

NAHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING 2023

MEETING RECORD

WEDNESDAY 14- THURSDAY 15 June 2023

Start: 9:30 | Close: 16:50 (AEDT)

In attendance:

Participant	Organisation
Bronwyn Hendry	AHA – NAHIP Chair
Mikhaila Nye	AHA – NSDIP Chair
Madeleine Leyden	AHA – record
Elias Christofi	AHA
Emily Sears	PHA
Andrew Breed	DAFF – NAHIP rep.
Adam Robinson	DAFF – Animal Biosecurity
Rob Atkinson	DAFF – OCVO
Gary He	DAFF – OCVO
Teagan Fitzwater	DAFF NAQS – proxy, NAHIP rep. & NSDIP observer
Geoff Campbell	NSW – NAHIP rep.
Cindy Dudgeon	NT – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Jo Mollinger	Qld – proxy NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Callain Howarth	SA – NAHIP rep.
Emma Watkins	Tas – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Julia Sarandopoulos	Vic – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Diana Turpin	WA – NAHIP rep.
Keren Cox-Witton	WHA – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Johann Schroder	SPA – NAHIP Industry Forum rep.
Charley-Rose Ford	APL – NAHIP Industry Forum rep.

Apologies: Guy Weerasinghe (Aus. Gov. – NAQS), Greg Williamson (Qld)

Objective of meeting:

- Brief Committee members on program deliverables, achievements, issues and expenditure.
- Discuss NAHIP jurisdictional, WHA, industry and Aus government 2022-2023 coordinator reports.
- Discuss and agree on draft NAHIP data standards for the proposed terrestrial animal tenancy within the AUSPestCheck® database system.

Day 1 – 14th June 2023**Welcome and introductions (B Hendry):**

- The Chair welcomed participants to the meeting and outlined the objectives of the meeting and the structure of the meeting.

1. 2022 in review**1.1 Update on 2022 action items (B Hendry)**

- Spoke to the action register and noted the status of all action items.
- Actions Items 1, 5, 6, 7, 9 10 and 11 are complete. Action item 5 is complete with this meeting.
- Action Item 2: *NAQS, WHA and AHA to discuss reporting lined for feral animal surveillance data* is ongoing and links to the AUSPestCheck® data standards discussions.
- Action Item 3: *AHA to consult with jurisdictions to identify current JEV reporting issues to ensure that JEV reporting into NAHIP is consistent with national case definitions* is superseded. AHC has not yet agreed to a consistent case definition for JEV.
- Action item 4: *Develop recommendations on reporting on inconclusive JEV results into NAHIP as part of broader consideration of the national proves of reporting inconclusive results* is ongoing and was discussed under Agenda Item 6.1.
- Action item 8: *DAFF to provide the committee with the findings of DAFF's review of whether NAHIP data is sufficiently meeting DAFF's needs in relation to the program's goal for "supporting trade in animal commodities and meeting Australia's international reporting obligations"* is closed. AHA met with DAFF representatives prior to this meeting. This is helping to inform the AUSPestCheck® data standards discussions.

Conclusion

- The update on action items was accepted by the Committee.

1.2 Program Status Report (M Nye)

- Spoke to the status report including the financial summary, deliverables and performance, operational issues, and charts. Total expenditure for 2021-22 was within budget, with under-expenditure primarily due to program meetings being held virtually during 2021-22, and contractor costs for AHIA design and delivery coming out under budget.
- Noted an error under 4. Financial summary, which should read "June 2022".
- WHA noted that Figure 4 contains all wildlife investigations, not just those for notifiable diseases, which is not comparable with the NAHIS data displayed which are only for notifiable disease investigations.

Conclusion

- The Committee accepted the report, noting the error under 4, and in Figure 4. AHA to update the status report and circulate to the committee.

