



Verification Division
S/684/2008
27 March 2008
ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

**EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF
THE TWENTY-SECOND OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Twenty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from 5 October 2007 to 8 February 2008. 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 12 September 2007);
 - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Test Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests”, QDOC/LAB/WI/PT2 (dated 12 September 2007); and
 - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests”, QDOC/LAB/WI/PT3 (dated 12 September 2007).
2. 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.
3. Two laboratories assisted the Secretariat in conducting this test: Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification, Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry, Warsaw, Poland, which prepared the test samples, and Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Porton Down, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which evaluated the test results.
4. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between the Secretariat staff and the test participants on 8 February 2008. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results, and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted the performance evaluation.
5. Laboratories 4, 5, 8, and 14 submitted their valid comments, and based upon these, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Porton Down, United Kingdom



of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, re-evaluated the preliminary results. The Secretariat agreed with the results of the re-evaluation, which led to no change in the preliminary scores for Laboratories 4, 5, 8, and 14. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 10 March 2008.

6. The principal results of the Twenty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) Twenty-two laboratories from 18 Member States were nominated 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) Nineteen laboratories met the adopted criteria for submission, timeliness, and reporting.
 - (d) Eighteen laboratories were qualified for scoring in the test.
 - (e) One laboratory reported chemicals that were categorised as false positive chemicals and consequently failed the test.
 - (f) One laboratory reported one non-scoring chemical.
 - (g) Twelve laboratories identified all of the deliberately introduced (spiked) chemicals used for scoring and reported them with sufficient analytical data.
 - (h) The laboratories that assisted the Secretariat in preparing the test samples and in evaluating the results were awarded the maximum performance rating of "A".
7. The final results for all the 21 participating laboratories are presented in the table annexed hereto.
8. 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 Twenty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

**FINAL RESULTS OF THE TWENTY-SECOND
OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST**

Participant (Identification Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments¹
Belgium Defence Laboratories Department (DLD) (2)	8	8	A	-
Czech Republic Research Institute for Organic Syntheses Centre of Ecology, Toxicology and Analytics (CETA) (5)	7	-	D	Spiking chemical C not reported Insufficient data for spiking chemicals A, B, D, E, F, G, and H
Finland Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN) (8)	8	8	A	-
France Centre d'Etudes du Bouchet (CEB) (18)	8	8	A	-
Germany Bundeswehr Research Institute for Protective Technologies and NBC Protection (WIS) (1)	8	8	A	-

¹ The spiking chemicals were as follows:

- O1:** (A) Diethyl ethylphosphonate; (B) O,O-Diethylethylphosphonothionate;
(C) Bis(N,N-diethylamino) ethylphosphonate ;
- O2:** (D) N,N-Diethylphosphoramidic dichloride; (E) Diethyl N,N-diethylphosphoramidate;
- W:** (F) Ethylphosphonic acid;
(G) Ethyl methylphosphonic acid; (H) Methylphosphonic acid

Participant (Identification Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments¹
India VERTOX Laboratory, Defence Research & Development Establishment (12)	8	8	A	-
India Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins, Analytical Chemistry Division, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology (10)	8	8	A	-
Iran (Islamic Republic of) Defense Chemical Research Laboratory (15)	5	5	C	Spiking chemicals C, G, and H not reported
Netherlands TNO Defence, Security and Safety (3)	8	8	A	-
Poland Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry	-	-	A	Preparation of samples
Romania Chemical Analysis and Testing Laboratory, NBC and Ecology Defence Scientific Research Centre (14)	7	6	C	Spiking chemical C not reported Insufficient data for spiking chemical B
Russian Federation Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory of the Federal National Unitary Establishment (CAL) (17)	8	8	A	-
Russian Federation The Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of the Military University for the Radioactive, Chemical and Biological Protection Military Research Centre (4)	8	8	A	-

Participant (Identification Code)	No. of Scorable Reported Chemicals	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments¹
Slovakia Reference Chemical Laboratory Zemianské Kostol'any (19)	4	1	D	Spiking chemicals B, C, G, and H not reported Insufficient data for spiking chemicals D, E, and F
South Africa Protechnik Laboratories a division of Armscor Business (Pty) Ltd (7)	7	-	F	Spiking chemical C not reported Reported three false positive chemicals (J, K, and L)
Spain Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas, Fábrica Nacional la Marañosa (11)	8	8	A	-
Sweden Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), Division of NBC- Defence (16)	8	8	A	-
Turkey The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey, Bursa Test and Analysis Laboratory (9)	4	-	D	Spiking chemicals C, F, G and H not reported Insufficient data for spiking chemicals A, B, D, and E
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), Porton Down	-	-	A	Evaluation of results
United States of America Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, University of California (13)	8	8	A	One non-scoring chemical reported
Viet Nam Chemical Monitoring Laboratory Military of Defense, Hanoi City (6)	4	3	D	Spiking chemicals C, F, G, and H are not reported Insufficient data for spiking chemical A

--- 0 ---