



## Viral Load Cascade Self-Assessment Scorecard

### Introduction

The African Society for Laboratory Medicine (ASLM), in collaboration with ICAP at Columbia University is conducting a rapid assessment of national laboratory systems supporting the HIV viral load test (VLT) scale-up in countries participating in the Laboratory Systems Strengthening Community of Practice (LabCoP). The rapid assessment is intended; (i) to assess strengths and weaknesses of the general laboratory system to support VLT scale up in a given country, and (ii) to monitor and demonstrate the degrees of improvement or continued challenges. The results will help determine the areas in which LabCoP will focus its resources and also opportunities for South-to-South sharing and co-creation of responses.

### Instructions

- Please read the contents of the checklist carefully before you complete the responses;
- All questions are referring to the national laboratory system
- You could consult the National HIV/AIDS Prevention & Control Unit at the Ministry of Health (MoH) and the National Reference Laboratory Center;
- Please refer to various data sources (routine laboratory & clinical data, reports, key informants, or other data sources) to come up with a reliable information/ or answer.

### General Information

Date of assessment (dd/mm/yyyy): \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of the country assessed: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of primary respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Organization of primary respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Position of primary respondent: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Contact address of primary respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

For each question, please check the box of the option that best describes your country setting or answers the question. You may provide additional explanation in the right side or on supplementary pages as needed.

S#	VLT Cascade Domains/Questions	1	2	3	4	Additional explanation whenever applicable
<b>Demand Creation for HIV VL testing</b>						
1.1	Is there a national strategy/procedure to increase demand of specialized or newly introduced lab tests by clinicians & clients at healthcare facilities (HF's)	<input type="checkbox"/> No standard operating procedure (SOP)/strategy to increase demand	<input type="checkbox"/> SOP/strategy developed, but not in use for updating clients, clinicians & stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> SOP/Strategy are used, and clinicians and clients actively seek such tests	<input type="checkbox"/> Most of facilities continuously monitor & evaluate test demands by clinicians and clients, and take actions to improve awareness	
1.2	Is there a national awareness creation initiative to PLHIV about VLT accessibility and its benefit?	<input type="checkbox"/> PLHIV unaware of the access to VLT and do not know its benefit	<input type="checkbox"/> PLHIV informed about the access of VLT but do not know its benefit	<input type="checkbox"/> Education/ awareness creation provided, and PLHIV actively seek VLT	<input type="checkbox"/> >75% of health districts management teams review data, work with stakeholders, and act to improve demand by clients/PLHIV	

1.3	Is there a national initiative/strategy that engages stakeholders (community leaders, HIV associations, ...) to support demand creation for VL testing	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders were not engaged, and there was no awareness initiative	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategy developed to advocate for VLT, but only a few stakeholders are engaged	<input type="checkbox"/> Workshops/Meetings convened or health education targeting VLT provided, & most stakeholders are engaged	<input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders actively involved and advocate accessibility of VLT and its benefit	
1.4	Is there a national training or orientation to update/educate clinicians on the availability and importance of VLT?	<input type="checkbox"/> Clinicians are not updated on test accessibility & not educated on its significance	<input type="checkbox"/> Clinicians are not educated, but SOPs or training curricula available or under development	<input type="checkbox"/> Clinicians are trained/oriented & routinely order VLT, but they order occasionally	<input type="checkbox"/> Clinicians routinely order VLT to monitor ART as per the national guideline and educate clients on its benefit	
<b>2</b>	<b>Specimen Collection and Processing</b>					
2.1	Are there national guidelines or protocols addressing quality specimen collection and processing for all types of tests?	<input type="checkbox"/> No standard guideline or procedure for quality specimen collection and preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard guideline and procedure are available or under development but do not cover all types of tests.	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and protocols for quality specimen collection cover all type of tests and are applied everywhere	<input type="checkbox"/> All health district management teams continuously evaluate processes against the protocol, and use findings to improve quality specimen collection and preparation	
	Are specimen rejection rate routinely monitored as part of the quality improvement for sample collection and processing?	<input type="checkbox"/> Sample rejection rates are not being monitored	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection rates are monitored in some testing facilities for some tests including VL testing	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection rates are monitored in all testing facilities for some tests , including VL testing	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection rates are monitored in all testing facilities for all essential diagnostic tests	
	What is the average of specimen rejection rates at national level	<input type="checkbox"/> Data are not available	<input type="checkbox"/> ≥10%	<input type="checkbox"/> between 5 and 10%	<input type="checkbox"/> <5%	
2.2	Is specimen collection procedure at facility level in compliance with the national protocols (guideline, SOPs or job aids) addressing the quality of VL specimen?	<input type="checkbox"/> No standard procedure for VL specimen collection and preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard procedure available and applied in some facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard procedure available and applied in all facilities, with monitoring in some HF	<input type="checkbox"/> All HF's monitor sample collection & processing against the protocol, and take corrective action	
<b>3</b>	<b>Sample Transportation</b>					

