable | 23 | 46.9% |

- 1.10 How many rabies cases have been detected in your country in the past two years?

| Species | 2014 | | | | 2015 | | | |
|----------------|----------|------------|---------|---------|----------|------------|---------|---------|
| | Reported | Percentage | Minimum | Maximum | Reported | Percentage | Minimum | Maximum |
| Humans | 43 | 87.8% | 1 | 7 | 43 | 87.8% | 2 | 10 |
| Dogs | 45 | 91.8% | 1 | 453 | 46 | 93.9% | 1 | 938 |
| Bats | 41 | 83.7% | 1 | 22 | 41 | 83.7% | 1 | 15 |
| Other wildlife | 45 | 91.8% | 1 | 1,227 | 45 | 91.8% | 2 | 1,974 |
| No answer | 2 | 4.1% | | | 2 | 4.1% | | |

Human cases

| | 2014 | 2015 | Total |
|------------|------|------|-------|
| Georgia | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| Israel | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Russia | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Spain | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Tajikistan | 7 | 10 | 17 |
| Turkey | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Total | 21 | 20 | |

1.11 When was the last human rabies case in your country reported?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Year or range provided | 37 | 75.5% |
| Within the last 5 years/ 2010–2016 | 16 | 32.7% |
| Within the last 10 years/ 2005–2010 | 3 | 6.1% |
| Within the last 15 years/ 2000–2005 | 4 | 8.2% |
| Over 15 years ago/ Before 2000 | 16 | 32.7% |
| Other | 5 | 10.2% |
| No answer | 5 | 10.2% |

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Indigenous | 21 | 53.8% |
| Imported | 15 | 38.5% |
| No answer | 3 | 7.7% |
| Not applicable | 10 | 20.4% |

1.12 How is rabies in animals and humans diagnosed in your country?

| | | Reported | Percentage |
|---------|-----------------------|----------|------------|
| Humans | Clinical signs | 26 | 53.1% |
| | Laboratory tests | 43 | 87.8% |
| | Clinical signs only | 2 | 4.1% |
| | Laboratory tests only | 19 | 38.8% |
| | Both | 24 | 49.0% |
| | None | 4 | 8.2% |
| Animals | Clinical signs | 28 | 57.1% |
| | Laboratory tests | 49 | 100.0% |
| | Clinical signs only | 0 | 0.0% |
| | Laboratory tests only | 21 | 42.9% |
| | Both | 28 | 57.1% |
| | None | 0 | 0.0% |

1.13 How many laboratories have the technical capability to diagnose rabies in your country? Is there a national reference laboratory (NRL) or sub-regional (SRLs) for rabies?

| | | | Reported | Percentage |
|------------|-----|-----------|----------|------------|
| Human | SRL | Yes | 8 | 16.3% |
| | | No | 27 | 55.1% |
| | | No data | 1 | 2.0% |
| | NRL | No answer | 13 | 26.5% |
| | | Yes | 29 | 59.2% |
| | | No | 14 | 28.6% |
| Veterinary | SRL | No answer | 6 | 12.2% |
| | | Yes | 23 | 46.9% |
| | | No | 20 | 40.8% |
| | NRL | No answer | 6 | 12.2% |
| | | Yes | 43 | 87.8% |
| | | No | 4 | 8.2% |
| | | No answer | 2 | 4.1% |

1.14 According to Chapter 2.1.13. of the *Terrestrial Manual*, which diagnostic tests are available at the sub-national rabies laboratories and the NRL in your country?

| | | Reported | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----|----------|------------|
| Fluorescent antibody test | SRL | 21 | 45.7% |
| | NRL | 43 | 93.5% |
| ELISA | SRL | 4 | 8.7% |
| | NRL | 24 | 52.2% |
| DRIT | SRL | 0 | 0.0% |
| | NRL | 6 | 13.0% |
| Other | SRL | 0 | 0.0% |
| | NRL | 5 | 10.9% |
| Cell culture | SRL | 6 | 13.0% |
| | NRL | 31 | 67.4% |
| Mouse inoculation | SRL | 9 | 19.6% |
| | NRL | 19 | 41.3% |
| PCR | SRL | 5 | 10.9% |
| | NRL | 40 | 87.0% |
| FAVN | SRL | 7 | 15.2% |
| | NRL | 29 | 63.0% |
| RFFIT | SRL | 3 | 6.5% |
| | NRL | 17 | 37.0% |
| Not applicable | | 3 | 6.1% |

