Breakout Group A:
Review and Critique the Proposed Assessment Tool

Question 1: Discussion Highlights

Are basic biosafety requirements/practices/procedures/programs adequately covered by tool?

- Summary of participants response
  - Yes, but there will be small things that do not meet test of adequacy
  - Document is useful for labs

Question 1: Discussion Highlights

Are basic biosafety requirements/practices/procedures/programs adequately covered by tool.

- Opposing or additional responses
  - Management: Mission and Vision doesn't reflect "Buy-in"
    - May need more questions on Management
  - Document is very long; needs to be streamlined
  - Improve focus regarding adequate biosafety training

Question 1: Discussion Highlights

Are basic biosafety requirements/practices/procedures/programs adequately covered by tool.

- Consensus/Summary statement
  - Tool needs to build on other tools, rather than being a standalone tool

- Recommendation(s)
  - Tool is comprehensive (requirements listed) but needs to be more performance-based (perspective needed)
  - Needs to be more educational vs. an inspection tool

Question 2: Discussion Highlights

Practicality of use of the tool

- Summary of participants response
  - Some questions are clear, others need further clarification
  - Needs training on the tool before implementation, including sending it out to labs for self-assessment
  - What is the mitigation component? How are scores used following assessment? Corrective actions?

Question 2: Discussion Highlights

Practicality of use of the tool

- Opposing or additional responses
  - Tool is not practical – too long
  - Training on the tool is needed
  - Language gets into enforcement and regulation
  - Hard to tell if practical without examples

Question 2: Discussion Highlights

Practicality of use of the tool

- Consensus/Summary statement
  - Not practical as is – needs to be piloted first

- Recommendation(s)
  - A virtual walk-through of 3-4 labs is needed before finalizing – a pilot of the tool
  - Needs to be translated into other languages

Question 3: Discussion Highlights

Adequacy of addressing BSL-2/BSL-3 needs in resource-limited settings

- Summary of participants response
  - Tool does break out BSL-3 lab settings, but may not be applicable in all BSL-2/BSL-3 settings

Question 3: Discussion Highlights

- Adequacy of addressing BSL-2/BSL-3 needs in resource-limited settings
- Opposing or additional responses
  - May not apply to all BSL-3 labs, particularly in resource-limited settings

Question 3: Discussion Highlights

Adequacy of addressing BSL-2/BSL-3 needs in resource-limited settings

- Consensus/Summary statement
  - Depending on the setting, the tool may not apply to all BSL-2/BSL-3
- Recommendation(s)
  - Some qualifiers should be added
  - Practical solutions should be taken into account -- BSL3 level be achieved in different manners
  - Need to have ability to add notes based on the environment of the laboratory

Question 4: Discussion Highlights

- Are biosafety needs/requirements of POCT addressed by tool?
- Summary of participants response
  - Should be facility-based, not community-based/focused
  - Separate checklist is needed for personnel in the field
  - How can document feed into a strategic plan?

Question 4: Discussion Highlights

- Are biosafety needs/requirements of POCT addressed by tool?
- Opposing or additional responses
  - Should not be used as an audit tool of POCT

Question 4: Discussion Highlights

Are biosafety needs/requirements of POCT addressed by tool?

- Consensus/Summary statement
  - Not relevant in all POCT settings, but may be utilized in HIV POCT settings to ensure biosafety training is included in quality management systems training
- Recommendation(s)
  - Needs to be color coded to allow better utilization in POCT settings

Question 5: Discussion Highlights

Weights assigned to each element of the tool

- Summary of participants response
  - Artificial weights – needs to be tied into another tool
  - Weights should be based on criticality vs. frequency
  - Early stages – no weights
  - Some sections should be identified as more critical than others
    - For resource-limited settings may provide a clearer picture

Question 5: Discussion Highlights

Weights assigned to each element of the tool

- Opposing or additional responses
  - How does scoring inform a SLIPTA/SLMTA checklist?
  - Check correlations between safety tool and SLMTA checklist

Question 5: Discussion Highlights

Weights assigned to each element of the tool

- Consensus/Summary statement
  - Focus should be on improvement of safety
- Recommendation(s)
  - Give section percentages – prioritizing sections (some sections more critical than others)
  - Way to show improvement is by not having points taken away
  - Critical sections should be identified during pilot phase