



**OPCW**

**Technical Secretariat**

---

Verification Division

S/484/2005

23 March 2005

ENGLISH only

**NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

**EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF  
THE SIXTEENTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Sixteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from 8 October 2004 to 11 February 2005. The test was conducted in accordance with the following set of quality documents:
  - (a) “Standard Operating Procedure for the Organisation of OPCW Proficiency Tests”, QDOC/LAB/SOP/PT1, dated 17 September 2004;
  - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Test Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests”, QDOC/LAB/WI/PT2, dated 17 September 2004; and
  - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests”, QDOC/LAB/WI/PT3, dated 17 September 2004.
2. Twenty laboratories in 19 Member States were nominated to participate in the test; in the end, 14 laboratories submitted a report of their analytical results for evaluation.
3. 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. Laboratories may either participate in these tests as regular participants, or support the Secretariat in the preparation of the test samples or in the evaluation of the test results.
4. Two laboratories generously offered to assist the Secretariat at no cost to the OPCW: the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, United States of America, which prepared the test samples, and the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which evaluated the test results.
5. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between Secretariat staff and the test participants on 11 February 2005. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results, and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted the performance evaluation.



6. Laboratories 2, 7 and 17 submitted comments, based on which the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory re-evaluated the preliminary results. The Secretariat agreed with the results of the re-evaluation and amended the scores for laboratories 2, 5, 7 and 17. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 11 March 2005.
7. The principal results of the Sixteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
  - (a) Of 20 nominated laboratories, including the two assisting laboratories, 14 laboratories submitted a report of their analytical results for evaluation.
  - (b) Four participating laboratories did not submit an analysis report: one had formally informed the test coordinator of its withdrawal before test samples were dispatched; two laboratories could not receive samples due to internal custom difficulties and were subsequently excluded from the test without penalty; one laboratory failed to submit an analysis report, which resulted in failing the test.
  - (c) All of the 14 laboratories that had submitted a report for evaluation met the adopted criteria and qualified for scoring.
  - (d) Seven of these laboratories identified all of the deliberately introduced (spiking) chemicals used for scoring, and reported them with sufficient analytical data.
  - (e) The laboratories that assisted the Secretariat in preparing the test samples and in evaluating the results were awarded the maximum performance rating of A.
8. The final results for all the participating laboratories are presented in the table annexed 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 is required to submit to the Secretariat a full report 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 Sixteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

## Annex

## FINAL RESULTS OF THE SIXTEENTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments <sup>1</sup>
Austria (12) RD-ARWT/ABCUT	6	0	D	Spiking chemicals A, E and J not reported. Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals B,C,D,G,H and I.
Belgium (10) Defence Laboratories Department (DLD)	9	9	A	-
Czech Republic (5) Research Institute for Organic Syntheses Centre of Ecology, Toxicology and Analytics	8	8	B	Spiking chemical A not reported.
Denmark (2) Ministry of Defence Emergency Management Agency, Chemical Division	8	6	C	Spiking chemical A not reported Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemical D and E.
Finland (9) Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)	9	9	A	-
France (6) Centre d'Etudes du Bouchet (CEB) Section Analyses Chimiques	9	9	A	-

<sup>1</sup> The spiking chemicals were as follows:

- O:** (A) Trichloronitromethane;  
(B) 2-(N-Ethyl-N-propylamino)ethylchloride;  
(C) 2-(N,N-Diisopropylamino)ethylchloride;  
(D) 2-(N,N-Diethylamino)ethylchloride
- L:** (E) Triethanolamine;  
(G) 2-(N,N-Diisopropylamino)ethanol;
- S:** (H) Ethyldiethanolamine;  
(I) Methyldiethanolamine;  
(J) Triethanolamine.

<b>Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)</b>	<b>No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals</b>	<b>No. of Scored Chemicals</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments<sup>1</sup></b>
Hungary (1) Department of Toxicology Institute of Health Protection Hungarian Defence Forces	6	0	D	Spiking chemicals A, I and J not reported.  Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals B,C,D,E,G and H.
India (11) Indian Institute of Chemical Technology (IICT)	9	9	A	-
India (15) Defence Research & Development Establishment VERTOX Laboratory	9	9	A	-
Malaysia (16) Department of chemistry Malaysia Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation	6	0	D	Spiking chemicals A, B and J not reported.  Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals C,D,E,G,H and I.
Morocco (13) Laboratoire Officiel d'Analyses et de Recherches Chimiques (LOARC)	-	-	F	No report submitted
Malawi Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS)	-	-	-	Withdrew
The Netherlands (17) TNO Defence, Security and Safety	9	8	B	Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemical J.
Romania (7) NBC and Ecological Defence Scientific Research Centre	9	7	C	Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals A and H.
Russian Federation (3) Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory GosNIIOKhT (CAL)	-	-	-	No test samples received
Spain (8) Fábrica Nacional "La Marañosa"	9	9	A	-

<b>Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)</b>	<b>No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals</b>	<b>No. of Scored Chemicals</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments<sup>1</sup></b>
Sweden (14) Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI) Division of NBC Defence	9	9	A	-
Ukraine (4) Kharkiv Research Center of Ministry Ecology (Ecocenter- 43) of the State Analytical Laboratory (SAL)	-	-	-	No test samples received
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  Defence Science and Technology Laboratory			A	Evaluation of results
United States of America Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory			A	Sample preparation