3.1	Is there a national integrated sample referral network for essential diagnostics (TB, VL, chemistry, hematology, and others)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Sample Referral established only for specific tests like EID or VLT with incomplete coverage	<input type="checkbox"/> Sample Referral established only for specific tests like EID or VLT with >75% coverage of ART facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated sample referral system established, with 50-74% coverage of HF	<input type="checkbox"/> >75% coverage of the integrated sample referral system and continuous optimization to map routes & linkage of labs for improved access to specialized & essential tests	
3.3	Is there a well-established procedure for quality assurance of the transport system (complete documentation, packaging system, tracking system, quality control practices & others) for VL specimen?	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no procedure or monitoring system for packaging & transportation of VL specimen	<input type="checkbox"/> Procedure available and unstructured reporting mentions generally poor packaging & transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Unstructured reporting mentions generally adequate packaging & transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Adherence to standard assessed regularly to detect problems and initiate corrective actions	
3.4	What is the national average for TAT from sample collection to result return?	<input type="checkbox"/> >20 days and there is no system to monitor TAT at intermediate steps	<input type="checkbox"/> >20 days and there is a system to monitor disaggregated TAT steps	<input type="checkbox"/> 5– 20 days and there is a system to monitor disaggregated TAT	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 days with continuous review of disaggregated TAT and corrective actions	
<b>4</b>	<b>HIV VL Testing</b>					
4.1	Are clinical laboratories implementing Quality Management System (QMS) as part of a national program?	<input type="checkbox"/> No standardized QMS initiated in the country	<input type="checkbox"/> National QMS program in place and implemented in <50% of the facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> >50% enrolled in QMS	<input type="checkbox"/> All or >75% of the labs enrolled in QMS, with quality standard part of the requirements for national certification.	
4.2	Are VLT laboratories SLIPTA audited and certified?	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no SLIPTA program in the country.	<input type="checkbox"/> <50% of VL testing laboratories are SLIPTA audited and certified.	<input type="checkbox"/> >50% of VLT laboratories are SLIPTA audited and certified with 3-5 star ratings.	<input type="checkbox"/> >75% of the VLT laboratories are SLIPTA certified with 3-5 star ratings and reference laboratory (ies) achieved international accreditation	
4.3	Are laboratories performing VL enrolled in an established external quality assurance (EQA) or Proficiency testing (PT) for VLT?	<input type="checkbox"/> No national EQA or PT program established for VLT	<input type="checkbox"/> VLT EQA established but only <50% of VL testing laboratories participate	<input type="checkbox"/> >50% of labs performing VLT participate in the EQA but there is no monitoring for the implementation of corrective actions	<input type="checkbox"/> >75% of laboratories participate in EQA with a follow up and support of corrective actions	

