



---

Verification Division  
S/588/2006  
13 September 2006  
Original: ENGLISH

**NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

**STATUS OF LABORATORIES DESIGNATED  
FOR THE ANALYSIS OF AUTHENTIC SAMPLES**

1. The Conference of the States Parties at its First Session established the conditions under which laboratories may seek designation (C-I/DEC.60, 61, 62, and 65, all dated 22 May 1997), and at its Fifth Session (C-V/6, dated 19 May 2000) mandated the Executive Council to take a decision regarding guidelines on the designation of laboratories for the analysis of authentic samples (EC-XX/DEC.3, dated 28 June 2000).
2. When designating laboratories for the analysis of authentic samples, and in accordance with C-I/DEC.61 and C-I/DEC.65, the Director-General takes the following into account:
  - (a) whether the laboratory has established a quality system in accordance with the relevant standards (ISO/IEC 17025:2005, ILAC-G 13:2000, or equivalent) and has a valid accreditation by an internationally recognised accreditation body for the tasks for which it is seeking designation—namely, for the analysis of chemical-warfare agents and related compounds in various types of samples; and
  - (b) whether the laboratory has performed successfully in the OPCW's proficiency-testing programme.
3. A laboratory must participate in the proficiency-testing programme at least once per calendar year. According to subparagraph 4(d) of the Annex to C-I/DEC.65, a rating of three A's, or two A's and one B, on a laboratory's three most recent consecutive tests, shall be regarded as constituting a successful performance.
4. If a designated laboratory performs unsuccessfully in a proficiency test, it is temporarily suspended. When this happens, the laboratory remains designated but, in accordance with EC-XX/DEC.3, will no longer be selected by the Director-General to receive and analyse authentic samples from the OPCW. However, it may perform other tasks, as set out in C-I/DEC.67.



5. Following the completion of the Nineteenth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, the Director-General wishes to inform Member States of the current status of the laboratories that have been designated for the analysis of authentic samples. Nineteen laboratories from 18 Member States have been designated, and 5 of these have been temporarily suspended.
6. The 19 designated laboratories are listed below.

<b>Designated Laboratory</b>		<b>Member State</b>
1.	Defence Laboratories Department (DLD)	Belgium
2.	The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (RICD)	China
3.	Research Institute for Organic Syntheses, Centre of Ecology, Toxicology and Analytics	Czech Republic *
4.	Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)	Finland
5.	Centre d'Etudes du Bouchet (CEB)	France
6.	Wehrwissenschaftliches Institut für Schutztechnologien – ABC-Schutz	Germany*
7.	VERTOX Laboratory Defence Research & Development Establishment	India*
8.	TNO Defence, Security and Safety	Netherlands
9.	Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification, Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry	Poland
10.	Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development	Republic of Korea*
11.	The Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of the Military University for Radioactive, Chemical and Biological Protection	Russian Federation
12.	Verification Laboratory, Centre for Chemical Defence (CCD), DSO National Laboratories	Singapore
13.	Protechnik Laboratories a division of Armscor Business (Pty) Ltd	South Africa
14.	Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas, Fabrica Nacional la Marañosa	Spain
15.	Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), Division of NBC-Defence	Sweden
16.	Spiez Laboratory	Switzerland

\* An asterisk next to the name of a laboratory indicates that it has been temporarily suspended, having performed unsuccessfully in a proficiency test, and that it will not be considered for the receipt of samples taken for off-site analysis until it again meets the criterion stated in subparagraph 2(b) above.

