



Verification Division
S/1265/2015
15 April 2015
ENGLISH only

NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH OFFICIAL OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Thirty-Sixth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from October 2014 to February 2015. The OPCW Laboratory is accredited by the Raad voor Accreditatie (RvA), the Netherlands, to conduct proficiency testing in compliance with the criteria laid down in ISO/IEC 17043. The test was conducted according to the following quality management system documents:
 - (a) “Standard Operating Procedure for the Organisation of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/SOP/PT01 (Issue 2, Revision 3, dated 4 April 2014));
 - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 2, Revision 3, dated 4 April 2014));
 - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of the Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT03 (Issue 3, Revision 1, dated 4 April 2014)); and
 - (d) Work Instruction for the Reporting of the Results of the OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 (Issue 1, Revision 4, dated 8 October 2014)).
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-Sixth Official OPCW Proficiency Test: the Defence Laboratories Department, Belgium, which assisted in sample preparation, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, United States of America, which 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 11 February 2015. 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 25 March 2015.



6. The principal results of the Thirty-Sixth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
 - (a) Twenty-two Member States nominated 27 laboratories, including the two assisting laboratories, for the test participation;
 - (b) Two of the participants withdrew from the test prior to the sample dispatch date;
 - (c) Twenty-five participants, including the two assisting laboratories and two trial participants, took part in the test;
 - (d) All the test participants and two assisting laboratories submitted their test report;
 - (e) Eleven participants identified and reported, with sufficient analytical data, all of the seven spiked chemicals and received a score of A;
 - (f) Three participants identified and reported six out of the seven spiked chemicals with sufficient analytical data and received a score of B;
 - (g) Three participants reported false positive chemicals and failed the test;
 - (h) One participant failed due to a reporting error as per §8.3 of QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 and received a score of F[†];
 - (i) Eighteen test participants reported non-scoring chemicals;
 - (j) No scores were given to two trial participants;
 - (k) The sample preparation laboratory and the evaluating laboratory were awarded the maximum performance rating of "A"; and
 - (l) There are 13 A's, three B's, one C, two D's, three F's and one F[†] in the test scores for the regular participants, including the two A's of the two assisting laboratories.
7. The final results for all the laboratories participating in the test 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 detailed follow-up 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-Sixth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

Annex

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

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported¹	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
Australia Defence Science and Technology Organisation (24)	4	3	#	Spiking chemicals C, D and F are not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemical A; Reported a non-scoring chemical J; No score is given for trial participation
Bangladesh Designated Reference Institute for Chemical Measurements (22)	-	-	F	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, F and G are not reported; Failure due to reporting three false positive chemicals K, L and N
Belgium Defence Laboratories Department	-	-	A	Sample prep. laboratory
Brazil CTEx, Laboratório de Análises Químicas (18)	6	6	B	Spiking chemical E is not reported
Brazil Chemical and Biological Mobile Lab, Brazilian Navy (21)	1	-	#	Spiking chemicals A, B, D, E, F and G are not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemical C; No score is given for trial participation

1

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

Sample 362: (A) Bis(2-N,N-diethylaminoethyl) ethylphosphonate

Sample 362: (B) Bis(2-N,N-diethylaminoethyl)disulfide

Sample 363: (C) 1,4-Thioxane

Sample 363: (D) 1,4-Dithiane

Sample 363: (E) 1,4-Thioxane oxide

Sample 366: (F) Divinyl sulfoxide

Sample 366: (G) Divinyl sulfone

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported¹	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
China The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (8)	7	7	A	Reported two non-scoring chemicals I and M
China Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Academy of Military Medical Sciences (5)	6	6	B	Spiking chemical E is not reported; Reported two non-scoring chemicals I and M
Denmark Danish Emergency Management Agency, Chemical Division (16)	6	-	F	Spiking chemical C is not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemicals A, B, D, E, F and G; Reported a non-scoring chemical I; Failure due to reporting a false positive chemical O
Ecuador Laboratorio Univeridad Católica de Cuenca Comunidad Educativa	-	-	-	Withdrew from the test
Fiji Fiji Police Forensic Chemistry Laboratory	-	-	-	Withdrew from the test
France DGA Maîtrise NRBC, Département d'analyses chimiques (3)	7	7	A	-
Germany Bundeswehr Research Institute for Protective Technologies and NBC Protection (10)	7	7	A	Reported two non-scoring chemicals I and M

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported ¹	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
India Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins (14)	6	6	F	Spiking chemical E is not reported; Failure due to reporting a false positive chemical P
India Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology (20)	6	6	B	Spiking chemical E is not reported; Reported a non-scoring chemical I
India Vertex Laboratory, Defence Research & Development Establishment (11)	7	7	F†	Reported three non-scoring chemicals H, I and J; F† means the failure due to reporting error (see §8.3 of QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04.)
Malaysia Department of Chemistry (19)	4	4	C	Spiking chemicals A, C and E are not reported; Reported two non-scoring chemicals I and J
Netherlands TNO Defence, Security and Safety (4)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
Norway FFI, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, Protection Division Laboratory for Identification of Chemical Warfare Agents (6)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical H

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported¹	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
Republic of Korea Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defense Development (9)	7	7	A	Reported two non-scoring chemicals I and M
Russian Federation Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of Military Research Centre (13)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
Russian Federation Central Chemical Weapons Destruction Analytical Laboratory of the Federal State Unitary Enterprise, "State Scientific Research Institute of Organic Chemistry And Technology" (15)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
Singapore Verification Laboratory, Defence Medical and Environmental Research Institute, DSO National Laboratories (2)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical M
South Africa Protechnik Laboratories, a division of Armscor Defence Institutes (Pty) Ltd. (17)	4	2	D	Spiking chemicals A, D and F are not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemicals C and G; Reported one non-scoring chemical I

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported¹	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
Sweden FOI, CBRN Defence and Security, Swedish Defence Research Agency (7)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down (1)	7	7	A	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
United States of America Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	-	-	A	Evaluating laboratory
Viet Nam Center for Technology Environmental Treatment (23)	-	-	D	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, F and G are not reported; Reported a non-scoring chemical J