



**OPCW**

**Executive Council**

---

111th Session  
10 – 13 March 2026

EC-111/NAT.8  
5 March 2026  
ENGLISH and RUSSIAN only

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**REQUEST FOR CIRCULATION OF A DOCUMENT  
AT THE 111TH SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

The Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the OPCW has requested that a note verbale addressed to the Technical Secretariat of the OPCW (dated 5 March 2026) be circulated as an official document of the 111th Session of the Executive Council.

Annex: Note Verbale No. 19 from the Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the Technical Secretariat of the OPCW Dated 5 March 2026



**Annex**

**NOTE VERBALE NO. 19 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATION OF THE  
RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO THE TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT OF THE OPCW  
DATED 5 MARCH 2026**

Unofficial translation



**ПОСТОЯННОЕ ПРЕДСТАВИТЕЛЬСТВО  
РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ  
ПРИ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ПО ЗАПРЕЩЕНИЮ  
ХИМИЧЕСКОГО ОРУЖИЯ**

PERMANENT REPRESENTATION  
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION  
TO THE ORGANISATION FOR THE PROHIBITION  
OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS

№ 19

Encl.: 12 pp.

The Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) presents its compliments to the Technical Secretariat of the OPCW and has the honour to transmit a national document of the Russian Federation «On the issue of so-called “poisoning” of A.Navalny by biotoxin epibatidine produced by South American dart frogs».

The Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the OPCW requests the OPCW Technical Secretariat that a copy of this Note Verbale with annex be distributed among States Parties as an official-series national document of the 111<sup>h</sup> Session of the OPCW Executive Council and made available on the OPCW website and “Catalyst” platform.

The Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the OPCW avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Technical Secretariat of the OPCW assurances of its highest consideration



The Hague, «05» March, 2026

**TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT OF THE  
ORGANISATION FOR THE PROHIBITION OF  
CHEMICAL WEAPONS**

**The Hague**

*Unofficial translation*

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

**On the issue of so-called “poisoning” of A.Navalny by biotoxin epibatidine produced by South American dart frogs**

Taking into account the letter of February 14, 2026 of Permanent Representatives of Germany, France, The Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) addressed to the Director-General of the OPCW Technical Secretariat (hereinafter – TS) on the so-called “poisoning” of Russian blogger A.Navalny with biotoxin epibatidine excreted by Ecuadorian dart frog, the Russian Federation believes it is necessary to focus on the following.

The letter of the above-mentioned Permanent Representatives to the OPCW claims that alleged deliberate “poisoning” of A.Navalny is an “established” fact, based on some results of analyses of biological materials obtained from the remains of A.Navalny, in which biotoxin epibatidine was found. According to the UK Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth and Development Affairs Yvette Cooper at the Munich Security Conference on February 14, 2026, British scientists from the Porton Down laboratory (Sky News channel) played a key role in revealing the “frog poison” scheme.

In fact, not a single concrete evidence is provided in favor of the quiet exotic version of the “poisoning” of A.Navalny presented by Western states in February 2024 while he was serving his sentence in a Russian correctional institution.

Exactly the same scenario was followed by the plot of alleged “poisoning” of A.Navalny in 2020 with a nerve agent from the so-called “Novichok” group, with subsequent unsubstantiated accusations by Germany against the Russian authorities, unconditionally supported by its Euro-Atlantic allies.

At the same time, these states ignored the facts that everything possible was done in Russia to save the blogger's life. When he became ill on board of the plane, the pilots made an emergency landing at Omsk airport, where doctors provided

him with the necessary emergency medical care. The leadership of the Russian Federation promptly responded to the request of his wife Yulia Navalnaya and German Chancellor Angela Merkel and agreed to his transportation to the German Charité clinic.

Thus, according to the version of the Western countries, it turns out that the Russian Federation sent A. Navalny to Germany for treatment with the only purpose to allow German specialists to determine that he had been poisoned with “Novichok” in Russia. However, no cholinesterase inhibitors were found in the blogger's tests which were performed in Omsk. This was indicated in a report of Russian doctors.

As a follow-up to their baseless accusations, the German authorities allegedly involved the laboratories of France and Sweden in the analysis of A. Navalny's biological samples, as well as the OPCW TS, as part of the provision of technical assistance in accordance with paragraph 38 (e) of Article VIII of the Chemical Weapon Convention (hereinafter - the Convention, CWC).

According to the results of sample analysis, France and Sweden confirmed the results obtained in Germany. Based on the reports of two designated OPCW laboratories, the Director-General of the OPCW TS Fernando Arias stated that biomarkers of the cholinesterase inhibitor were found in the blogger's biomaterials, “which have similar structural characteristics to the toxic chemicals belonging to schedules 1.A.14 and 1.A.15” (document TAV/01/20 dated October 6, 2020). However, no names or structural formulas of the allegedly “discovered” chemicals or their degradation products were presented.

In this regard, the Russian Federation requested the publication of the specific formula of the detected toxic chemical for its possible inclusion in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals to the CWC in accordance with the established procedure. However, Germany, France and Sweden, as well as the OPCW TS, rejected this request.

In such an ambiguous situation, the Russian Federation requested the Director-General of the OPCW TS to provide technical assistance under

paragraph 38 (e) of Article VIII of the CWC. The main task for Russian specialists was to analyze together with OPCW experts the remaining samples of biomaterials in Russia. At the same time, it was proposed to carry out such a study jointly in one of Russian certified laboratories, using equipment that could be brought by representatives of the OPCW TS.

