



S/1739/2019
27 March 2019
ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE FORTY-FOURTH
OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Forty-Fourth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from October 2018 to March 2019. The OPCW Laboratory is accredited by the Raad voor Accreditatie (RvA), the Netherlands, to conduct proficiency testing in compliance with the criteria laid down in ISO/IEC 17043. The test was conducted according to the following quality management system documents:
 - (a) Standard Operating Procedure for the Organisation of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/SOP/PT01 (Issue 3, Revision 1, dated 18 April 2017));
 - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 3, Revision 1, dated 18 April 2017));
 - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of the Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT03 (Issue 3, Revision 3, dated 7 April 2017)); and
 - (d) “Work Instruction for the Reporting of the Results of the OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 (Issue 2, Revision 4, dated 20 April 2018)).
2. In order to retain their designation, designated laboratories must demonstrate once per calendar year that they have maintained their capabilities in a proficiency test organised by the Secretariat, unless the additional guidelines in decision C-20/DEC.4 (dated 2 December 2015) are applicable.
3. The Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development, Republic of Korea prepared the test samples and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, United States of America evaluated the results of the Forty-Fourth Proficiency Test.
4. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between Secretariat staff and the test participants on 13 February 2019. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted their performance evaluation.



5. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 11 March 2019.
6. The principal results of the Forty-Fourth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) All test participants submitted their analytical report within the test period;
 - (b) Six regular participants identified and reported all of the spiked chemicals with sufficient analytical data for all of the spiked chemicals;
 - (c) Three participants identified and reported 7 out of the 8 spiked chemicals with sufficient analytical data for all of the reported chemicals;
 - (d) No false positive chemicals or non-scoring chemicals were reported;
 - (e) The sample preparation and the evaluating laboratories submitted their report and are awarded the maximum performance rating of “A”; and
 - (f) There are six As, three Bs, and four Cs in the test score for the 13 regular participants and the two assisting laboratories.
7. The final results for all of the laboratories participating in the test are presented in the table annexed hereto.
8. The participating laboratories are reminded that if they have made any errors or reported false positives or false negatives (arising from a failure to find a spiking chemical or to provide sufficient supporting data for a chemical that is found), they should take immediate remedial action. Before participating in the next test, each such laboratory is required to submit a detailed follow-up report to the Secretariat stating the cause of the problem and any remedial action it has taken. Any such laboratory failing to submit the required report, including details of the remedial action it has taken, will not be permitted to participate in the next proficiency test.

Annex: Final Results of the Forty-Fourth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

**FINAL RESULTS OF THE FORTY-FOURTH
OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

Participant Laboratory Code	No. of Spiking Chemicals¹ Reported	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
China The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (19)	8	8	A	-
China Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Institute of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Academy of Military Medical Sciences (20)	8	8	A	-
Finland VERIFIN, Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (3)	8	8	A	-
France DGA Maîtrise NRBC, Département d'analyses chimiques (4)	7	7	B	Spiking chemical F was not reported

1

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

Sample 442:	(A)	Diisopropyl methylphosphonate
Sample 442:	(B)	3-Quinuclidinol
Sample 442:	(C)	2-(N,N-Diethylamino)ethane sulfonic acid
Sample 443:	(D)	3-Quinuclidinol
Sample 445:	(E)	Pinacolyl alcohol
Sample 445:	(F)	Methylphosphonic acid
Sample 445:	(G)	Pinacolyl methylphosphonic acid
Sample 446:	(H)	3-Quinuclidinol

Participant Laboratory Code	No. of Spiking Chemicals¹ Reported	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
India Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins (1)	8	8	A	-
Japan Chemical School, Ministry of Defense (14)	6	4	C	Spiking chemicals C and F were not reported; insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals E and G
Pakistan Defense Science Technology Organisation (16)	8	8	A	-
Republic of Korea Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defense Development	-	-	A	Sample preparation assistance
Romania Scientific Research Centre for CBRN Defense and Ecology, Chemical Analysis and Special Synthesis Laboratory (8)	7	7	B	Spiking chemical B was not reported
Russia Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of the Military Research Centre (15)	7	6	C	Spiking chemical F was not reported; insufficient data for reported spiking chemical G

Participant Laboratory Code	No. of Spiking Chemicals¹ Reported	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
Russia Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory of the Federal State Unitary Enterprise, “State Scientific Research Institute of Organic Chemistry And Technology” (5)	7	7	B	Spiking chemical F was not reported
Spain LAVEMA (Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas), INTA Campus La Marañosa (6)	6	6	C	Spiking chemicals F and H were not reported
South Africa Protechnik Laboratories, a division of Armscor Defence Institutes (Pty) Ltd. (04)	7	6	C	Spiking chemical H was not reported; insufficient data for reported spiking chemical E
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down (9)	8	8	A	-
United States of America Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	-	-	A	Evaluating assistance