Actions

1. Update the NAHIP 21-22 Status Report and circulate to the Committee.

1.3 Report Updates (M Nye)

- Animal Health Surveillance Quarterly (AHSQ)
- During 2021-22, Volume 26, Issues 1 – 4 were published to SciQuest, the repository platform that houses AHSQ.
- SciQuest recently underwent a site upgrade with the migration of all AHSQ publications to the new site platform. During this process, the readership analytics for 2021, and from May to August 2022 were lost.
- Analytics from the email notification that goes out to subscribers when each issue is published show that email subscription interactions for each issue over last three volumes have increased slightly from 327 opens across Vol 24, to 353 and 355 for Vol 25 and 26. Downloads of AHSQ from the AHA website have steadily increased over the last three volumes, from 284 for Vol 24, to 344 for Vol 25 and 581 for Vol 26.
- AHA plans to review AHSQ in 2023-24 and will involve the Committee, including jurisdictions, industry, as well as the relevant areas of DAFF. This will be to ensure it is still fit for purpose, and to discuss data presentation given the transfer to AUSPestCheck®.
- The Committee discussed the value in the AHSQ readership analytics presented, noting that the usual information on international readership wasn't available for Volume 26. Agreement that further information on percentages of interaction based on the number of emails sent, and identifying the target for communication levels, would be useful. Further discussion occurred under Agenda Item 1.4 regarding analytics.
- The Committee also noted that readers are not equal, with a specific target international reader being more valuable than other non-target readers.
- J Schroder highlighted that AHSQ and AHIA underpin claims of freedom from important exotic diseases and that although readership is not huge, the reports support valuable trade.
- Jurisdictional coordinators confirmed that the ACDP data remains useful for crosschecking when submitting data at the end of the quarter, and requested that it be supplied three weeks before data is due rather than the current two weeks' timeframe.
- A roster for the provision of case reports has been trialled to ensure a better spread of articles across Australia each quarter. Feedback received from jurisdictional coordinators has been positive, noting that jurisdictions can swap quarters, or provide an article when it is not their rostered quarter, if they wish.
- Animal Health in Australia (AHIA)
- The 2021 AHIA annual report was published during the 2021-22 FY. The annual report focuses on key achievements, disease investigations, surveillance activities and updates to policies and programs for each calendar year. The report is available digitally via the AHA website, with printed copies distributed to key animal health system stakeholders in Australia, as well as all WOAHA delegates. Hard copies of the report were distributed directly to 95 contacts across Australia, and around 165 international contacts, including WOAHA delegates and other organisations.
- Since publishing, the 2021 report has been downloaded from AHA's website 2416 times. This compares to the 2019-2020 annual report (two years combined), which has been downloaded 1553 times and the 2018 report 1104 times. The 2021-23 System report has been downloaded 1601 times.
- Analytics for the 2022 report so far show around 1000 downloads in the first few weeks following publishing.
- The Committee noted that total download levels don't necessarily provide an indication on whether the report is reaching the target audience.

- Feedback from DAFF's exports and market access branches has indicated that AHSQ and AHIA are valuable resources for supporting market access negotiations. AHA continues to work closely with DAFF to ensure the AHIA Annual and System reports are fit for purpose.
- AHA to work with its Communications team and with DAFF to determine whether target trading partners are accessing AHIA and AHSQ.

Conclusion

- The Committee noted the updates on AHSQ and AHIA with further discussion to occur on readership levels and a review of AHSQ planned for 2023-24.

Actions

2. AHA to update the AHSQ production process to send ACDP data to jurisdictional coordinators three weeks before data is due.
3. AHA to coordinate a review of AHSQ during 2023-24 to ensure it is fit for purpose given planned change to AUSPestCheck® DAFF to begin discussions internally.
4. AHA to work internally with its Communications team and with DAFF to determine whether target audiences (specific trading partners) are accessing the report, and to determine a benchmark for success is in relation to readership levels.

2. Reports

2.1 Coordinator reports

NSW (G Campbell)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Lab test standards for NSW have been developed and will be discussed under Agenda Item 6.1.
- Noted that NSW collates and uploads data for the ACT.

