

NSDIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING 2026

MEETING RECORD

Thursday 14 May 2026

Agriculture House, Canberra

Start: 1:30 | Close: 16:23 (AEST)

In attendance:

PARTICIPANTS	
Sheaaz Sakur (AHA – Minutes)	Diana Miller (SA)
Mikhaila Nye (AHA – Chair)	Emma Watkins (Tas. - proxy)
Heather Richards (AHA)	Abigail A Van Der Zwan (Vic - proxy)
Emily Sears (AHA)	Anna Erickson (WA - virtual)
Anna Ly (AHA)	Keren Cox-Witton (WHA)
Emily Sellens (Aus. Gov.)	Liz Gemes (AVA - observer)
Tom De Ridder (Aus. Gov. NAQS - proxy)	Rachael O’Brien (ALFA - proxy)
Matilda Morgan (NSW)	Kyeelee Driver (ACT)
Isabel MacPhillamy (NT)	Selina Ossedryver (QLD)

Apologies: Guy Weerasinghe (Aus. Gov. NAQS), Jennifer Voss (Tas.), Julia Sarandopoulos (Vic.), (Bomber) Michael Lancaster (ALFA)

Objective of meeting:

- Brief NSDIP Committee members on program deliverables, achievements, issues and expenditure.
- Receive and discuss urgent program matters.

Welcome and introductions (M Nye):

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

1. 2024-25 in review

1.1 Update on 2025 action items (S Sakur)

- Referred to the action register and noted the status of all action items from the May 2025 face-to-face meeting, November 2025 virtual meeting, and those carried over from the 2024 meetings.

May 2025

- Actions 1 and 3–5 were confirmed as completed.
- Action 2 is currently on hold and has been identified for further discussion as part of the CAHD uplift project.

Carried over from the 2024 meeting

- Action 1 remains in progress. WA advised that PVPs are satisfied with the increased subsidy rates, with further details to be included in their next coordinator report.
- Action 2 has been completed.

- Action 3 has been delayed. The final program evaluation report will first be circulated to the Committee following the May NSDIP meeting for input and a paper will then be shared with AHC outlining recommendations from the review.

November 2025

- Action 1 is pending. WA requires permission to circulate the brain removal techniques training video and to include it on the AHA website.
- Action 2 has been completed.
- Action 3 is scheduled for completion at the October virtual meeting.

Conclusion

The Committee noted and accepted the update on action items. It was acknowledged that Action 2 from the May 2025 meeting remains on hold pending further consideration through the CAHD uplift project. WA will include feedback on the increase to subsidy rates in their next coordinator report and share the link to the training video if approved for circulation with the Committee.

Action items:

1. WA will include feedback in their next coordinator report on the increased subsidy rates for PVPs and advise the Committee on whether the video can be circulated.

2. Database and DMU Policy

2.1 Central Animal Health Database (CAHD) update (E. Sears)

- AHA provided an update on CAHD Uplift project, noting ongoing discussions with members and stakeholders in close collaboration with AHA's Board, and a shared vision for the future of CAHD has been established.
- A short workshop was held with the NAHIP Committee and focused on identifying practical improvements to support user needs.
- In the NSDIP space, initial discussions have commenced on how CAHD could support invoicing processes such as for NSDIP.
- The species list has been identified as a key area requiring further consideration.
- It was noted that NSDIP data is not regularly extracted for reporting except annually for AHIA.
- Emma W. highlighted the importance of Significant Disease Investigations (SDIs) as a key component of surveillance, including reporting on investigation numbers and associated funding.
- Selina O. noted that the Qld SDI page is linked to the AHA website. Proposed an external-facing landing page, potentially linked to WHA, to promote the program and provide access to dashboards and submission contact information or a placemat on the NSDI program. It was agreed that an example placemat would be shared with the NSDIP Committee for consideration.

2.2 Database updates including syndrome list feedback (M. Nye)

- Sought feedback from the Committee on the implementation of the updated syndrome list, noting that an error with formatting in the workbook had been identified through the NAHIP meeting and will be investigated and resolved. No other feedback was raised.

2.3 Database management and use (DMU) policy updates (M. Nye)

- A draft of the updated DMU Policy, with tracked changes, had been circulated.

