

NSDIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING 2023

MEETING RECORD

THURSDAY 15 June 2023

Start: 12:30 | Close: 16:50 (AEDT)

In attendance:

Participant	Organisation
Mikhaila Nye	AHA – NSDIP Chair
Madeleine Leyden	AHA – record
Bronwyn Hendry	AHA
Elias Christofi	AHA
Emily Sears	PHA
Adam Robinson	DAFF – Animal Biosecurity
Anna Kabaila	DAFF – NSDIP rep.
Teagan Fitzwater	DAFF NAQS – proxy, NAHIP rep. & NSDIP observer
Rebecca Forsythe	NSW – NSDIP rep.
Cindy Dudgeon	NT – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Jo Mollinger	Qld – proxy NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Diana Miller	SA – NSDIP rep.
Emma Watkins	Tas – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Julia Sarandopoulos	Vic – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Anna Erickson	WA – NSDIP rep.
Keren Cox-Witton	WHA – NAHIP & NSDIP rep.
Cristy Secombe	AVA – NSDIP observer proxy

Apologies: TBC (NSDIP Industry rep.), Melanie Latter (NSDIP – AVA observer), Selina Ossedryver (Qld – NSDIP rep.)

Objective of meeting:

- Brief Committee members on program deliverables, achievements, issues and expenditure.
- Discuss NSDIP jurisdictional, WHA, industry and government 2022-2023 coordinator reports or 2023-2024 training activities.
- Discuss and agree on draft NSDI data standards for the proposed terrestrial animal tenancy within the AUSPestCheck® database system.

Welcome and introductions (M Nye):

- The Chair welcomed participants to the NSDIP meeting, including those joining virtually.

6.3 NSDIP data project (E Sears and E Christofi)

- Provided an update on the AUSPestCheck® project and the timeline for delivery. Spoke to the mandatory fields for AUSPestCheck® and mapped across the NSDIP data project fields for the committee to consider.
- Noted the additional field of 'status,' which is mandatory for AUSPestCheck®. For NSDIP, this field must be entered as 'present', as it is a requirement under NSDIP that there must be clinical signs present to warrant an investigation.
- Discussion of the optional field 'number cases', with agreement that the 'total number at risk' or on the property or 'number sick,' would be useful fields and allow for the calculation of mortality or morbidity rate. Clarity needed on if the number refers to individual animals or groups.

- WHA noted that for wildlife, a taxonomic list that is regularly updated will be needed in AUSPestCheck®.
- Discussion of the optional field, 'number dead,' noted this could be used to assess mortality rate.
- Discussion on the four payment fields and the payment record field. AHA confirmed that the claim fields are used to validate invoices for payments under the program. Members queried the purpose of the fields 'amtPaidVet', 'pmtrecord' and 'LabClaim' as this is not currently clear. AHA will confirm if these fields are required for program governance or reporting reasons. Currently they are not used by all jurisdictions. It was noted that these fields could help support future business cases for increased program funding, as it helps to indicate that jurisdictions provide significant in-kind funding to veterinarians and laboratories outside of the program.
- Discussion on location fields. The Committee queried if AUSPestCheck® can accept deidentified location, such as on an LGA level. The Committee noted AUSPestCheck® can accept location data that is deidentified, however this would be done by providing a centroid latitude and longitude, for example the centroid of the LGA, or the nearest major city or vet practice.
- Discussion on optional data field, 'summary' and suggestion to update it to 'outcome,' as this would be consistent with other surveillance programs' data to be housed within AUSPestCheck®, such as NNDI.

Action/s

1. AHA to investigate with its Finance Team whether the data fields 'amtPaidVet', 'pmtrecord' and 'LabClaim' are required for NSDI program governance. If not, these fields are to be removed from the draft NSDIP data standards.
2. PHA to explore whether LGA names can be back-transformed into the lats/longs of the LGA centroid.
3. AHA and PHA to review the consistency of the proposed APC data fields terminology between the animal health surveillance programs, particularly summary vs. outcome.
4. AHA and PHA to finalise the draft data NSDIP standard based on feedback and circulate to the Committee.

7. 2022-23 in review

7.1 Update on action items (M Nye)

- Spoke to the action register and noted the status of all action items as complete.

Conclusion

- Update on action items accepted by the committee.

7.2 Program status report (M Nye)

- Spoke to the status report including the financial summary, deliverables and performance, operational achievements, 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 a pending payment for NSW training activities.

Conclusion

- The Committee accepted the report as written.

8. Reports 2021-22

8.1 Coordinator Reports

NSW (R Forsythe)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Budget allocation used primarily for private veterinary practitioner (PVP) training through a webinar series on emergency and zoonotic diseases and a video on necropsy and sampling techniques.
- Will be seeking support to accrue some 2022-23 budgeted funds and use for development of training and resources to support PVPs undertaking investigations into neurological horses.
- Discussion on engagement of PVPs. Victoria have some examples of communications out to private vets on their website: <https://agriculture.vic.gov.au/biosecurity/animal-diseases/significant-disease-investigation-sdi-program>

NT (C Dudgeon)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted would like to encourage more small ruminant and horse investigations.

Qld (J Mollinger)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- In the past, Qld used funding to send a small number of vets to VIC for SDI training.
- Biannual PVP training delivered in Qld is being piloted and started September 2022.
- QLD winding back from using NSDIP for Hendra investigations.

SA (D Miller)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- SA relies heavily on private vets for disease surveillance and finds the NSDIP valuable to support this.
- PIRSA vets approve each investigation on a case-by-case basis.
- Noted challenge that sometimes PVPs are late to invoice SA.