4.4	How are VL test results being shared from the laboratory to the clinic where HIV care and treatment is provided?	Only physical return of written/printed results	<input type="checkbox"/> Use physical return and SMS printer.	<input type="checkbox"/> Most facilities use physical return but some facilities started using Email message, and online database.	<input type="checkbox"/> All laboratories use online system including Email message online database.	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4.5	Are the following standard protocols (tools) put in place in the VL testing Laboratories? Mark that applies from the list: <input type="checkbox"/> SOP for assessing specimen acceptability upon receipt in the lab <input type="checkbox"/> Job aids for sample management from preparation to disposal <input type="checkbox"/> VL testing algorithm <input type="checkbox"/> VL Log Scale <input type="checkbox"/> High VL Register <input type="checkbox"/> SOP on VL Monitoring <input type="checkbox"/> Internal auditing tool (e.g., VL scorecard or structured checklist) to assess the quality of VL testing	<input type="checkbox"/> none of them are available	<input type="checkbox"/> More than 3 are available and used in some facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 are available and used in all facilities but results are not interpreted at national level	<input type="checkbox"/> All are available and used in >75% of facilities and results are collated at national level	
<b>Waste Management and Biosafety</b>						
4.6	Are there national policies, strategies, or guidelines for laboratory waste management and disposal, which are used in the VL testing VL laboratory	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> Waste management policy & strategy are under development, VL labs use facility SOP/guide	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy and strategy are available, but generally not used/enforced in VL testing laboratories	<input type="checkbox"/> Waste management and disposal is done in >75% VL testing laboratories as per national guidelines	
4.7	Is there a national on biosafety and biosecurity manual, which are used by VL testing laboratories?	<input type="checkbox"/> No biosafety biosecurity manual	<input type="checkbox"/> National biosafety & biosecurity manual is under development. VL labs use institutional SOP/guide	<input type="checkbox"/> bio safety & biosecurity manual are available and is applied in all VLT laboratories	<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety & biosecurity manual is applied in all laboratories with a regular monitoring for compliance in place	
<b>Supply Chain Management and Equipment Maintenance</b>						
4.8	Is there a national procurement strategy of reagent and consumable for laboratory testing?	<input type="checkbox"/> No national strategy for procurement. VL testing laboratories	<input type="checkbox"/> National Procurement strategy is available, but there were stock outs of VL reagents and	<input type="checkbox"/> National Procurement strategy is available, and stock outs of VL reagents and supply are	<input type="checkbox"/> No stock out is recorded in any VL testing laboratory and stockout for all essential tests are monitored and	

		procure reagent through fragmented systems.	supply recorded in >50% of VLT labs in the last 6 months	recorded in <50% in the last 6 months.	evaluated at the national level	
4.9	Are the VL national testing needs covered by the current VL testing capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/> The VL testing needs are not defined at national level	<input type="checkbox"/> Testing needs are defined and covered by testing capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Testing needs are covered and needs are forecasted for the next 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> Current and forecasted needs are covered and testing capacity is continuously optimized at national level	
4.10	Is the national lab maintenance plan/strategy implemented for VLT equipment?	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no plan and VL testing labs experience backlog testing due to lack of equipment maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance agreement in place, but scheduled service provided irregularly with interruptions of VLT still reported	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule Maintenance provided as per agreement, and no specimen backlog reported due to service interruption in the last 12 months.	<input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance plan/strategy is available for all essential equipment (not only VL) and includes integrated pricing.	
4.11	Are VLT laboratories adequately staffed with skilled human resources?	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no data on HR available	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a shortage of staff (based on national norms) with training needs for VL testing identified in >50% of the VLT laboratories and not addressed by the national HR development strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no shortage of HR with current training needed for VLT addressed in the national HR development strategy.	<input type="checkbox"/> No shortage of human resources and no training needs with the national HR development strategy addressing forecasted staffing needs for VLT and other essential diagnostics.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Results Utilization</b>					
	Is there a national LIMS system to ensure swift delivery and notification of abnormal test results?	<input type="checkbox"/> No system in place	<input type="checkbox"/> Various LIMS are in place in some laboratories but are not institutionalized at national level	<input type="checkbox"/> A national standardized LIMS is in place but not fully implemented across laboratories	<input type="checkbox"/> All laboratories use the national LIMS, with clear roles and responsibilities established assigned at HF level.	
5.1	Are there protocols for the interpretation of VL results and utilization for client management	<input type="checkbox"/> No SOP or job aids are available, even at facility level	<input type="checkbox"/> National protocols are available but are used in <50% facilities delivering HIV care	<input type="checkbox"/> National guidelines are used in >50% facilities delivering HIV care	<input type="checkbox"/> National guidelines are used in all HF and improved client management is measured based on a review of program data measure	
5.2	Is there a strategy ensuring that clinicians are continuously trained for the interpretation of VLT results	<input type="checkbox"/> There is no strategy to ensure that clinicians are properly trained	<input type="checkbox"/> There are donor-initiated initiatives only in some HF.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a strategy at national level applied in <50% HF delivering	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a national strategy in place, applied in >50% HF and regularly monitored and evaluated at national level.	

