



S/2438/2025
13 August 2025
ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH OFFICIAL OPCW ENVIRONMENTAL PROFICIENCY TEST**

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the States Parties of the results of the Fifty-Seventh Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (the Secretariat) from April to August 2025. 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 International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission Standard 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 4, Revision 2, dated 9 April 2025));
 - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 4, Revision 1, dated 9 April 2025));
 - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of the Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT03 (Issue 4, Revision 4, dated 10 April 2025)); and
 - (d) “Work Instruction for the Reporting of the Results of the OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 (Issue 4, Revision 0, dated 10 April 2025)).
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 sample preparation assistance laboratory was the Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN), Helsinki, Finland, while the evaluation assistance laboratory was the Combat Capabilities Development Command (DEVCOM) Chemical Biological Center, Forensic Analytical Laboratory, Maryland, United States of America.
4. Before the closing date, 17 States Parties nominated 20 laboratories, including the two assisting laboratories, for participation in the Fifty-Seventh Official OPCW Proficiency Test. One of the nominated laboratories requested to be withdrawn from test participation after the sample dispatch, which was accepted by the Test Coordinator. Accordingly, in the test there were 17 regular participants and the two assisting laboratories.



5. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed on 15 July 2025 at a hybrid meeting (held online and at the OPCW Centre for Chemistry and Technology in Pijnacker-Nootdorp, the Netherlands) between Secretariat staff and the test participants. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted their performance evaluation.
6. The evaluation assistance laboratory submitted its final technical review report to the Secretariat on 30 July 2025.
7. The principal results of the Fifty-Seventh Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) Sixteen regular test participants submitted their analytical reports within the test period.
 - (b) Two regular participants identified and reported all of the spiking chemicals with sufficient analytical data for all of the spiking chemicals and received a performance rating of A.
 - (c) Two regular participants identified and reported six out of the seven spiking chemicals with sufficient data and received a performance rating of B.
 - (d) Eight participants identified and reported more chemicals than they had missed and received a performance rating of C.
 - (e) Three regular participants identified less than half of the seven spiking chemicals and received a performance rating of D.
 - (f) One participant identified a false positive chemical and received a performance rating of F.
 - (g) One regular participant did not submit its report within the test period and received a performance rating of F*.¹
 - (h) Six non-scoring chemicals were reported.
 - (i) The sample preparation assistance laboratory submitted its report and was awarded the maximum performance rating of A.
 - (j) The evaluation assistance laboratory submitted its technical review report and was awarded the maximum performance rating of A.
 - (k) There were four A's, two B's, eight C's, three D's, one F*, and one F for the 17 regular participants and the two assisting laboratories.
8. The final results for all of the laboratories participating in the test are presented in the table in the Annex hereto.
9. 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

¹

A laboratory will receive a rating of F for reporting a false positive. A performance rating of F* (that is, with an asterisk) indicates that the laboratory did not submit its report on time.

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: Results of the Fifty-Seventh Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

RESULTS OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

Participant Code Laboratory	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported ²	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
23 Algeria National Institute of Criminalistics and Criminology of the National Gendarmerie (NICC/NG)	6	6	F	2-(N,N-diethylamino)ethane-sulfonic acid was reported, which was classified as a false positive.
13 Australia Defence Science and Technology Group	7	7	A	-
37 Brazil Chemical Analysis Laboratory of the Brazilian Navy Nuclear, Biological, Chemical and Radiological Defense Centre	5	4	C	Chemicals C and G were not reported. Data for chemical E were not sufficient for scoring.
Finland Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)	-	-	A	Sample Preparation Assistance Laboratory
22 India (CRCL) Central Revenues Control Laboratory, Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs	-	-	F*	The report was not received within the allotted test period.

2

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

- A 3-Quinuclidinol
- B Dipropyl methylphosphonate
- C N-Methyl-N-propylethanimidamide
- D Thiodiglycol
- E Benzoic acid
- F Thiodiglycol
- G Methylphosphonic acid.

Participant Code Laboratory	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported²	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
20 India (CSIR-IICT) Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins	7	5	C	Data for chemicals B and E were not sufficient for scoring.
09 India (IPFT) Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology	5	4	C	Chemicals C and G were not reported. Data for chemical F were not sufficient for scoring.
34 Italy Italian Customs and Monopolies Agency, Antifraud Directorate, Central Laboratory	4	2	D	Chemicals C, E, and G were not reported. Data for chemicals A and F were not sufficient for scoring.
30 Japan Chemical School, Self-Defense Force	5	5	C	Chemicals C and G were not reported.
40 Malaysia (DCM) Department of Chemistry	5	3	D	Chemicals C and G were not reported. Data for chemicals E and F were not sufficient for scoring.
32 Malaysia (STRIDE) Science and Technology Research Institute for Defence	2	1	D	Chemicals A, C, E, F, and G were not reported. Data for chemical D were not sufficient for scoring.
29 Morocco Administration de la Defense Nationale Gendarmerie Royale Institut de Criminalistique ICGR	6	4	C	Chemical C was not reported. Data for chemicals A and D, were not sufficient for scoring.
38 Nigeria National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control, NAFDAC	6	5	C	Chemical C was not reported. Data for chemical A were not sufficient for scoring.

Participant Code Laboratory	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported²	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
08 Poland Chemical Laboratory of CBRN Area Control Centre of Polish Armed Forces	5	5	C	Chemicals C and G were not reported.
06 Republic of Korea CBRN Defense Research Institute (CDRI), ROK CBRN Defense Command	7	6	B	Data for chemical E were not sufficient for scoring.
15 Romania Research and Innovation Center for CBRN Defense and Ecology, Chemical Analysis Laboratory	6	5	C	Chemical C was not reported. Data for chemical G were not sufficient for scoring.
02 Slovakia Section of Chemical Laboratories, Military Unit	6	6	B	Chemical C was not reported.
33 South Africa Protechnik Laboratories	-	-	-	Withdrew before receiving samples.
18 Türkiye Chemical Warfare Agents Diagnosis and Verification Laboratory	7	7	A	-
United States of America Combat Capabilities Development Command (DEVCOM), Chemical Biological Center, Forensic Analytical Laboratory	-	-	A	Evaluation Assistance Laboratory