1.15 To which international entities are rabies cases in humans and animals and rabies surveillance data notified/ reported?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|
| OIE/ WAHIS | 49 | 100.0% |
| No | 0 | 0.0% |
| No answer | 0 | 0.0% |
| WHO Rabies Bulletin Europe | 41 | 83.7% |
| No | 7 | 14.3% |
| No answer | 1 | 2.0% |
| EU/ ADNS | 36 | 73.5% |
| No | 12 | 24.5% |
| No answer | 1 | 2.0% |
| EFSA | 32 | 65.3% |
| No | 16 | 32.7% |
| No answer | 1 | 2.0% |

2. Control measures

2.1 Is rabies in animals and humans notifiable in your country?

| | | Reported | Percentage |
|--------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Human | Yes | 46 | 93.9% |
| | No | 2 | 4.1% |
| | No answer | 1 | 2.0% |
| Animal | Yes | 48 | 98.0% |
| | No | 1 | 2.0% |

2.2 Is there a specific national legislation on animal rabies control in place in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 44 | 89.8% |
| No | 5 | 10.2% |
| Not applicable | 0 | 0.0% |

2.3 If you answered yes to 2.2, does this legislation provide a case definition for rabies?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 36 | 81.8% |
| No | 8 | 18.2% |
| Not applicable | 5 | 10.2% |

2.4 Based upon case definitions described in your legislation or relevant policy, is laboratory confirmation of rabies diagnosis required?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 47 | 97.9% |
| No | 1 | 2.1% |
| Not applicable | 1 | 2.0% |

2.5 Is animal importation included in the national legislation on animal rabies control?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 43 | 97.7% |
| No | 1 | 2.3% |
| Not applicable | 5 | 10.2% |

2.6 Are the measures for animal importation in your country in compliance with Chapter 8.13. of the *Terrestrial Code*?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 48 | 98.0% |
| No | 1 | 2.0% |
| Not applicable | 0 | 0.0% |

2.7 Is a rabies control or elimination programme implemented in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 33 | 67.3% |
| No | 16 | 32.7% |
| Not applicable | 0 | 0.0% |

2.8 If the answer to 2.7 is yes, what species does it target?

| | | Reported | Percentage |
|--------------|----------------|----------|------------|
| Red foxes | Yes | 25 | 73.5% |
| | No | 8 | 23.5% |
| | Not applicable | 16 | 32.7% |
| Raccoon Dogs | Yes | 10 | 29.4% |
| | No | 23 | 67.6% |
| | Not applicable | 16 | 32.7% |
| Dogs | Yes | 25 | 73.5% |
| | No | 8 | 23.5% |
| | Not applicable | 16 | 32.7% |
| Other | Yes | 17 | 50.0% |
| | No | 16 | 47.1% |
| | Not applicable | 16 | 32.7% |
| No answer | | 1 | 2.9% |

| Other | Reported |
|--|----------|
| All susceptible animals | 1 |
| All susceptible species | 1 |
| All suspect animals that are sensitive to the rabies virus | 1 |
| Any rabies susceptible species | 1 |
| Badger kept in capture | 1 |
| Carnivores | 1 |
| Cats | 4 |
| Domestic ferret | 1 |
| Golden jackal | 1 |
| Jackals | 3 |
| Livestock animals | 1 |
| Other domestic species susceptible to rabies | 1 |
| Rodents | 1 |

2.9 With reference to Article 8.13.2. of the *Terrestrial Code*, if dogs are the target species you indicated in 2.8., what are the core components of the dog rabies control programme?

| | | Reported | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------|------------|
| Legislative framework | Yes | 23 | 92.0% |
| | No | 2 | 8.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |
| Communication plan | Yes | 10 | 40.0% |
| | No | 15 | 60.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |
| Epidemiological assessment | Yes | 17 | 68.0% |
| | No | 8 | 32.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |
| Dog bite prevention programme | Yes | 14 | 56.0% |
| | No | 11 | 44.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |
| Mass dog vaccination campaigns | Yes | 19 | 76.0% |
| | No | 6 | 24.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |
| Evaluation of campaigns | Yes | 10 | 40.0% |
| | No | 15 | 60.0% |
| | Not applicable | 24 | 49.0% |

2.10 Are unowned or stray dog (and cat) populations considered a problem in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 21 | 42.9% |
| No | 27 | 55.1% |
| No answer | 1 | 2.0% |

The term 'considered' is subjective and could be up for interpretation by some countries.

