

FOR INFORMATION

NAHIP Advisory Committee Virtual Meeting Oct 2024

Agenda Item 1.1

Last updated: **21 October 2024**

Prepared by Diana Turpin

Western Australian NAHIP coordinator report 2023-24**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the NAHIS Advisory Committee NOTE:
 - a. Western Australian NAHIP activities for 2023-2024

BACKGROUND

2. Western Australia collects, review and uploads data quarterly into NAHIS, submits case reports for AHSQ, performs data checks for publication of data in AHSQ and AHIA, participates in NAHIP Advisory Committee Meetings and submits an annual coordinator report as per the program requirements.

DISCUSSION

3. Western Australia accesses and summarises data from our Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) (Sample Manager) for NAHIP reporting using Power Query. Data cleaning continues to be a labour-intensive process with a significant in-kind contribution to the program.
4. The Department's Diagnostic and Laboratory Services (DDLs) continues to progress options for a new LIMS.
5. Western Australia submitted three case reports for AHSQ during the 2023-2024 financial year, including:
 - a. Peri-oral lesions in a mob of sheep; vesicular disease excluded and contagious ecthyma diagnosed
 - b. Avian influenza exclusion in a poultry farm mortality event
 - c. Exclusion of bovine spongiform encephalopathy in steer showing neurological signs
6. In December 2023, Western Australia confirmed participation in the NAHIP Advisory Committee Laboratory Standards Sub-group.
7. In December 2023, Western Australia provided feedback to AHA on the AUSPestCheck Data Management and Use Policy for NAHIP. Western Australia had a meeting with AHA in early 2024 to discuss the feedback and completed one preliminary training session on how to use the AUSPestCheck platform.
8. Western Australia participated in the SCAHLS NAHIP Data Quality Workshop held virtually in March 2024. Western Australia understands that in recent years, with the increase in biosecurity threats, trading partners are moving towards requiring more sound evidence of absence for certain diseases and subjecting data to greater scrutiny. Western Australia understands that guidance from the Commonwealth on how current evidence of absence data could be improved remains pending.
9. Western Australia provided feedback on the revision of the National Syndrome List. Western Australia understands that SCAHLS are now leading on this activity.
10. Western Australia seeks further information around the scope and cost of not progressing AusPestCheck and the scope and cost of creating another data management system. Significant consultation is required to scope the needs of the stakeholders that provide the data for the report.

11. Western Australia shared the Priority Reportable Animal Disease Project work with the NAHIP Advisory Committee Laboratory Standards Sub-group as an example of case definitions used in Western Australia for reportable animal disease testing.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

12. Nil

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

13. Western Australia has consulted with AHA on the Draft AUSPestCheck Data Management and Use Policy for NAHIP, but further consultation is required.
14. NAHIP Advisory Committee Laboratory Standards Sub-group has consulted with SCAHLS on the quality of NAHIP data and the revision of the National Syndrome List.

NEXT STEPS/ACTIONS

15. Discussion of feedback at the NAHIP advisory Virtual Meeting as required.

FEEDBACK

- 16.

Q1 My organisation's needs and expectations of the NAHIP are being met.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: Each jurisdiction currently applies professional judgement and any relevant internal protocols around what should be reported under NAHIP. Each jurisdiction uses different criteria and operates on different LIMS. In this regard, concerns have been raised from a quality management system perspective when looking at national collation, analysis and reporting. It has been agreed that standardisation/harmonisation should occur at the national level as NAHIP is a national program informing national disease status and information provided to trading partners and WOA, however little progress has been made in this space, noting the resourcing and time commitment to achieve this common goal. Guidance on what defines a negative case is needed more than what defines a positive case.				

Q2 My organisation is satisfied that the outputs of NAHIP, such as the Animal Health in Australia report are Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly, are credible and robust.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: Western Australia thanks AHA for compiling AHSQ and AHiA reports. Similar to comments above, further work is needed to improve data quality with guidance from DAFF to ensure these outputs remain useful and relevant for the target audience (e.g. trading partners).				

Q3 The format and protocols in place for uploading and transferring national surveillance data are fit for purpose.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: Collating data for 13 different projects is onerous. Western Australia welcomes any progress towards a single NND project for clinical cases for NAHIP reporting. Submissions that are finalised late and are reported in a different quarter are not always captured.				

Q4 NAHIP satisfies national surveillance data and reporting requirements. (Please outline any requirements not being met).				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: Western Australia understands that more comprehensive data are needed for market access as the expectations of trading partners have increased in relation to Australia's substantiation of our animal health status. More guidance at the national level is needed to help inform what more comprehensive data looks like.				