



Verification Division
S/629/2007
30 March 2007
ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

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

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Twentieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from 6 October 2006 to 9 February 2007. 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 15 September 2006;
 - (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 15 September 2006.
2. Twenty-one laboratories in 18 Member States were nominated to participate in the test. In the end, 18 laboratories each submitted a report of their analytical results for evaluation.
3. Designated laboratories must, in order to retain their designation, 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 in conducting this test: Centre d’Etudes du Bouchet (CEB), Section Analyses Chimiques, France, which prepared the test samples, and Verification Laboratory Centre for Chemical Defence (CCD), DSO National Laboratories, Singapore, which evaluated the test results.
5. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between Secretariat staff and the test participants on 9 February 2007. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results, and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted the performance evaluation.



6. Laboratories 4 and 16 submitted comments on time, and, based upon these, DSO National Laboratories, Singapore, re-evaluated the preliminary results. The Secretariat agreed with the results of the re-evaluation, which led to a change from a C to a B in the preliminary score for Laboratory 4, but to no change in the score for Laboratory 16. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 9 March 2007.
7. The principal results of the Twentieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) Twenty-one laboratories were nominated by 18 Member States to participate in this proficiency test, including the two assisting laboratories.
 - (b) One participating laboratory withdrew from the test before the sample dispatch date, which was accepted by the OPCW Laboratory without any penalties (see paragraph 10 of QDOC/LAB/SOP/PT1).
 - (c) Eighteen laboratories met the criteria for submission, timeliness, and reporting.
 - (d) Of the 18 laboratories that submitted a report, 16 laboratories were scored in the test.
 - (e) Two laboratories reported chemicals that were categorised as a false positive chemical, and consequently failed the test.
 - (f) Six laboratories identified all of the deliberately introduced (spiking) chemicals used for scoring, and reported them with sufficient analytical data.
 - (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 Twentieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

**FINAL RESULTS OF THE TWENTIETH
OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments¹
Austria (6) RD-ARWT/ABCUT	4	0	D	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, and F not reported Insufficient analytical data to support the identification of spiking chemicals E, G, H, and I
Belgium (18) Defence Laboratories Department (DLD)	8	8	B	Spiking chemical G not reported
China (9) The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry (RICD)	9	9	A	-
China (15) The Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Academy of Military Medical Science	9	9	A	-
Czech Republic (13) Research Institute for Organic Syntheses	8	7	C	Spiking chemical G not reported Insufficient analytical data to support the identification of spiking chemical A
Finland (1) Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN)	9	9	A	-

¹ The spiking chemicals were as follows:

- O:** (A) Ethyl methylphosphonate
(B) Bis(2-methoxyethyl) methylphosphonate
(C) O-Methyl S- pentyl methylphosphonothiolate
(D) O-Cyclopentyl S-ethyl methylphosphonothiolate
- W:** (E) 2-(N,N-diisopropylamino)ethanol
(F) Ethyl methylphosphonate
- S:** (G) Ethylphosphonic acid
(H) Ethyl methylphosphonate
(I) Diethyl methylphosphonate

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments¹
India (10) Defence Research & Development Establishment VERTOX Laboratory	9	9	A	-
India (16) Indian Institute of Chemical Technology (IICT)	9	-	F	False positive chemical reported
Iran, Islamic Republic of (5) Defense Chemical Research Laboratory	5	2	D	Spiking chemicals A, F, G, and H not reported Insufficient analytical data to support the identification of spiking chemicals B, C, and I
Malaysia (17) Department of Chemistry Malaysia Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation	7	7	C	Spiking chemicals C and D not reported
Poland (7) Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry	7	6	C	Spiking chemicals B and G not reported
Romania (2) NBC and Ecological Defence Scientific Research Centre	4	3	D	Spiking chemicals A, C, D, G, and H not reported Insufficient analytical data to support the identification of spiking chemical E
Russian Federation (4) The Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of Military University for the Radioactive, Chemical and Biological Protection	8	7	B	Spiking chemical D not reported

Participant Laboratory (and Test Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Scored Chemicals	Rating	Comments¹
South Africa (11) Protechnik Laboratories (Pty) Ltd	6	-	F	Spiking chemicals A, G, and H not reported False positive chemical reported
Spain (14) Fábrica Nacional “La Marañosa”	7	7	C	Spiking chemicals G and H not reported
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (19) Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl)	8	8	B	Spiking chemical G not reported
United States of America (8) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	8	8	B	Spiking chemical G not reported
United States of America (3) Edgewood Chemical and Biological Forensic Analytical Center	9	9	A	-
France Centre d’Etudes du Bouchet (CEB), Section Analyses Chimiques	-	-	A	Sample preparation
Singapore Verification Laboratory Centre for Chemical Defence (CCD), DSO National Laboratories	-	-	A	Evaluation of results