NT (C Dudgeon)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted that *E. canis* has resulted in challenges with reporting in addition to animal welfare, disease prevention and public health issues. Reports are primarily received through AMRRIC. Reporting is based upon suspicion of infection, which may not correlate with the prevalence of infection in that area. Qld also uses AMRRIC and for *E. canis*, dogs must be symptomatic for testing. Neither Qld nor NT are pushing testing of *E. canis* in healthy animals (e.g. for movement or in known areas of disease) by private vets where the owner doesn't want to test.

QLD (J Mollinger)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Questioned if new geographical boundaries in AUSPestCheck® compared with current NAHIP ones will affect data input for reporting. Further discussions on this will occur through the AUSPestCheck® development process. Brief discussion that DAFF is considering a scoping report about a proposed Southern Australian Biosecurity Network.

SA (C Howarth)

- Spoke to the paper provided.

TAS (E Watkins)

- Spoke to the paper provided.

VIC (J Sarandopoulos)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted that the JEV response complicated data reporting, especially equine cases, given serological data complexities.

WA (D Turpin)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted the upload process into NAHIS is very laborious due to needing to manually check each case report.

WHA (K Cox-Witton)

- Spoke to the paper provided.

NAQS (T Fitzwater)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Raised the need for consistent case definitions across jurisdictions.
- Noted some underactivity due to COVID and staffing limitations in the 21-22 financial year.
- Noted challenges with differences between routine and feral testing and where these data are reported.

Conclusion

- The Coordinator Reports were accepted as written.

2.2 Australian Government Report (A Breed)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted that DAFF commission Ausvet to conduct an evaluation of Australia's animal health surveillance system. The report is currently with DAFF for consideration of the recommendations. It was agreed that the report should be circulated to the NAHIP Committee for discussion when available.
- Noted concerns about lack of clarity around case definitions.
- Discussion on where data are reported for feral and wild species, between eWHIS, NAQS' system and NAHIS.
- Discussion on the National Animal Health Surveillance Plan (NAHS Plan), which was recently endorsed by Animal Health Committee. The Plan is high-level, and no action plan has been developed yet.
- The National Epidemiology Advisory Group (to Animal Health Committee) now has its list of nominated representatives, but no further actions have occurred.
- DAFF raised that confidence in Australia's animal health surveillance system is important for trade negotiations, and this is broader than having investigations data available. Also, compiling the requested information and providing a narrative about the system each time, on an ad-hoc basis, is time consuming and can result in duplication of work by different branches of DAFF.

- Noted that if fields are to be removed from surveillance program data standards, and therefore not entered into the national system, the data needs to still be available at the jurisdictional level, with an agreed process for managing ad hoc requests for specific data.

Conclusion

- The Committee accepted the report. Further discussions on data fields were discussed under Agenda Item 3.

2.3 Industry report (C Ford and J Schroder)

- C Ford and J Schroder spoke to the two papers.
- Discussion on avian influenza (AI) reporting. There is a reluctance in Australia to undertake active surveillance for AI in commercial flocks, but in light of the highly pathogenic H5N1 threat from overseas AI surveillance is important. The greatest risk of incursion is considered to be wild bird migration. WHA has produced information and undertakes surveillance for AI as part of its Wild Bird Surveillance Program ([Wildlife Health Australia > Programs & Projects > Wild Bird Surveillance](#)), however, this program is not designed for early detection.
- A Breed noted that WOAHA has updated the AI reporting case definition to only include high pathogenic (i.e., has removed low pathogenicity H5 and H7 from being immediately reportable)
- J Schroder raised the importance of engaging producers for surveillance of exotic diseases, as well as for endemic diseases that are exotic to some Australian regions. Producers will likely be the first to notice an outbreak of an exotic disease.

Conclusion

- The two industry reports were accepted by the Committee. Further discussions on data fields, including for AI surveillance, were discussed under Agenda Item 3. DAFF, AHA and WHA will continue to be aware of the increased risk of AI, and AHA will raise this with the National Epidemiology Advisory Group.