2.11 If yes, is there a dog population control programme, as described in Chapter 7.7. of the *Terrestrial Code*, in place?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 24 | 82.8% |
| No | 4 | 13.8% |
| No answer | 1 | 3.4% |
| Not applicable | 20 | 40.8% |

Five countries indicated that a dog population control programme is in place despite stray dogs not being a problem. Other countries may have chosen not to respond to the question if stray dogs were not considered a problem.

2.12 What measures, as laid down in Article 7.7.6. of the *Terrestrial Code*, are implemented in your country to control dog populations?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|---|----------|------------|
| Control of dog movement - international (export/ import) | 45 | 91.8% |
| Education and legislation for responsible ownership | 42 | 85.7% |
| Registration and identification of dogs (licensing) | 40 | 81.6% |
| Capture and return, rehoming or release | 33 | 67.3% |
| Regulation of commercial dog dealers | 32 | 65.3% |
| Control of dog movements – within country (e.g. leash laws, roaming restrictions) | 31 | 63.3% |
| Euthanasia | 24 | 49.0% |
| Removal and handling | 23 | 46.9% |
| Reproductive control | 22 | 44.9% |
| Reduction in dog bite incidence | 20 | 40.8% |
| Environmental controls | 14 | 28.6% |
| None | 1 | 2.0% |

2.13 Is registration of owned dogs using regional/central databases compulsory in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 38 | 77.6% |
| No | 11 | 22.4% |

2.14 Does your country conduct dog population censuses, using methods recommended in Article 7.7.8. of the *Terrestrial Code*?

| Self-declared freedom from rabies | Dog-population census | Reported | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | Yes | 13 | 52.0% |
| | No | 12 | 48.0% |
| No | Yes | 10 | 41.7% |
| | No | 13 | 54.2% |
| | No answer | 1 | 4.2% |

2.15 Based on the latest census, what is the estimated number of dogs in your country?

| | Reported | Percentage | Minimum | Maximum |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|---------|------------|
| Year | 32 | 65.3% | 2000 | 2016 |
| Not applicable | 1 | 2.0% | | |
| No answer | 16 | 32.7% | | |
| Owned dogs Number | 33 | 67.3% | 2,158 | 10,400,000 |
| Other* | 4 | 8.2% | | |
| No answer | 12 | 24.5% | | |
| Stray dogs Number | 11 | 22.4% | 1,647 | 900,000 |
| Zero | 10 | 20.4% | | |
| Other** | 11 | 22.4% | | |
| No answer | 17 | 34.7% | | |

| * Owned dogs/ Other | Reported |
|---------------------|----------|
| Not known | 1 |
| No data | 1 |
| Not applicable | 1 |
| Not available | 1 |

| ** Stray dogs/ Other | Reported |
|----------------------|----------|
| No answer | 2 |
| Not known | 1 |
| No data | 5 |
| Not estimated | 1 |
| Not applicable | 1 |
| Not available | 1 |

Some countries may have interpreted that only censuses that use methods in the *Terrestrial Code* are applicable. Numbers may be underreporting.

2.16 If the target species you indicated in 2.8. is wildlife (i.e. red foxes, raccoon dogs), what measures are implemented to control rabies in these species?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Intensive hunting | 5 | 17.9% |
| No | 22 | 78.6% |
| No answer | 1 | 3.6% |
| Not applicable | 21 | 42.9% |
| Oral rabies vaccination (ORV) | 23 | 82.1% |
| No | 4 | 14.3% |
| No answer | 1 | 3.6% |
| Not applicable | 21 | 42.9% |
| Other | 4 | 14.3% |
| No | 23 | 82.1% |
| No answer | 1 | 3.6% |
| Not applicable | 21 | 42.9% |
| None | 1 | 3.6% |
| No | 26 | 92.9% |
| No answer | 1 | 3.6% |
| Not applicable | 21 | 42.9% |

| Other | Reported |
|---|----------|
| Deratisation, bait, etc. | 1 |
| laboratory examination of 4 hunted (dead found) foxes (raccoon dogs)/100 km ² | 1 |
| Rabies free, wildlife reservoir species and pets are randomly investigated; | 1 |
| Testing of target species (foxes) for detection of rabies virus and for monitoring of the vaccination effectiveness; testing of target suspect/indicator animals of all susceptible species found on the whole territory of the country | 1 |

