



Verification Division  
S/1083/2013  
21 March 2013  
ENGLISH only

### NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

#### EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE THIRTY-SECOND OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Thirty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from October 2012 to February 2013. The test was conducted in accordance with the following quality management system documents:
  - (a) “Standard Operating Procedure for the Organisation of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/SOP/PT01 (Issue 2, Revision 2, dated 6 August 2012));
  - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 2, Revision 1, dated 6 August 2012));
  - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of the Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT03 (Issue 2, Revision 4, dated 6 August 2012)); and
  - (d) Work Instruction for the Reporting of the Results of the OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 (Issue 1, Revision 1, dated 6 August 2012)).
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.
3. Two laboratories offered to assist the Secretariat in conducting the Thirty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test: the VERTOX Laboratory, Defence Research & Development Establishment, Gwalior, India assisted in preparing the test samples and the Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas (LAVEMA), Instituto Tecnológico “La Marañosa”, Madrid, Spain assisted in evaluating the test results.
4. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between the Secretariat staff and the test participants on 5 February 2013. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results, and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted the performance evaluation.
5. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 1 March 2013.



6. The principal results of the Thirty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
  - (a) twenty-seven regular participants including two assisting laboratories took part in the test, as well as one trial participant;
  - (b) twenty-four of the test participants submitted their analytical report within the test period;
  - (c) one participant did not submit a report and thus failed the test;
  - (d) one laboratory submitted a report after the test period and thus failed the test;
  - (e) twelve test participants identified and reported, with sufficient analytical data, all of the spiked chemicals;
  - (f) ten false positive chemicals were reported by three test participants;
  - (g) three non-scoring chemicals were reported by three test participants;
  - (h) no score was given for trial participation;
  - (i) the sample preparation laboratory and the evaluating laboratory were awarded the maximum performance rating of “A”; and
  - (j) there are fourteen As, two Bs, four Cs, one D and six Fs in the test score for the participants, including the two As of the two assisting laboratories.
7. The final results for all the 28 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 Thirty-Second Official OPCW Proficiency Test

## Annex

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

<b>Participant (Laboratory Name / Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Belgium</b> Defence Laboratories Department (12)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Brazil</b> CTEx, Laboratório de Análises Químicas (5)	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>F</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, D, E and H were not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals C and G. Reported one non-scoring chemical I. Failure due to reporting one false positive chemical L.
<b>China</b> Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Institute of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Academy of Military Medical Sciences (8)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>China</b> Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (13)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Finland</b> VERIFIN, Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (21)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-

\*

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

Sample 321: (A) N-propyl-N-isopropylaminoethane-2-ol

Sample 321: (B) N,N-dipropylaminoethane-2-ol

Sample 322: (C) Pinacolyl alcohol

Sample 322: (D) Diethyl phosphite

Sample 322: (E) Diethyl N-ethyl-N-methylphosphoramidate

Sample 325: (F) Diethyl N,N-diethylphosphoramidate

Sample 325: (G) Pinacolyl methylphosphonic acid

Sample 326: (H) Diisopropyl-(d14) methylphosphonate

<b>Participant (Laboratory Name / Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported<sup>*</sup></b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>France</b> DGA Maîtrise NRBC, Département d'analyses chimiques (7)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Hungary</b> Hungarian Defense Forces, Military Hospital, Scientific Institute, Toxicological Research Department (24)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>C</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B and H were not reported.
<b>India</b> VERTOX Laboratory, Defence Research & Development Establishment (31)	-	-	<b>A</b>	Sample preparation laboratory.
<b>Indonesia</b> Denpasar Branch Forensic Laboratory of Indonesian National Police (16)	-	-	<b>F</b>	Failure due to no report submission.
<b>Indonesia</b> Center of Forensic Laboratory, Criminal Investigation Agency, Indonesian National Police (22)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>F</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H were not reported. Failure due to reporting 5 false positive chemicals N, O, P, Q, R and S.
<b>Indonesia</b> Laboratorium Forensik, Cabang Surabaya Puslabfor (23)	-	-	<b>F</b>	Failure due to late submission of the report.
<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b> Defence Chemical Research Laboratory (1)	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>C</b>	Spiking chemical C was not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals D, E and F.
<b>Malawi</b> Malawi Bureau of Standards (17)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>#</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H were not reported. Reported two false positive chemicals L and M. Score not given for trial participation.
<b>Netherlands</b> TNO Defence, Security and Safety (2)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-

<b>Participant (Laboratory Name / Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported<sup>*</sup></b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Norway</b> FFI, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (14)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Poland</b> Laboratory for Chemical Weapons Convention Verification, Military Institute of Chemistry and Radiometry (19)	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>C</b>	Spiking chemical H was not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical B.
<b>Republic of Korea</b> Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development (25)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Romania</b> Central Customs Laboratory (3)	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>F†</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, G and H were not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical F. Failure due to non-compliance with QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 §8.3.
<b>Russian Federation</b> Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory of the Federal State Unitary Enterprise, “State Scientific Research Institute of Organic Chemistry and Technology” (9)	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>B</b>	Spiking chemical H was not reported.
<b>Russian Federation</b> Laboratory for Chemical and Analytical Control, Military Research Centre (11)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported one non-scoring chemical I.
<b>Singapore</b> Verification Laboratory, Defence Medical and Environmental Research Institute, DSO National Laboratories (20)	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>B</b>	Spiking chemical H was not reported. Reported one non-scoring chemical K.

F†

Failure is due to non-compliance with paragraph 8.3 of QDOC/LAB//WI/PT04.

<b>Participant (Laboratory Name / Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Slovakia</b> Reference Chemical Laboratory, Military Unit (26)	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>F</b>	Spiking chemicals C, D and H were not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals A, B, E and F. Failure due to reporting two false positive chemicals T and U.
<b>Spain</b> Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas (LAVEMA), Instituto Tecnológico “La Marañosa” (30)		-	<b>A</b>	Evaluating laboratory.
<b>South Africa</b> Protechnik Laboratories (6)	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>C</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B and H were not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical E.
<b>Switzerland</b> Spiez Laboratory, Swiss NBC Defence Establishment (18)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</b> Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down (15)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported one non-scoring chemical J.
<b>United States of America</b> Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (4)	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Vietnam</b> Centre of Technological Environmental Treatment (10)	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>D</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, D, E, G and H were not reported. Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals C and F.

Note: # = No score for trial participation.