

FOR INFORMATION

NAHIP Advisory Committee Annual Meeting 2020

Agenda Item 3.1

Last updated: **4 September 2020**

Prepared by J. Owens

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

1. That the NAHIS Advisory Committee **NOTE:**
 - a. The current 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 automatically generated, but extensive manual checking of data is essential to ensure sufficient accuracy.

The recent review of the Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly (AHSQ) data requirements for the comparative graphs produced for this publication is very pleasing, to generate more consistency in understanding of the data requirements and reporting between the jurisdictions. A review of all data requirements for NAHIP would also be very welcome, both to ensure that it is relevant, appropriate and as consistent as possible between the jurisdictions. It should be noted, however, the increased resources required to provide this data, as well as to make changes to what is provided. This should not, however, preclude appropriate review and any required changes.

The change that occurred to article requirements for the AHSQ in 2018-19 has continued to improve the ability to report on exotic or emergency animal disease (EAD) rule-out cases. As described last year, the previous requirement for 3-5 cases per state/territory per quarter meant that the reason for inclusion of some cases was dubious, in order to meet the quota. Now the jurisdictions are able to provide their best case examples, as available, and the focus on EAD exclusions is therefore much improved.

Further feedback on NAHIP overall, from the South Australian perspective, is provided under Item 7.

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 2019-20 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: As described in previous reports, the quarterly NAHIS/NAHIP reporting and AHSQ written reports provide one extra opportunity for data review. However, the delay in data reporting/sharing reduces the overall value of the system. Real-time data sharing (or as close to as possible, given technological and data review requirement constraints) would be most useful. Further guidance at a national level as to the specific data requirements for market access/export would be appreciated, so as the NAHIP Advisory Committee we can ascertain whether the data provided is necessary, sufficient and consistent.				

Q2 The outputs of NAHIP, such as the Animal Health in Australia report, Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly and the interactive data map are credible and robust.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Please explain your answer, including any suggested changes: As described in previous reports, the data and summary information provided in the AHSQ is valuable and interesting. Guidance at a national level is needed, however, as to whether the small numbers of samples/cases provided for some diseases are sufficient, based on the level of risk. A determination of required sample numbers based on population and risk should contribute to this advice. Also, determination as to whether there is consistency across the states in terms of sampling, reporting, etc. is required to fully determine how credible the combined data is. The recent review of the data to be provided for the comparative graphs produced for the AHSQ is very pleasing, and should contribute to the quality of this output.				

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: As previously reported, the spreadsheets and data upload are quite straightforward. It is a considerably manual process and at this stage it remains essential that data is checked manually, otherwise data quality would be compromised. No automated upload would be possible at this point without significant risk of incorrect data.				

Q4 NAHIP satisfies national surveillance data and reporting requirements.				
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. The NAHIS data certainly contributes to the overall surveillance data within South Australia, but NAHIP does not fully satisfy our reporting needs from a state perspective. A more regional focus is needed to meet the needs of our stakeholders, considering local factors. Although enhanced ability to visualise the data from neighbouring states may also help to better inform South Australia of our disease risks. If the NAHIP program meets the reporting needs at a national level for justification of evidence of absence of exotic/emergency diseases and market access, etc., then our participation in it and its outputs are of high value. As commented above, clarification at a national level as to what data is required to meet these needs would enhance the program.				