2.17 If you use oral rabies vaccination (ORV) to combat wildlife rabies, please provide information on the following issues:

| | Reported | Percentage | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| Yes | 22 | 91.7% | | |
| Km ² | 23 | 95.8% | 2,500 | 54,761.5 |
| Frequency of vaccine bait distribution per year | 23 | 95.8% | 1 | 3 |
| Aerial | 23 | 95.8% | | |
| Manual | 8 | 33.3% | | |
| Vaccine strain used | 20 | 83.3% | | |
| Baits/km ² | 23 | 95.8% | 16 | 40 |
| Bait uptake | 22 | 91.7% | | |
| Seroconversion | 22 | 91.7% | | |
| Not applicable | 25 | 51.0% | | |

| Vaccine strain | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| ERA G333 | 1 | 4.2% |
| SAD B 19 | 4 | 16.7% |
| SAD Bern | 12 | 50.0% |
| SAG2 | 4 | 16.7% |
| VRG | 1 | 4.2% |
| No answer | 3 | 12.5% |

One country provided answers to the first two parts of the question despite 2.16 not being applicable. These answers were included in the analysis.

Two countries use two vaccine strains.

2.18 Is anti-rabies vaccination of domestic animals compulsory in your country? If yes, how many domestic animals were vaccinated in the past two years?

| | | 2014 | | 2015 | |
|--------------------|-----------|----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | | Reported | Percentage | Reported | Percentage |
| Dogs (owned) | Yes | 32 | 65.3% | 32 | 65.3% |
| | No | 17 | 34.7% | 17 | 34.7% |
| Cats (owned) | Yes | 20 | 40.8% | 20 | 40.8% |
| | No | 26 | 53.1% | 26 | 53.1% |
| | No answer | 3 | 6.1% | 3 | 6.1% |
| Cattle | Yes | 8 | 16.3% | 9 | 18.4% |
| | No | 30 | 61.2% | 30 | 61.2% |
| | No answer | 11 | 22.4% | 10 | 20.4% |
| Small ruminants | Yes | 6 | 12.2% | 7 | 14.3% |
| | No | 31 | 63.3% | 31 | 63.3% |
| | No answer | 12 | 24.5% | 11 | 22.4% |
| Other livestock | Yes | 6 | 12.2% | 7 | 14.3% |
| | No | 30 | 61.2% | 30 | 61.2% |
| | No answer | 13 | 26.5% | 12 | 24.5% |

| Country | 2014 | 2015 | Census year | Census | Per cent vaccinated |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|
| | Dogs vaccinated | Dogs vaccinated | | | |
| Belarus | 389,183 | 372,576 | No answer | No answer | |
| Croatia | 350,060 | 355,881 | 2015 | 355,881 | 100.0% |
| Czech Republic | 1,600,000 | 1,600,000 | 2015 | 2,000,000 | 80.0% |
| Denmark | >54,000 | >62,000 | 2000 | 550,000 | |
| Estonia | 24,517 | 19,439 | 2014 | 95,829 | 20.3% |
| Georgia | 179,759 | 191,285 | No answer | 350,000 | 54.7% |
| Hungary | 1,118,000 | 1,200,000 | 2015 | 1,500,000 | 80.0% |
| Israel | 251,367 | 253,811 | 2015 | 400,000 | 63.5% |
| Kazakhstan | 586,270 | 829,852 | No answer | No answer | |
| Kyrgyzstan | 453,114 | 164,429 | 2016 | 417,595 | 39.4% |
| Latvia | 65,165 | 54,170 | No answer | No answer | |
| Lithuania | 128,381 | 125,781 | No answer | n/k | |
| Montenegro | 2,176 | 1,833 | No answer | No answer | |
| Poland | 2,576,304 | 2,651,785 | No answer | No answer | |
| Portugal | 164,827 | 85,805 | 2014 | 1,400,000 | 6.1% |
| Romania | 1,062,983 | 1,455,669 | 2015 | 3,000,000 | 48.5% |
| Serbia | 278,635 | 267,646 | 2014 | 278,602 | 96.1% |
| Slovenia | 174,700 | 89,371 | 2016 | 223,822 | 39.9% |
| Tajikistan | No answer | 64,594 | 2016 | 375,000 | 17.2% |
| Turkey | 611,798 | 665,666 | 2015 | No answer | |
| Turkmenistan | 96,399 | 95,492 | No answer | No answer | |
| Uzbekistan | 1,119,700 | 1,302,300 | No answer | 1,340,000 | 97.2% |

