

FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

NAHIP Advisory Committee Teleconference Meeting 2023

Agenda Item 1

Last updated: **16 August 2023**

Prepared by C. Howarth

NAHIP – STATE COORDINATOR REPORT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the NAHIP Advisory Committee:
 - **NOTE** the feedback as provided by South Australia within this report.

BACKGROUND

1. South Australia reports data quarterly via the standard NAHIP reports, as per the program requirements.

DISCUSSION

2. South Australia continues to use Power BI as the initial step in generating SA NAHIP quarterly reports; however, the data still requires meticulous manual checking to ensure its accuracy and adherence to current reporting criteria.
3. Further discussion is needed as to why reporting of some fields and/or worksheets are still required, given that recent feedback (at the 2021-22 NAHIP meeting) from the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry has indicated that they are not being used for market access data needs.
4. Existing reporting criteria does not ensure consistency of data reporting between jurisdictions.

FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES

5. Nothing to report.

FEEDBACK

6. Additional feedback from South Australia is as outlined on page 2 onwards.

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: South Australia (SA) provides data to NAHIP in accordance with national data reporting obligations. As mentioned in previous years the NAHIP data reports and national outputs are not extensively used within South Australia to contribute to state-based policy development or decision-making, etc. Currently SA does not have any specific needs in regard to NAHIP, except for the process to be as efficient as possible. There is also an expectation for national guidance to be provided on what data is required to meet market access/trade and any other relevant national needs, and to review the current requirements to ensure that all that is being asked for within the data standards is still relevant. The process involved for NAHIP reporting remains manual and labour-intensive to adhere to the current data standards and ensure appropriate data quality. With the proposed transition to AUSPestCheck reporting and development of updated data standards, this would be an opportune time to consider national input into the relevance of the fields (e.g. poultry fields such as housing and vaccination status) and their necessity to be included in AUSPESTCheck. Many of the fields are difficult to obtain, even after individual case follow-up with surveillance staff.				

Q2 My organisation is satisfied that the outputs of NAHIP, such as the Animal Health in Australia report are Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly (AHSQ), are credible and robust.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: The AHSQ is well presented structurally and visually and the inclusion of AHSQ case reports is of interest. However, there is uncertainty regarding the reporting criteria for some notifiable disease investigations and thus the consistency of the data reported between jurisdictions and therefore whether it is actually comparable. A good example of this is the reporting of equine flavivirus results. The reporting criteria remain unclear, with a lot of potential for variation in interpretation, further complicated by the lack of a clear, agreed case definition. Further clarification of these criteria is required, and somehow it needs to be made clear that the NAHIP dataset does not represent all surveillance effort undertaken (e.g. the NNDI worksheet contains only investigations with a definitive outcome are included – using the flavivirus example, this excludes a large percentage of the overall surveillance effort).				

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: The instructions included in most of the project excel tabs are thorough and make the submitting/uploading process straightforward. Although minor, the sensitivity of the NAHIS to subtle changes in text has proven to hinder the upload process. As an example, the requirement for full italics for <i>Ehrlichia canis</i> for a successful upload of these data fields – it is sometimes difficult to tell what the difference is between what has been rejected from upload and what the system (based on the list in the spreadsheet) actually requires.				

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: South Australia upholds its national obligation to upload data into the national animal health information program; however, guidance at the national level is required to ensure that this data is meeting the national surveillance data and reporting requirements.				