- Committee members were invited to provide additional feedback. Noted Appendix A is to be updated following a user audit and the updated DMU will then be recirculated.
- NSDIP outputs associated with AHSQ were discussed, which includes NSDIP feature articles produced every 1–2 years, and reference to the NSDIP where funding has been provided to investigations written up in AHSQ as case reports.

Conclusion

The Committee noted the updates provided on the Future CAHD Project. There was support for continued consultation and development, including investigation of dashboard functionality and external-facing communication tools.

Action items:

2. *AHA to circulate an example placemat to the NSDIP Committee for consideration of whether a similar approach could be adopted to provide an overview and regular update on the program.*

3. Program evaluation

3.1 NSDIP evaluation outcomes (H. Richards)

- AHA has developed a draft NSDIP evaluation report which draws on multiple data sources and engagement with the Committee.
- The report includes findings from the evaluation and items for Committee consideration, to inform future recommendations.
- Key Findings and Discussion Points:
 - The program is valued for fostering engagement with PVPs and providing a forum to discuss SDI funding and share learnings.
 - Flexibility in funding use was noted as beneficial; however, it limits the ability to adopt a nationally consistent approach.
 - Objective 3 of the NSDIP was identified as an area requiring further consideration.
- Program Scope and Stakeholder Considerations:
 - Expansion of program scope (e.g. additional species) requires careful consideration of funding sources and stakeholder alignment. Jurisdictions (e.g. QLD) noted this may not be a viable option given current program intent and funding model.
 - Access challenges were highlighted, particularly in northern and remote regions (e.g. NT, WA, TAS), including limited veterinarian availability and high associated travel costs.
 - Variability in program delivery across jurisdictions was noted.
- NABSnet
 - The interaction between NSDIP and NABSnet in northern jurisdictions (QLD, NT, WA) was discussed. Overlap and synergies between NSDIP and NABSnet were acknowledged, and co-funding opportunities across field and laboratory components were noted.
 - Members queried whether NABSnet activities had been captured in the evaluation and noted the opportunity to incorporate additional insights.
 - Committee shared interest in understanding NABSnet learnings, evaluation outcomes, and potential application to NSDIP, noting that NABSnet supports mentoring, training, and improved submission quality, with strong engagement outcomes.
 - Tom R (NAQS) was asked to share findings from the last NABSnet evaluation.
- Training, Engagement and Outcomes:

- Training and mentoring initiatives (e.g. masterclasses, workshops, PVP support) were identified as key program strengths.
- Jurisdictions noted challenges in maintaining PVP engagement and evolving training delivery models (e.g. hybrid formats).
- Opportunities for collaboration with external organisations (e.g. AVA) to support training were identified.
- Producer engagement and perceived value were discussed, including the importance of clearly communicating subsidies and benefits.
- Tom R (NAQS) noted that a key challenge for NABSnet is the timely provision of feedback to producers. The Committee acknowledged the program's strong performance in driving interest and engagement and requested that NAQS provide further information on the factors influencing PVP participation.
- Jurisdictional differences in reporting practices and funding attribution were noted as complex areas.

Conclusion

The Committee noted the draft evaluation findings and supported further review to inform recommendations to AHC. An ad-hoc meeting will be scheduled to progress recommendations. AHA will circulate the draft evaluation report for Committee review prior to this meeting. Tom R (NAQS) will seek approval to engage further on NABSnet-related discussions and provide additional input to support the NSDIP evaluation.

Action items:

3. *AHA to circulate the draft NSDIP evaluation report to the Committee for review.*
4. *AHA to schedule an ad-hoc meeting to finalise the review report and develop recommendations for AHC.*
5. *T. De Ridder (NAQS) to provide additional information on NABSnet, including past evaluation insights and engagement outcomes.*

4. NSDIP Business Plan (BP)

a. Business Plan (H. Richards)