| | Self-declared freedom from rabies | Compulsory vaccination | 2014 | | 2015 | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | | | Reported | Percentage | Reported | Percentage |
| Dogs (owned) | Yes | Yes | 12 | 24.5% | 12 | 24.5% |
| | | No | 13 | 26.5% | 13 | 26.5% |
| | No | Yes | 20 | 40.8% | 20 | 40.8% |
| | | No | 4 | 8.2% | 4 | 8.2% |
| Cats (owned) | Yes | Yes | 6 | 12.2% | 6 | 12.2% |
| | | No | 17 | 34.7% | 17 | 34.7% |
| | | No answer | 2 | 4.1% | 2 | 4.1% |
| | No | Yes | 14 | 28.6% | 14 | 28.6% |
| | | No | 9 | 18.4% | 9 | 18.4% |
| | | No answer | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 2.0% |
| Cattle | Yes | Yes | 2 | 4.1% | 2 | 4.1% |
| | | No | 18 | 36.7% | 18 | 36.7% |
| | | No answer | 5 | 10.2% | 5 | 10.2% |
| | No | Yes | 6 | 12.2% | 7 | 14.3% |
| | | Non | 12 | 24.5% | 12 | 24.5% |
| | | No answer | 6 | 12.2% | 5 | 10.2% |
| Small ruminants | Yes | Yes | 1 | 2.0% | 1 | 2.0% |
| | | No | 19 | 38.8% | 19 | 38.8% |
| | | No answer | 5 | 10.2% | 5 | 10.2% |
| | No | Yes | 5 | 10.2% | 6 | 12.2% |
| | | No | 12 | 24.5% | 12 | 24.5% |
| | | No answer | 7 | 14.3% | 6 | 12.2% |
| Other livestock | Yes | Yes | 2 | 4.1% | 2 | 4.1% |
| | | Non | 17 | 34.7% | 17 | 34.7% |
| | | No answer | 6 | 12.2% | 6 | 12.2% |
| | No | Yes | 4 | 8.2% | 5 | 10.2% |
| | | No | 13 | 26.5% | 13 | 26.5% |
| | | No answer | 7 | 14.3% | 6 | 12.2% |

Some countries provided numbers of animals vaccinated for species where vaccination is not compulsory. Other countries may have chosen not to provide numbers for non-compulsory species. All numbers provided have been included in the analysis.

2.19 To your knowledge, do the rabies vaccines used in your country comply with the OIE quality standards in Chapter 2.1.13. of the *Terrestrial Manual*?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|----------------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 48 | 98.0% |
| Not applicable | 1 | 2.0% |

2.20 What activities are implemented to promote cross-border collaboration with neighbouring countries on rabies control?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|--|----------|------------|
| Exchange of <i>ad hoc</i> information between Veterinary Authorities on outbreaks or increased risks in border areas | 38 | 77.6% |
| No | 11 | 22.4% |
| Frequent exchange of information / data between Veterinary Authorities at a ministerial level | 31 | 63.3% |
| No | 18 | 36.7% |
| Frequent exchange of information / data between Veterinary Authorities at a local level | 19 | 38.8% |
| No | 30 | 61.2% |
| Regular meetings with Veterinary Authorities of neighbouring countries | 32 | 65.3% |
| No | 17 | 34.7% |

2.21 In case of an outbreak or increased risk, do you have a contingency plan available?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 31 | 63.3% |
| No | 18 | 36.7% |

2.22 How are rabies control measures in your country coordinated with public health authorities?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|--|----------|------------|
| Public health authorities are members of the national rabies control coordination committee | 26 | 53.1% |
| No | 23 | 46.9% |
| Public health authorities are members of the local rabies control coordination committee (district / county level) | 18 | 36.7% |
| No | 31 | 63.3% |
| Regular meetings at a ministerial / local level | 24 | 49.0% |
| No | 25 | 51.0% |
| Frequent exchange of epidemiological information / data | 40 | 81.6% |
| No | 9 | 18.4% |
| Frequent exchange of information / data on control measures | 35 | 71.4% |
| No | 14 | 28.6% |
| Not coordinated with public health authorities | 1 | 2.0% |
| No | 48 | 98.0% |

