

FOR INFORMATION

NAHIP Advisory Committee Annual Meeting 2021

Agenda Item 3.1

Last updated: **10 November 2021**

Prepared by J. Owens

NAHIP – STATE COORDINATOR REPORT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the NAHIP Advisory Committee **NOTE:**
 - a. The status of the National Animal Health Information Program (NAHIP) activities in South Australia, and the feedback provided on the program.

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

3. Quarterly NAHIP reporting continues as per the standard program arrangements. SA NAHIP reports are now initially generated within a Power BI interface, but extensive manual checking of the data outputs are required, to ensure sufficient accuracy.

A review of all data requirements for NAHIP is urgently needed, to ensure that the data reported is consistent between jurisdictions, and relevant to meet national reporting requirements such as for evidence of disease absence and market access. In addition, the relationship of current reporting requirements to the developing AusPestCheck system need to be clarified. Development of data standards for AusPestCheck should not proceed without overall review of what reporting/data are required to meet the objectives described above. Clarity of data requirements is required regardless of whether the data is to be uploaded to the existing NAHIP platform, or to a new AusPestCheck system.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4. Nothing to report.

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

5. Not applicable.

NEXT STEPS/ACTIONS

6. No specific action required at this stage.

FEEDBACK

7. Feedback on the performance of NAHIP over the 2020-21 financial year is as indicated below.

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: The process of reviewing and collating data for NAHIP reporting is a very manual, labour-intensive process. Therefore, further guidance at a national level as to the specific data requirements would be appreciated, so that the NAHIP Advisory Committee can determine whether the data provided is necessary, sufficient, and consistent. That way, efforts can be focussed on the provision of the most appropriate and meaningful data. It was evident from the process of reviewing the Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly (AHSQ) data requirements that over time the reporting from the individual jurisdictions has diverged, and therefore the consistency of reporting is questionable. Review of all the NAHIP reporting requirements is needed.				

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: The Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly (AHSQ) publication is interesting and well-presented. However, as described above, there is some concern as to the consistency of the data reported between jurisdictions. Further guidance at a national level is required as to whether the data provided is sufficient (and required) to meet national reporting requirement, such as those to support market access through publications such as the AHSQ.				

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 spreadsheets and data upload are quite straightforward. As reported at the 2020 meeting, the process is very much manual, with extensive data review required, otherwise data quality would be compromised. No automatic upload would be possible presently, without significant risk of providing incorrect data.				

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: As reported 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. If the NAHIP				

program meets the reporting needs at a national level for justification of evidence of absence of exotic/emergency animal diseases and market access, etc. then our participation in it and its outputs are of high value. However, as described above, further guidance at the national level as to the reporting requirements necessary to meet these objectives is required.