	and utilization for patient management?			HIV care and monitored in some HF		
5.3	Are there standardized Enhanced Adherence Counseling (EAC) strategies & tools for PLHIV with unsuppressed VL?	<input type="checkbox"/> No EAC strategy & monitoring registers/forms	<input type="checkbox"/> EAC strategy & tools available and used in some HF, but they are not standardized	<input type="checkbox"/> Standardized EAC strategy & tools are used in all HF and monitored in some facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> EAC is routinely monitored and evaluated at national level and data with opportunities to improve patient management	
5.4	Are there standardized processes for referring patients with SUPPRESSED VL to less intense models of care	<input type="checkbox"/> There are no processes in place	<input type="checkbox"/> There are various processes at facility levels	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a standardized process at national level but it not yet monitored	<input type="checkbox"/> The standardized process is monitored and evaluated for continuous improvement of patient management.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Leadership and Management</b>					
6.1	Is there a unit at the MoH or technical working group TWG responsible for coordination and implementation of national lab system strengthening?	<input type="checkbox"/> No national TWG but there is focal person/team at the MoH	<input type="checkbox"/> TWG is established but not functional	<input type="checkbox"/> National lab system coordinated and supported by TWG that has clear terms of reference	<input type="checkbox"/> TWG engages all lab stakeholders, review/evaluate system for improved quality lab services	
6.2	Is there a national plan or M&E framework for effective scale up of VL testing?	<input type="checkbox"/> VLT is not recommended by the national HIV treatment guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/> VLT is recommended by national HIV policy/guidelines but no specific plan or M&E framework	<input type="checkbox"/> VLT implementation plan and/or M&E framework integrated into the national HIV program guidelines, with a designated coordinating technical working group.	<input type="checkbox"/> All of before and results regularly analyzed at national level and used to improve the effectiveness of the VL scale up	
<b>7</b>	<b>National Data on VL Testing and ART</b>					
7.1	Number of Laboratories currently carrying out HIV VL testing ; _____ labs Number of VL testing Machines for different types; Abbott m2000 ....., Roche CAP CTM 96 ....., CAP CTM 48 ....., Cobas 4800....., Cobas 8800....., Seimens K-PCR ..... Bio-muerex .....Caigen ..... Hologic ..... POC –Gene Expert ..... SAMBA ..... - Testing capacity of the national VL testing labs altogether: _____ tests/year - Total # VL tests done in the last 12 months: _____ tests/year - Please list the company (ies) for which there is a national reagent rental agreement in place. Name the company(ies): _____”					
7.2	Estimated number of (PLHIV) in the current year: _____ - #/% PLHIV currently on ART: _____ - #/% PLHIV currently on 1 <sup>st</sup> line ART regimen: _____ - #/% PLHIV on ART eligible for a routine VL test: _____ - #/% PLHIV on ART who received a routine VL test: _____ - #/% PLHIV on ART who are Virally Suppressed (<1,000 copies/ml) on routine testing : _____ - #/% Virally suppressed PLHIV referred to a less intense model of HIV care: _____					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- #/% PLHIV on ART with a VL of <math>\geq 1,000</math> RNA copies/ml who received Enhanced Adherence Counseling (EAC) : _____</li> <li>- #/% PLHIV on ART with <math>\geq 1,000</math> copies/ml who received a follow-up VL testing within 3-to-6 months of Enhanced Adherence Counseling (EAC): _____</li> <li>- #?% PLHIV on ART with a follow-up VL test result of <math>&lt; 1,000</math> copies/ml: _____</li> <li>- #/% PLHIV on ART with two consecutive VL test results of <math>\geq 1,000</math> copies/ml who SWITCHED to a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> line ART regimen: _____</li> </ul> <p>Number of people with a VL <math>&gt; 1000</math> copies/ml who had suppressed VL at follow-up testing*</p>
	<p>List 3-5 critical challenges of VL scale up in the country</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. _____</li> <li>2. _____</li> <li>3. _____</li> <li>4. _____</li> <li>5. _____</li> </ol>
	<p>Any comments/best practices/recommendations for VL scale up that could be applicable in other settings?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. _____</li> <li>2. _____</li> <li>3. _____</li> <li>4. _____</li> <li>5. _____</li> </ol>

*Abbreviation: Lab = laboratory; VL=Viral Load,*