### Breakout Group C (Day 2)

Discuss the utilization of two different laboratory designations: tier (per Maputo document) vs. biosafety level

Patty Olinger

# Question 1: Should the laboratory tier designations and biosafety level designation be integrated?

- Tier level (Maputo designation) is based on services
  - Appendix E describes biosafety capacity at different tiers
- Is there a way to integrate these tiers of services w/BSL categorization?
- Integrating the designation is very difficult and different since the health care facility is independent of a presenting "risk"
  - E.g.: Ebola presents at primary health care centers
  - BSL designation may be relevant in US and high-income countries but not in low-income settings
- Biosafety level encompasses a combination of 4 elements: facility, equipment, practices, occupational health

#### Discussion:

- Biosafety pertains to "management systems" that aren't related to capacity
- A tier 4 does not relate to a BSL IV
- Need for risk assessment in every facility
  - E.g., Egypt where pathogens are presenting out of sync with their "tier"
- Need to go "case-by-case" situation
- Tier gives MOH an understanding of regional services and testing capacity
- However "safety" capacity needs to be present everywhere
- What are the key components of safety capacity how can they relate to one another?
- Tier relate to laboratory function and service which is defined equipment and personnel training
- Biosafety pertains to "management systems" which isn't related to capacity

#### Discussion:

- Suggested approach:
- Tier Activities conduct a **"risk assessment"** by the four discrete components of biosafety: (i) facility, (ii) equipment, (iii) practices, (iv) occupational health
- Need guidance in pre-assigning "risk assessment" based on experience from vertical disease programs
- Are local lab techs be capable of doing the risk assessment?
  - Team approach recommended that includes" SMEs & local expertise
  - But is this approach practical for scale-up?
  - How do we fulfill the needs of hundreds of low level labs that are in place?
  - Also, how do you translate this approach from a vertical program to an epidemic problem?

#### Discussion:

- For vertical programs the biosafety "risk assessment" can be done in advance (based on the local environment): e.g., SMEs, lab techs, biosafety officer.
- Local teams need to be empowered to do the assessment themselves, which can be facilitated with the draft biosafety check list
- Maybe make the risk assessment piece clearer
- Regarding scale-up:
  - Reinforcement of biosafety check list talks about sustainable prevention
  - IHR and GSHA emphasizes early detection and early response
- Need to clarify the application and purpose of the myriad tools that have been published per situation so that local staff aren't confused with tool application

#### Discussion/Recommendation:

- Useful to have a questionnaire and tool as a starting point for countries without any resource; but what about countries w/tools in place that conflict with those tools developed by outside experts?
- It was noted that IHR lab assessment tools have a small portion of biorisk assessment
- Concern that this check list may overlap with WHO check list from an international body
- Does PEPFAR check list unnecessarily overlap with WHO check list?
- CEN tool vs. PEPFAR tool are they simple and how do they interact?

## Question 2: What are the laboratory tiered and biosafety level recommendations for point-of-care testing?

- Unresolved question w/in academic discussions
- One point of view: You have to sit down and evaluate the 13 elements in the draft biosafety check list.
  - You need a menu of elements to review and assess
  - Value: easy to deploy, easy to implement, will at a minimum will raise the awareness and provides measurement
- Opposing viewpoint: You need to know what is going on. And if you can score these elements then you can score the "risks assessment" at the local level and decide their local mitigation options