Tas (E Watkins)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- TAS relies heavily on PVPs for disease surveillance and finds the NSDIP valuable to support this. Noted that PVPs are becoming more time-poor, and some areas have a decreasing number of PVPs available, so the NSDIP is important to support engagement of PVPs.
- NSDIP supported a number of FMD exclusions and was useful in excluding a suspect JEV in its largest piggery immediately prior to the 2022 mainland outbreak.
- TAS, VIC and WA raised that the subsidies the program provides don't cover the cost of investigations. Queried whether there should be additional programs for subsidising PVPs where their investigations provide a public good and what this might look like.

Vic (J Sarandopoulos)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- NSDIP funds are used for investigations only, with additional funds from the Agriculture Victoria Significant Disease Investigation Program used for further investigations and training

WA (A Erickson)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted a potential gap identified in peri-urban areas.
- WA holds a veterinary training workshop annually which is outside of the NSDIP.
- WA get private vets to itemise their invoices to clients showing the NSDIP discount.
- Aiming to utilise the 2022-23 budget to increase testing for neurological horses for Hendra and Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) but are experiencing limited uptake due to paired sera requirements for JEV.

WHA (K Cox-Witton)

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- NSDIP funding is used for wildlife disease investigations (in conjunction with jurisdictions) and sentinel wildlife clinics.

Conclusion

- The coordinator reports were accepted as written.

Actions

5. Vic to confirm why the SDI flip books were originally developed and advise NSW.
6. Vic to share links to the SDI booklets with AHA for circulation to the Committee.

9. Australian Government Report**9.1 Australian Government Report (A Kabaila)**

- Spoke to the paper provided.
- Noted the progress of the Southern Australia Biosecurity Network (SABSnet) project and related paper, which is currently with DAFF for consideration.

Conclusion

- The Australian Government report was accepted as written.

Actions

7. DAFF to inform the Committee on the contents of the report on the Southern Australia Biosecurity Network project after AHC consideration.

10. NSDIP Business Plan**10.1 Business Plan (B Hendry)**

- B Hendry provided an update on changes to the Business Plan.
- The Committee noted inclusion of fish in the footnote on page 3 when referring to the definition of livestock species. Investigations in aquatic species have not historically been performed under the NSDIP. AHA to review and update the Business Plan definition of livestock accordingly for approval by the committee.
- Discussion on Table 2 (target outcomes measurement), and whether the number of investigations is an appropriate evaluation measure for program effectiveness, as it differs across jurisdictions (*Postscript: please note that this information is already reported in each year's status report*). WHA noted that the number of investigations they report and cover

under the program is dropping due to higher lab costs. Qld noted that the program goal is more around building relationships with private vets, which is hard to measure.

- Discussion on program risks and how the NSDIP fits with other programs that work in the same space, such as NABSnet, the proposed SABSnet and the NAHIP.
- Discussion on the program evaluation section.
- Discussion on the objectives and outcomes of the program and what indicators are needed to evaluate the success of the program. Suggestion that evaluation of the data fields to be added as an evaluation question.

Risk register

Risks identified by the Committee:

- Risk of losing historic NSDIP data in the transition from the current database to AusPestCheck®. Risk of transition of NSDIP data into AusPestCheck®. Mitigation through working with Ausvet and PHA to ensure successful migration of historic data.
- Risk of inadequate NSDIP budget resulting in significant in-kind support being required from the jurisdictions.

Actions

8. The Committee to review the NSDIP Business Plan evaluation questions at its 2024 annual meeting.

11. Meeting close

11.1 Day 2 wrap up (M Nye)

- Discussion on the timing of meetings, with the Committee noting 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 the financial year. For the 2022-23 financial year, a short virtual meeting will be held in late August/early September 2023 for discussion about 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

9. AHA to provide clarity to jurisdictional coordinators on what needs to be included in the annual NSDIP coordinator reports.
10. AHA to schedule a virtual NSDIP meeting for late August/early September 2023 for discussion about the 2022-23 coordinator reports.

NSDIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING JUNE 2023

ACTION REGISTER

#	ACTION	WHO	BY
1	Investigate with its Finance Team whether the data fields 'amtPaidVet', 'pmtrecord' and 'LabClaim' are required for NSDI program governance. If not, these fields are to be removed from the draft NSDIP data standard.	AHA	Completed (<i>Update – these fields are not required by AHA and they have been removed from the draft NSDIP data standards</i>)
2	Explore whether LGA names can be back-transformed into the lats/longs of the LGA centroid.	PHA	September 2023
3	Review the consistency of the proposed APC data fields terminology between the animal health surveillance programs particularly summary vs. outcome.	AHA & PHA	September 2023
4	Finalise the draft data NSDIP standard based on feedback and circulate to the Committee.	AHA & PHA	July 2023
5	Confirm why the SDI flip books were originally developed and advise NSW.	Vic	August 2023
6	Share links to the SDI booklets with AHA for circulation to the Committee	Vic	Completed. <i>Circulated with the final record.</i>
7	Inform the committee on the contents of the report on the Southern Australia Biosecurity Network project after AHC consideration.	DAFF	May 2024
8	Review the NSDIP Business Plan evaluation questions at its 2024 annual meeting.	All	May 2024
9	Provide clarity to Jurisdictional Coordinators on what needs to be included in the annual NSDIP coordinator reports.	AHA	Completed. <i>Circulated via email.</i>
10	Schedule a virtual NSDIP meeting for late August/early September 2023 for discussion about the 2022-23 coordinator reports.	AHA	Completed. <i>Scheduled for 1st September.</i>