Actions

5. AHA to raise the Committee's concerns about the increased risk of high path AI with the Surveillance and Epidemiology Working Group.

3. NAHIP Business Plan

3.1 NAHIP Business Plan and risk register (B Hendry)

- B Hendry provided an update on changes to the Business Plan.
- Noted that the risk register layout and content is being updated across all AHA programs, it was suggested that the aim should be for these to meet the international FAO standards for surveillance monitoring and evaluation measures: [FAO Surveillance Evaluation Tool (SET) (published in 2018) <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/evaluation-action-fao-surveillance-evaluation-tool-set>].
- Discussion on NAHIP's Program Goal and whether it could be amended in relation to developments, for example, arising from the National Animal Health Surveillance Plan (NAHS Plan). The Committee noted that any changes to the stated Program Goal would need to be considered by the Committee and endorsed by Chief Veterinary Officers/Animal Health Committee.

- Discussion on AUSPestCheck® governance in relation to adding fields to the NAHIP data standards. Governance arrangements are still being developed; however, it was confirmed that any proposals to change the data standards would come to the Committee for approval.
- Discussion on data quality and timeliness, and whether there should be more analysis of the data. Note that this is broader than just the NAHIP and should be addressed under the NAHS Plan. AUSPestCheck® is intended to improve the efficiency of data upload.

Risk register

Risks identified by the Committee:

- Risk that program reports don't support market access requirements and that the reports produced aren't used for their intended purpose. Mitigated through regular governance meetings (annual NAHIP meeting), and analytics into the readership.
- Risk of not having clear documentation on what is reported where and reporting lines, particularly in relation to feral and wildlife data vs. domestic livestock data. Mitigation through clarifying wording in the Business Plan.
- Risk of not having clear documentation about the development of the AUSPestCheck® data standards. Noted that corporate knowledge has been lost, for example, about the reasons for the current AI and ND data fields. Mitigation through retaining documentation of decisions made in the development of the AUSPestCheck® data standards.
- Risk of losing historic NAHIP data in the transition from the current database to AUSPestCheck®. Mitigation through working with Ausvet and PHA to ensure successful migration of historic data.

Conclusion

- The Business Plan was noted by the Committee.

Actions

6. WHA and NAQS to document where wildlife and feral animal data is reported between eWHIS, NAQS and NAHS databases.
7. AHA to update Business Plan to include identified risks.

4. Workshop Day 1

4.1-2 Workshop Part 1 (E Sears and E Chistofi)

- Provided an update on the AUSPestCheck® project and the timeline for delivery. Spoke to the minimum fields (Mandatory) needed for AUSPestCheck®, the consolidation of data projects from NAHIP and equivalent fields from the NAHIP data projects fields for the committee to consider.
- Agreement that the 'Date of activity' (Mandatory field) descriptor be updated to change the descriptor to accept both collection date and lab receipt date.
- Agreement that the 'EntityName' (Mandatory field) descriptor be updated to reflect testing of suspected 'pathogen' vs. disease.

Conclusion

- The Committee noted the AUSPestCheck® update and the agreed updates to the data fields. The updated draft NAHIP NNDI data standards will be circulated out of session for final approval and endorsement by Committee members and jurisdictional CVOs.

Actions

Nil

5. Meeting close**5.1 Day 1 wrap up (B Hendry)**

- Discussion on the timing of meetings, with the Committee noting that reporting on the previous financial year in May of the following year is not ideal for reflecting on activities. The Committee agreed that a short virtual meeting, focusing only on the coordinator reports for the year, will be held following the end of each financial year. For the 2022-23 financial year, a short virtual meeting will be held in late August/early September 2023 for discussion on the coordinator reports for the year. A face-to-face meeting will be scheduled for May 2024 to note the coordinator reports and to discuss additional program items, such as the Business Plan.