- It was acknowledged that the BP draft was not circulated prior to the meeting. The updated draft BP for 2026–27 will be circulated post meeting, acknowledging it will need further revision pending outcomes from the program evaluation process.
- Updates to / discussion relating to the BP:
 - Section 2.8 Relevant Policy, Legislation and Rules - reference to the Data Management and Use Policy has been included
 - Section 4.1 Subsidy for Significant Disease Investigation
 - Committee noted the responsibilities of the Australian Government (DAFF) within the BP (page 16) requires clarification. It was agreed that DAFF's role should be reframed to focus on advisory input (on an as needed basis).
 - Section 5. Stakeholder Communications - Opportunities to improve awareness of NSDIP through stakeholder groups (e.g. Biosecurity Qld through Cattle Veterinarians Association) were discussed, including consideration of producer-facing incentives and communications.
 - Section 6 Financial Management
 - The funding section has been updated for 2026–27, including the 2026-27 service delivery amounts. Clarification was provided that AHA has discontinued CPI-based adjustments and from 2026-27 onwards, has

adopted a ground-up, activity-based costing approach to develop annual budgets.

- NSDIP funding is linked to the AHA Annual Operating Plan (AOP) process, which determines allocations for subscription programs. Committee requested a footnote referring to the AOP process to be added to the BP.
- Noted that the BP is a three-year strategic document; with the program budget development to occur annually through the AOP process.
- It was agreed that future BP financial discussions (including recommendations for funding amounts) will shift from May to October meetings to align with the AOP timeline.
- Recommendations to inform the 2027–28 budget must be finalised during the October meeting.
- Funding estimates developed through the AOP process can be requested of AHA as needed by Committee members to support their budget development requirements.
- Section 7.2 Information Management - QLD requested additional reference to the DMU Policy.
- Section 9 Business Rules:
 - Section has been realigned with AHA corporate and AOP development processes.

Conclusion

The Committee noted the draft BP, acknowledging that further refinement will occur following evaluation outcomes.

Actions

NIL

5. Other Business

- QLD provided an update on the current hybrid PVP training sessions being delivered.
- The theoretical component has been split into five sessions (1–1.5 hours each), delivered weekly on Tuesdays from 4:30–6:00pm, complemented by in-person practical sessions.
- Registration numbers have been lower than expected (18 participants compared to 20–30 typically attending face-to-face workshops – where participants are required to cover their own travel costs).
- The hybrid model was developed in response to stakeholder feedback, including similar feedback received by the AVA. Attendance at webinar sessions has averaged 8–10 participants. The hybrid model has proven more cost-effective to deliver, with recorded sessions providing an opportunity for future resource reuse.
- Limited engagement was observed during sessions, including minimal participation in Q&A segments. Timing of sessions was noted as a potential factor affecting participation, particularly due to competing priorities for producers and veterinarians. The importance of facilitation techniques (e.g. use of icebreakers) to support engagement was noted.
- The AVA offered to raise awareness of training opportunities that were shared with them to support broader promotion and awareness.

Meeting close

- The next meeting will be held virtually in October 2026 with date TBC.
- Meeting closed 16:23

NSDIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MAY 2026

ACTION REGISTER

#	ACTION	WHO	BY
1	Include feedback in their next coordinator report on the increased subsidy rates for PVPs and advise the Committee on whether the video can be circulated.	WA	October 2026
2	Circulate an example placemat to the NSDIP Committee for consideration of whether a similar approach could be adopted to provide an overview and regular update on the program.	AHA	July 2026
3	Circulate the draft NSDIP evaluation report to the Committee for review.	AHA	June 2026
4	Schedule an ad-hoc meeting to finalise the review report and develop recommendations for AHC.	AHA	July 2026
5	Provide additional information on NABSnet, including past evaluation insights and engagement outcomes.	T. De Ridder (NAQS)	June 2026

OUTSTANDING 2024-25 ACTION ITEMS

Item	Meeting	Description	Who	When	Status
2	May 2025 F2F	AHA, WHA and NAQS to consult around an updated species list for CAHD.	AHA, WHA and NAQS	Sep-25	On hold
3	November 2025 Virtual	AHA to display totals based on the number of exclusions and include the corresponding outcomes (positive or negative) in the next status report.	AHA	Oct-26	In progress
3	May 2024 F2F	AHA to send the final report of the program evaluation to AHC. <i>Amendment – evaluation conducted late 2025.</i>	AHA	Aug-26	In progress