After three months of negotiating the modalities of such interaction, the OPCW TS refused to accept the proposal of the Russian Federation. Meanwhile, it requested the transfer of samples of A.Navalny's biomaterials available in Russia for analysis by certified OPCW laboratories without the participation of Russian specialists. In the context of the “conspiracy show” played out by Western countries, Russia's transfer of samples to the OPCW TS was deemed inappropriate.

This reaction of the OPCW TS to the assistance requested by Russia has once again clearly demonstrated that the Organization's policy making organs are under the influence of Western countries that seek to use this international forum for their political purposes.

The statement of five states dated February 14, 2026, duplicated in the speeches of foreign ministers of these countries, is aimed at implementing the same anti-Russian scenario on yet another alleged “poisoning” of A.Navalny. It is very symptomatic in this context that there is no real factual information in the statement of Western states about where and how biological samples from the remains of A.Navalny were obtained, who took them and how they were transferred to the laboratories of the countries concerned. No results of the analysis of these samples have been provided. Thus, the very idea of the accusation corresponds to the previously far-fetched insinuations regarding the so-called “poisoning” of A.Navalny with a toxic substance from the “Novichok” group in August 2020.

Epibatidine is a bicyclic organic compound, an alkaloid of biological origin, which was first isolated from the mucous membrane of Ecuadorian dart frogs by the American biochemist J.W.Daly in 1974, while its structure was eventually

established in 1992. More than fifty methods of laboratory synthesis of this toxin have been developed in the West since. Synthetic epibatidine is currently widely commercially available from several well-known pharmaceutical and other specialized companies: in the USA – “Sigma-Aldrich (Merck)”, “The BioTek”, “BOC Sciences”, “AA BLOCKS” and “A2B Chem”; in the United Kingdom – “Biorbyt” and “LGC Standards”; in Spain – “CymitQuimica”; in Germany – “Chemos GmbH”; in Switzerland – “Biotrend Chemicals AG” and in a number of other countries.

The Russian Federation notes that the alleged “poisoning” of the Russian blogger imputed to Russia is the prerogative of forensic medical examination.

In addition, the Russian Federation notes that it remains unclear where and how A.Navalny’s biological samples were obtained, by whom they were collected and how exactly they were transferred to the laboratories of the countries concerned. Moreover, the available synthetic epibatidine could be deliberately added into A.Navalny’s biological samples during their presumed long-term presence (two years have passed since his death on 16 February 2024) on the territory of one of the Western countries in order to falsify the results of the analysis and subsequently accuse Russia of using this toxic substance.

To exclude possible falsification and obtain reliable results when establishing the fact of poisoning, a number of general rules have been adopted in forensic medicine, which are well known to foreign criminologists. These rules are set out, for example, in the following scientific publication: *Flanagan R.J. et al. “Fundamentals of analytical toxicology: clinical and forensic”, 2020, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

The following information was mandatory to be reflected in the reports of foreign laboratories in accordance to common practice:

- Where, when and how exactly A.Navalny's biological samples were collected? Do these methods comply with the requirements of analytical toxicology (since the exhumation of the corpse (burial remains), as it is understood, was not carried out, was the above sampling taken at the funeral?);

- Where the biological samples have been stored for two years after A.Navalny's death;

- What are the qualifications of the persons involved in the sampling of biomaterials, and do they meet the necessary requirements, including the storage of samples;

- What measures have been taken to exclude the possible falsification of biomedical samples;

- How many and what kind of samples have been analyzed and what are the results;

- Results of quantitative analysis of epibatidine in the samples and the comparability of findings with its lethal concentration for humans (why there is no information on the results of the analysis of the samples taken, as well as on the laboratories that carried out these analyses, except for the laboratory in Porton Down, UK);

- Identified toxicant metabolites;

- Symptoms of poisoning and its compliance with the pharmacological characteristics of a toxicant.

The absence of the above materials and any verifiable data confirms in essence the version of another provocation against the Russian Federation.

With regard to the allegation in the above-mentioned statement of the Permanent Representatives of the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Sweden to the OPCW dated 14 February 2026 that Russia did not respond to the questions submitted by a group of 45 “concerned countries” dated 5 October 2021 under paragraph 2 of Article IX of the CWC, the Russian side would like to recall that after receiving the above request, namely on 7 October 2021, the Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the OPCW transmitted through the OPCW TS its Note Verbale No.44 with two annexes (document EC-98/NAT.8, dated 7 October 2021, on 235 pages), which contained comprehensive answers, and reiterated its questions that had been posed to France, Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The responses received from the four above-mentioned countries to the Note Verbale No.44 did not contain any adequate clarifications. In this regard, the Russian side sent two more Notes Verbales – No.54 (document EC-98/NAT.13 dated 2 November 2021) and No.58 (document EC-99/NAT.2 dated 15 November 2021) with the request to provide specific answers to the previously posed questions. This request is also repeated in the Notes Verbales of the Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the OPCW No. 15 and 16 dated 24 February 2026 (documents EC-111/NAT.5 and EC-111/NAT.6 dated 24 February 2026).

In general, the joint statement by the governments of France, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom about Russia's alleged involvement in the so-called "poisoning" of A.Navalny with epibatidine and thus violating the provisions of the CWC is absolutely groundless and provocative in nature.