OPCW

Technical Secretariat

Verification Division S/565/2006 18 April 2006 ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

- 1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Eighteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter "the Secretariat") from 7 October 2005 to 10 February 2006. 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 9 September 2005;
 - (b) "Work Instruction for the Preparation of Test Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests", QDOC/LAB/WI/PT2, dated 1 December 2004; and
 - (c) "Work Instruction for the Evaluation of Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests", QDOC/LAB/WI/PT3, dated 9 September 2005.
- 2. Twenty-six laboratories in 23 Member States were nominated to participate in the test; in the end, 23 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 assisted the Secretariat to conduct this test: the Defence Laboratories Department (DLD) in Belgium, which prepared the test samples, and the Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons (VERIFIN) in Finland, which evaluated the test results.
- 5. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between the Secretariat staff and the test participants on 10 February 2006. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results, and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted the performance evaluation.

- 6. Laboratory 8 and Laboratory 23 submitted their comments, based upon which VERIFIN re-evaluated its preliminary results. The Secretariat agreed with the results of the re-evaluation, which led to no changes in the preliminary score for either laboratory 8 or laboratory 23. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 10 March 2006.
- 7. The principal results of the Eighteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) Of 26 nominated laboratories, including the two assisting laboratories, 23 laboratories submitted a report of their analytical results for evaluation.
 - (b) Twenty-one of the 23 laboratories that had submitted a report for evaluation met the adopted criteria and qualified for scoring.
 - (c) Fourteen laboratories identified all of the deliberately introduced (spiking) chemicals used for scoring, and reported them with sufficient analytical data.
 - (d) One laboratory failed to submit an analysis report, which resulted in failure of the test.
 - (e) One laboratory reported two chemicals that were categorised as a false positive chemical and an irrelevant chemical, respectively, and consequently failed the test.
 - (f) One laboratory submitted its analysis report late (more than 15 calendar days); it also did not use the proper reporting templates, which resulted in failure of the test.
 - (g) 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 Eighteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

FINAL RESULTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments ¹
Belgium Defence Laboratories Department (DLD)			A	Sample preparation
China (4) The Laboratory of Analysis Chemistry, RICD	7	7	A	-
Czech Republic (7) Research Institute for Organic Synthesis	7	7	A	-
Denmark (8) Ministry of Defence, Emergency Management Agency, Chemical Division	6	5	С	Spiking chemical F not reported. Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemical B.
Finland Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)			A	Evaluation of results
France (17) Centre d'Etudes du Bouchet (CEB)	7	7	A	-
Hungary (23) Department of Toxicology Institute of Health Protection Hungarian Defence Forces	6	5	С	Spiking chemical F not reported Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemical D.
India (9) Indian Institute of Chemical Technology (IICT)	7	7	A	-

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

O: (A) Ethyl methyl methylphosphonate

(B) Diethyl phosphite

W: (C) Diethyl N,N-diisopropyl phosphoramidate

(**D**) Dipinacolyl methylphosphonate

S: (E) Diethyl N,N-diisopropyl phosphoramidate

(F) S,S-Diethyl methylphosphonodithiolothionate

Dipinacolyl methylphosphonate

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments ¹
India (14) Defence Research & Development Establishment VERTOX Laboratory	7	7	A	-
Iran, Islamic Republic of (18) Defense Chemical Research Laboratory	6	6	В	Spiking chemical F not reported
Republic of Korea (1) The Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development	6	6	В	Spiking chemical F not reported
Malaysia (19) Department of Chemistry Malaysia Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation	6	4	С	Spiking chemical F not reported Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals A and B.
Mexico (13) Administrador General de Aduanas	-	-	F	No report submitted.
The Netherlands (10) TNO Defence, Security and Safety	7	7	A	-
Republic of Poland (16) Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification, Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry	7	7	A	-
Singapore (20) Verification Laboratory Centre for Chemical Defence (CCD), DSO National Laboratories	7	7	A	-
South Africa (2) Protechnik Laboratories a division of Armcor Business (Pty) Ltd	7	7	A	-
Spain (22) Fábrica Nacional "La Marañosa"	7	7	A	-
Sweden (24) Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), Division Defence Forces	6	6	В	Spiking chemical F not reported.
Switzerland (11) Spiez Laboratory	7	7	A	-

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments ¹
Turkey (15) Ministry of Health, Refik Saydam Central Hygiene Institute	-	-	F	Spiking chemicals B, C, E, F and G not reported Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemicals A and D. Irrelevant chemical reported. False positive chemical reported.
Turkey (5) The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey	-	-	F	Late submission of report.
Ukraine (3) Laboratory of physical and chemical control methods	4	3	D	Spiking chemicals A, B and F not reported. Insufficient analytical data to support identification of spiking chemical E.
UK (12) Defence Science and Technology Laboratory	7	7	A	-
United States of America (21) Edgewood Chemical and Biological Forensic Analytical Center	7	7	A	-
United States of America (6) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	7	7	A	-