<b>Designated Laboratory</b>		<b>Member State</b>
17.	Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
18.	Edgewood Chemical and Biological Forensic Analytical Center	United States of America*
19.	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, University of California	United States of America

7. The performance ratings of the designated laboratories in official proficiency tests are annexed to this Note.

Annex:

Performance Ratings for Designated Laboratories in Official Proficiency Tests

**Annex**

**PERFORMANCE RATINGS FOR DESIGNATED LABORATORIES IN OFFICIAL PROFICIENCY TESTS**

Laboratory	Member State	6th (1999)	7th (2000)	8th (2000)	9th (2001)	10th (2001)	11th (2002)	12th (2002)	13th (2003)	14th (2003)	15th (2004)	16th (2004)	17th (2005)	18th (2005)	19th (2006)
Defence Laboratories Department (DLD)	Belgium	C	A	A	D	–	A	A	–	A	–	A	–	A	–
The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (RICD)	China	C	A	–	–	A	–	A	–	A	A	–	–	A	–
Research Institute for Organic Syntheses, Centre of Ecology, Toxicology and Analytics	Czech Republic	C	B	A	–	B	–	B	–	D	–	B	–	A	–
Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)	Finland	A	A	–	–	A	A**	A	–	A	–	A	–	A	–
Centre d'Etudes du Bouchet (CEB)	France	B	A	–	–	A	A	–	A	–	–	A	–	A	–
Wehrwissenschaftliches Institut für Schutztechnologien – ABC-Schutz	Germany	B	A	–	A	-	A	A	A	–	A	–	A	–	C
Defence Research & Development Establishment, VERTOX Laboratory	India	C	B	A	D	D	C	B	A	C	withdrew	A	A	A	C
TNO Defence, Security and Safety	Netherlands	A	A	A	B	A	–	A	–	A	-	B	–	A	A
Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification, Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry	Poland	A	–	A	–	A	–	C	A	–	A	–	–	A	–
Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development	Republic of Korea	C	A	A	B	-	A	A	–	A	A	–	–	B	C

\*\* This score is a result of the satisfactory assistance provided by the laboratory during the proficiency test, but cannot be used to evaluate whether the laboratory can be considered for designation, because this laboratory assisted during a proficiency test in 2001 and that score was subsequently counted for designation (see paragraph 5(c) of C-I/DEC.65, which states that “laboratories cannot use performance rating for preparing the samples or evaluating the analytical results of more than one of their last three consecutive proficiency tests”).

Laboratory	Member State	6th (1999)	7th (2000)	8th (2000)	9th (2001)	10th (2001)	11th (2002)	12th (2002)	13th (2003)	14th (2003)	15th (2004)	16th (2004)	17th (2005)	18th (2005)	19th (2006)
The Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of the Military University for Radioactive, Chemical and Biological Protection	Russian Federation	B	A	–	–	C	–	B	–	A	A	–	A	–	–
Verification Laboratory, Centre for Chemical Defence (CCD), DSO National Laboratories	Singapore	C	–	A	F	A	A	A	–	A	A	–	–	A	–
Protechnik Laboratories a division of Armscor Business (Pty) Ltd	South Africa	–	F	–	–	F	A	–	B	–	A	–	–	A	–
Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas, Fabrica Nacional la Marañosa	Spain	D	–	–	–	B	A	A	–	B	–	A	–	A	–
Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), Division of NBC Defence	Sweden	B	–	A	–	A	–	C	–	A	–	A	–	B	A
Spiez Laboratory	Switzerland	B	A	–	–	A	–	A	–	A	A	–	–	A	A
Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	B	–	A	A	–	A**	A	–	A	–	A	–	A	–
Edgewood Chemical and Biological Forensic Analytical Center	United States of America	A	A	–	B	–	A	–	A	–	A	–	A***	A	C
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, University of California	United States of America	–	–	–	F	A	A	B	–	A	–	A	–	A	–

--- 0 ---

\*\*\* This score is a result of the satisfactory assistance provided by the laboratory during the proficiency test, but cannot be used to evaluate whether the laboratory can be considered for designation, because this laboratory assisted during a proficiency test in 2003 and that score was subsequently counted for designation (see paragraph 5(c) of C-I/DEC.65, which states that “laboratories cannot use performance rating for preparing the samples or evaluating the analytical results of more than one of their last three consecutive proficiency tests”).