# Biosafety Protocol Approval Letter: A Tool for Risk Assessment & Post-Approval Monitoring

Meagan P. Fitzpatrick, Steve Arehart, Kalpana Rengarajan, PhD, MPH, RBP & Patricia Olinger, RBP; Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA.

## {Objectives}

#11

Emory University's Environmental Health and Safety Office (EHSO) critically examined and edited their Biosafety Protocol Approval Letter to meet the following objectives:

- » Improve the letter so that it communicates the outcomes of biological risk assessments in a more clear and concise way.
- » Modify the letter so it can be used as a tool for post-approval monitoring.

#### {Methods}

- 1 » Critically examined the existing approval letter.
- 2 » Benchmarked with other institutions.

Edited the existing letter. Used an

 $3 \gg$  addendum to include discovered gaps and opportunities.

Conducted a beta test with principal investigators (PIs), members of the Institutional Biosafety Committee

4 » (IBC), Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), Division of Animal Resources (DAR), and EHSO.

 $5 \gg$  Incorporated edits from the beta test.

6 » Began using the new letter across Emory's campus.

> Teamwork... Our Path to Excellence www.ehso.emory.edu

Environmental Health and Safety Office Research Administration

## Out with the old...

The original approval letter included:

- » Overall biosafety level (BSL) / animal biosafety level (ABSL)
- » List of animals, agents, and human material
- » NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant or Synthetic Nucleic Acid Molecules (NIH Guidelines) classification (ex: III-D-1, III-E-1)

1	1 m			
	Date Priverses Advess 1 Advess 2	Environmental Health and S. Amarch Administration	they office Institutional Davade Research: Declaping	y Committee Sulley
	Biomafory File & (File 8) Preposal title: (Protocol Titles	,		
1	Dear Dr. <u>El Name</u> The proposal to work with bloks above was reviewed by the loss above y activities should be on commanded for <u>Distudity</u> are	his is approval is valid and spical textine, infections again testional Biosafety Committie reducted utilizing to	n (Renewal Month) 1, 2013. D. and or recombinant DNA m	elected of sol
-14	nimal related research	t aboratory	practices, safety optimized	revenued
Have	inals approved for research	should be conducted	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d facilition
Ager	with amount cell lines OPIM	and a A	Simul Rematery Level	
NIH.	Guidelines Records			
For an availab	y additions or charges in the	Classification: (rDNA)		
The Dis	nafety anima and state	locel, an amendment form		
Trans	spread file number on	Contraction in the second s	evely to by automin	

#### ... and in with the new!

The new letter includes two parts: a formal letter and an addendum. The formal letter contains the NIH Guidelines classification, renewal dates, and personnel listing. The attached and referenced addendum provides a concise view of the approved research, along with requirements (administrative controls, work practices, engineering controls, and personal protective equipment) that the PI must follow in order to maintain their approval status.

EMC UNIVER	RY SITY Research Administra	ealth and Safety Office tion		1762 Clifton Road, Suite 12( Atlanta, Georgia 303; (404) 727-59; FAX: (404) 727-97	22 22 78 Statemer
	- informe i				
The table outlines the	e requirements that must be ma	intained in order for the	approved researc	h to be conducted at Emory University:	
ROTOCOL INFORM	IATION				approval
Principal Investige	tor				
Protocol Number			Approval Date		
Training         BBB         Gammal         Back         BSO         BSO <t< th=""><th>Ability to trainings medical</th></t<>					Ability to trainings medical
Occupational Health	Vaccinations None	Hepatitis B	Tetanus Influenza Other:		working
Requirements	Other		Medical Clearar	ce for Respirator	
Animal Biosafety . ABSL-1 ABSL-2 ABSL-2 ABSL-2 ABSL-2 ABSL-2 ABSL-3 Engineering Control Other	ierel Age	Cabinet Other:	Animals	FOR vork conducted at Verkes, FOR vork conducted at Verkes, follow 1 Verkes Folicies for PE Gloves, Bution Frem Gown, Additional: Gloves, Solid Front Gown, Hair Cov Surgical Mask, Shoe Covers Additional: Requirements for ABSL-1 & ABSL- listed above data for the Gloves, Solid Front Gown, Hair Cover, Double Shoe Covers Additional:	Th vivo s set multi and cond that invo models a used to s each typ
IN VITRO STUD	REQUIREMENTS				
Biosafety Level	Agents		PPE Requirements		
BSL-2				Front Lab Coat & Eye Protection (when ities with a splash or impact potential)	In vitro s
BSL-3	3SL-3		Double Gloves, Solid Front Lab Coat, & Eye Protection (when performing activities with a splash or impact potential) Additional:		biosafety
Engineering Controls	Work in a Biosafety Cabinet     Centrifuge Safety Caps     Other:			provides	
Solid Biohazard Waste Disposal	Dispose of untreated was	post-app			

Statement at the top of the page informs researchers that the approval is conditional.

Ability to select specific trainings, vaccinations, and medical tests as prerequisites to working on the protocol.

*In vivo* section allows EHSO to set multiple biosafety levels and conditions for protocols that involve varied animal models and agents. It also is used to specify controls for each type of experiment.

*In vitro* section also allows for approvals to be set at multiple biosafety levels. Separating the *in vivo* and *in vitro* materials provides greater clarity for post-approval monitoring.

## {Conclusions}

The Biosafety Protocol Approval Letter is used by multiple groups (PIs, EHSO, IACUC, DAR, Institutional Review Board [IRB]) to maintain and monitor the approval for laboratories to work with biological/infectious material and/or recombinant/synthetic nucleic acid molecules. Prior to a recent revision, the letter presented certain challenges. The original letter only listed an overall biosafety level and list of material. Therefore, if a protocol had some work conducted in a BSL-2 lab and other experiments in a BSL-3 lab, the approval letter would only list BSL-3. Also, the letter did not include detailed requirements from the biological risk assessment. This made it difficult for PIs to adhere to the safety requirements and for members of EHSO, IRB, DAR and IACUC to use the letter during post-approval inspections and study reviews.

The new letter uses an addendum to resolve these issues through the use of tables broken into four sections: protocol information, general, *in vivo*, and *in vitro* study requirements. These sections allow for easy indication of requirements for each type of experiment and improved communication of the approval status to all affected players.

The new letter is a valuable tool during postapproval monitoring. Electronic versions are accessible to EHSO in the field during inspections on iPad tablets and to the IRB, IACUC and DAR via an access-controlled web-drive. Sharing the letters through realtime electronic systems ensures that all users have access to the most current versions, thus streamlining the approval maintenance process.