Conclusion

- The Committee agreed to hold the annual committee meeting in May each year, with a short virtual meeting to be held following the end of the financial year to discuss the coordinator reports.

Actions

8. AHA to provide guidance to jurisdictional coordinators on what needs to be included in the annual NAHIP coordinator reports.
9. AHA to schedule the virtual NAHIP meeting for late August/early September 2023 for discussion of the 2022-23 coordinator reports.

Day 2 – 15th June 2023**Welcome and introductions (B Hendry):**

- The Chair welcomed participants to the meeting and outlined the objectives of the meeting and the structure of the meeting.

6. Workshop Day 2**6.1-2 Workshop Part 2 and 3 (E Sears and E Christofi; G Campbell)**Introductory discussion:

- Discussion on the purpose of NAHIP and data collation, analysis and reporting requirements.
- Discussion on the objectives of NAHIP – it is for routine reporting, not outbreak reporting.
- Agreement to the centralisation of the 11 data projects in NAHIS into one data project by the Committee.
- Documentation will be kept on decisions made in the development of the AUSPestCheck[®] data standards to ensure that this understanding is not lost. Jurisdictions will still collect all data, but only report nationally on the agreed streamlined data.

- Agreement that there will be future scope to have additional programs (e.g., monitoring, health, etc.) added and that AHA would develop documentation on the governance of how this would be agreed.

DAFF OCVO perspective:

- DAFF OCVO team did not express concerns over centralising the 11 data projects as the variation in data fields are not required for reporting. The data required for 6-monthly reporting is well defined, however the OCVO noted that there are instances where more granular data is required, particularly in response to ad hoc requests.
- DAFF OCVO team noted that the WOAHA reporting is primarily in relation to evidence of proof of freedom from six target diseases: foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, peste des petits ruminants' classical swine fever, African horse sickness, and contagious bovine pleural pneumonia.

Data fields:

- DAFF confirmed that the current reporting of only positive and negative data is sufficient for trade and market access. Inconclusive or probable results would not be reported to trading partners by DAFF even, if they were captured.
- Agreement that the 'Status' (Mandatory field) descriptor be updated to remove 'pending'. For now, 'positive' and 'negative' remain the only descriptors, until further discussions on laboratory testing and conclusions about 'presumptive positive/presumptive negative' or 'inconclusive' are finalised.
- Agreement that 'TestType' not be mapped across to AUSPestCheck® as this field is not utilised and the test types currently reported on do not reflect the current full suite of testing.
- Agreement that 'ResponseType' (mandatory field) descriptor be adjusted to indicate the highest level of testing for the disease undertaken i.e., point of care, private laboratory, state laboratory or testing at ACDP.
- Agreement that 'Related' (optional field) be removed. Agreement that the property identifier field and the comment field can be used to detail movement history or show related investigations.

Draft laboratory standards document:

- G Campbell spoke to the draft lab standards document.
- Discussion on the interpretation of results from standard and non-standard tests. Tas and Qld rely on pathologist interpretation for results.
- DAFF noted that they receive more enquiries on endemic notifiable disease testing rather than exotic disease testing. WOAHA requirements are currently being met, so those requirements should not drive data quality decisions.
- The Committee discussed whether SCAHLS would be best placed to provide a list based on the NSW lab standards document to be expanded to include all jurisdictions and a list of tests available for each disease.
- Agreement that 'Syndrome' (optional field – avian influenza, Newcastle disease and equine herpes virus 1) be kept as an optional field within AUSPestCheck® and used by those jurisdictions that can report on it. Agreement that NSW, NT, Qld, SA and Tas will report on this fields. WA to confirm if they can report against this field. Further consideration of the

Syndrome list is required. Suggestion that syndromic reporting nationally be considered by the AHC Surveillance and Epi working group.