2.23 What is done in your country to increase public awareness?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|--|----------|------------|
| Education of people on rabies risks | 37 | 75.5% |
| No | 12 | 24.5% |
| Radio and TV spots | 26 | 53.1% |
| No | 23 | 46.9% |
| Provision of information material (brochures, posters, leaflets) | 44 | 89.8% |
| No | 5 | 10.2% |
| Organisation of World Rabies Day (WRD) activities | 17 | 34.7% |
| No | 32 | 65.3% |
| Other | 11 | 22.4% |
| No | 38 | 77.6% |
| Nothing specific | 3 | 6.1% |
| No | 46 | 93.9% |

| Other | Reported |
|--|----------|
| a) campaign on responsible ownership; b) information related to travel with domestic animals | 1 |
| Campaign 'Responsible Ownership', travelling information | 1 |
| Dedicated homepage | 1 |
| Education in schools | 1 |
| Explanatory works public seminars, etc. | 1 |
| Information in the DGAV website | 1 |
| Information in the web page of the State Veterinary Administration | 1 |
| Information in websites of Veterinary and Food Board and Health Board | 1 |
| Information material published on website | 1 |
| Manual for rabies control, meetings, presentations in events or training courses | 1 |
| videos displayed on screens at the ferries terminals | 1 |

3. Challenges

3.1 In your view what are the biggest challenges to achieve a rabies free status or to remain rabies free?

| Ranked 1st | Reported | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Illegal importation of pet animals | 16 | 32.7% |
| Reinfection from neighbouring infected areas | 13 | 26.5% |
| Lack of funding / financial constraints | 10 | 20.4% |
| Lack of capacities | 2 | 4.1% |
| Illegal importation or translocation of wildlife | 2 | 4.1% |
| Ineffectiveness of currently implemented programmes | 1 | 2.0% |
| Emerging alien reservoir species | 1 | 2.0% |
| Insufficient international support | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other (rank) | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 45 | |

| Ranked 2nd | Reported | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Lack of capacities | 6 | 12.2% |
| Illegal importation or translocation of wildlife | 6 | 12.2% |
| Emerging alien reservoir species | 6 | 12.2% |
| Ineffectiveness of currently implemented programmes | 5 | 10.2% |
| Reinfection from neighbouring infected areas | 4 | 8.2% |
| Illegal importation of pet animals | 3 | 6.1% |
| Lack of funding / financial constraints | 2 | 4.1% |
| Insufficient international support | 0 | 0.0% |
| Other (rank) | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 32 | |

| Ranked 3rd | Reported | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Lack of funding / financial constraints | 6 | 12.2% |
| Ineffectiveness of currently implemented programmes | 4 | 8.2% |
| Reinfection from neighbouring infected areas | 4 | 8.2% |
| Illegal importation or translocation of wildlife | 4 | 8.2% |
| Insufficient international support | 3 | 6.1% |
| Illegal importation of pet animals | 3 | 6.1% |
| Emerging alien reservoir species | 3 | 6.1% |
| Lack of capacities | 1 | 2.0% |
| Other (rank) | 1 | 2.0% |
| Total | 29 | |

| Other | Reported |
|--|----------|
| Challenges of implementation of the stray dog population control programmes at the local level/municipal authorities | 1 |
| Lack of epidemiological assessment | 1 |
| Reduced passive surveillance programme | 1 |
| Unwillingness of neighbouring infected country to implement effective ORV programme | 1 |

3.2 Do you consider the work being carried out by the OIE sufficient to make a difference in the elimination of both canine and wildlife rabies in the region?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----------|----------|------------|
| Yes | 39 | 79.6% |
| No | 7 | 14.3% |
| No answer | 3 | 6.1% |

3.3 Are there any rabies-related issues you wish the OIE to consider or address in the near future that might help your country to facilitate rabies control and elimination?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----------|----------|------------|
| Free text | 16 | 32.7% |
| Other | 4 | 8.2% |
| No answer | 29 | 59.2% |

3.4 Are you aware of the WHO/OIE/FAO tripartite initiative aimed at ‘eliminating human dog-mediated rabies by 2030’?

| | Reported | Percentage |
|-----|----------|------------|
| Yes | 46 | 93.9% |
| No | 3 | 6.1% |