- Discussion that inconclusive and syndromic surveillance could potentially be developed under a separate (not NNDI) data project within AUSPestCheck® in the future.
- Agreement for a 'lab standards' subgroup of the Committee to work on criteria for positive, negative and inconclusive/provisional results, and standard lab tests for key diseases. The subgroup will consist of G Campbell, S Ossedryver and a representative from ACDP to be identified. Other jurisdictions are welcome to identify a representative to sit on the group. SCAHLS may be approached to provide a report as per above on lab standards to support the group.

Conclusion

- The Committee noted the proposed data fields for AUSPestCheck®. AHA and PHA will circulate an updated list of fields for endorsement by the committee and CVOs.

Actions

10. AHA and PHA to send out the updated version of the draft NAHIP NNDI data standards for AUSPestCheck® for the NAHIS NNDI to the Committee for review and endorsement.
11. Jurisdictions to identify representatives (if interested) for the subgroup to address lab standards and definitions of results. These representatives will work with their jurisdictional laboratory counterparts as required.
12. Qld to share syndrome list with AHA, to compare to the list of 26 in NAHIS workbook in the development of the syndrome list in the NAHIP NNDI data standard.
13. AHA to contact the Surveillance and Epidemiology Working Group, and to express that the Committee has identified that there is value in having data about clinical syndromes reported nationally.
14. The 'laboratory standards' subgroup of the Committee to document standard lab tests for key nationally notifiable diseases and develop criteria for reporting against the 'status' or outcome of the investigation based on results of laboratory testing for circulation to the Committee.

NAHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE INTERIM MEETING ACTION REGISTER

#	ACTION	WHO	BY
1	Update the NAHIP 21-22 Status Report and circulate to the Committee.	AHA	Completed
2	Update the AHSQ production process to send ACDP data to jurisdictional coordinators three weeks before data is due.	AHA	Completed
3	Coordinate a review of AHSQ during 2023-24 to ensure it is fit for purpose given planned data changes. DAFF to begin discussions internally.	AHA	June 2024
4	Work internally with its Communications team and with DAFF to determine whether target audiences (specific trading partners) are accessing the report, and to determine a benchmark for success is in relation to readership levels. Include this information in the 22-23 Status Report	AHA	August 2023
5	Raise the Committee's concerns about the increased risk of high path AI with the Surveillance and Epidemiology Working Group.	AHA	August 2023
6	Document where wildlife and feral animal data is reported between eWHIS, NAQS and NAHIS databases.	WHA & NAQS	October 2023
7	Update Business Plan to include identified risks.	AHA	August 2023
8	Provide guidance to jurisdictional coordinators on what needs to be included in the annual NAHIP coordinator reports.	AHA	Completed. <i>Circulated via email.</i>
9	Schedule the virtual NAHIP meeting for late August/early September 2023 for discussion of the 2022-23 coordinator reports.	AHA	Completed. <i>Scheduled for 30 August.</i>
10	AHA and PHA to send out the updated version of the draft NAHIP NNDI data standards for AUSPestCheck® for the NAHIS NNDI to the Committee for review and endorsement.	AHA/PHA	Completed.
11	Jurisdictions to identify representatives for the subgroup to address lab standards and definitions of results if interested.	Jurisdictions	September 2023
12	Share syndrome list with AHA to compare to the list of 26 in NAHIS workbook in the development of the syndrome list in the NAHIP NNDI data standard.	QLD-completed AHA to progress further	July 2023 October 2023
13	Contact the Surveillance and Epidemiology Working Group, and to express that the Committee has identified that there is value in having data about clinical syndromes reported nationally.	AHA	August 2023

14	The 'laboratory standards' subgroup of the Committee to document standard lab tests for key nationally notifiable diseases and develop criteria for reporting against the 'status' or outcome of the investigation based on results of laboratory testing for circulation to the Committee.	Documentation of standard lab test types commenced by two voluntary jurisdictions, as agreed during the NAMP TC meeting. Intent is to discuss potential use of such a table with jurisdictions at first subgroup meeting. Subgroup first Meeting	July 2023 November, 2023
----	--	--	--