



## NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

### EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH OPCW PROFICIENCY TEST

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Thirty-Eighth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from October 2015 to March 2016. 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 4, dated 10 April 2015));
  - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 2, Revision 4, dated 10 April 2015));
  - (c) “Work Instruction for the Evaluation of the Results of OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT03 (Issue 3, Revision 2, dated 10 April 2015)); and
  - (d) “Work Instruction for the Reporting of the Results of the OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT04 (Issue 2, Revision 1, dated 10 April 2015)).
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, unless the additional guidelines in decision C-20/DEC.4 (dated 2 December 2015) are applicable.
3. Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas (LAVEMA), Instituto Tecnológico “La Marañosa”, Spain assisted the Secretariat in evaluating the results of the Thirty-Eighth Official OPCW Proficiency Test. The OPCW Laboratory prepared the test samples and sent them to the participants.
4. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between Secretariat staff and the test participants on 17 February 2016. The participants were given two weeks to comment on the results and to inform the Secretariat whether they accepted their performance evaluation.
5. The evaluating laboratory submitted its final evaluation report to the Secretariat on 10 March 2016.



6. The principal results of the Thirty-Eighth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
  - (a) Twenty-one Member States nominated 26 laboratories for participation in the test.
  - (b) Two laboratories nominated for this test opted to take it on a trial basis.
  - (c) The total number of participants for this test was 26, of which 23 were regular participants, two were trial participants, and one was the assisting laboratory.
  - (d) All test participants submitted their test analysis report within the test period.
  - (e) Fourteen test participants identified and reported, with sufficient analytical data, all of the six spiked chemicals and received a score of A.
  - (f) Three test participants identified and reported, with sufficient analytical data, five out of the six spiked chemicals and received a score of B.
  - (g) Two test participants reported false positive chemicals and failed the test.
  - (h) Seventeen test participants reported non-scoring chemicals.
  - (i) No scores were given to the two trial participants.
  - (j) The evaluating laboratory was awarded the maximum performance rating of A.
  - (k) There are 15 As, three Bs, one C, three Ds, and two Fs in the test scores for the regular participants, including the one A assigned to the assisting laboratory.
7. The final results for all of 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 a detailed follow-up report to the Secretariat 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-Eighth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

## Annex

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

<b>Laboratory (Participant Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Australia</b> Defence Science and Technology Group (14)	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>#</b>	Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemicals A, B, C, and D; Reported two non-scoring chemicals G and I; no score given for trial participation
<b>Belgium</b> Defence Laboratories Department (24)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Brazil</b> CTEx, Laboratório de Análises Químicas (15)	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>C</b>	Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemicals B, C, and F
<b>China</b> Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Academy of Military Medical Sciences (8)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported two non-scoring chemicals G and H
<b>China</b> The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (9)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>Finland</b> Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN) (3)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G

1

The spiking chemicals were as follows:  
 Sample 381: (A) Propylphosphonic acid  
 Sample 381: (B) O-Ethyl methylphosphonate  
 Sample 382: (C) N,N-Diisopropyl ethanolamine  
 Sample 382: (D) N-Methyl diethanolamine  
 Sample 385: (E) O,O-Dimethyl methylphosphonate  
 Sample 386: (F) Chloropicrin

<b>Laboratory (Participant Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>France</b> DGA Maîtrise NRBC, Département d'analyses chimiques (25)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>Hungary</b> Hungarian Defence Forces Medical Centre (23)	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>#</b>	Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemicals A, B, D, E, and F; Reported a false positive chemical L; no score given for trial participation
<b>India</b> VERTOX Laboratory, Defence Research & Development Establishment (10)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>India</b> Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins (16)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical I
<b>India</b> Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology (19)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>F</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G with insufficient data; Reported a false positive chemical J
<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b> Defense Chemical Research Laboratory (11)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>B</b>	Spiking chemical F is not reported; Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>Norway</b> FFI, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, Protection Division (7)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>Republic of Korea</b> Chemical, Biological and Radiological Defense Research Institute (18)	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>B</b>	Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemical F; Reported a non-scoring chemical G

Laboratory (Participant Code)	No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported <sup>1</sup>	No. of Chemicals Scored	Rating	Comments
<b>Republic of Korea</b> Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development (2)	6	6	A	-
<b>Romania</b> Chemical Analysis and Testing Laboratory Scientific Research Center for CBRN Defence & Ecology (22)	6	6	F	Reported a false positive chemical K
<b>Russian Federation</b> Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of Military Research Centre (12)	6	6	A	-
<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” (26)	6	6	A	-
<b>Singapore</b> Verification Laboratory, Defence Medical and Environmental Research Institute, DSO National Laboratories (20)	6	6	A	Reported two non-scoring chemicals G and H
<b>Slovakia</b> Reference Chemical Laboratory, Military unit (13)	2	1	D	Spiking chemicals B, C, D and F are not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemical A; Reported a non-scoring chemical G with insufficient data
<b>South Africa</b> Protechnik Laboratories, a division of Armscor Defence Institutes (Pty) Ltd. (4)	5	5	B	Spiking chemical B is not reported; Reported a non-scoring chemical G

<b>Laboratory (Participant Code)</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals Reported<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Spain</b> The Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas (LAVEMA), Instituto Tecnológico “La Marañosa” (27)	-	-	<b>A</b>	Evaluating laboratory
<b>Turkey</b> Gulhane Military Medical Academy, Medical CBRN Laboratory (17)	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>D</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, and F are not reported; Insufficient data for the reported spiking chemical E; Reported a non-scoring chemical G with insufficient data
<b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</b> Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down (5)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>United States of America</b> Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (21)	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported a non-scoring chemical G
<b>Viet Nam</b> Centre of Technology Environmental Treatment (6)	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>D</b>	Spiking chemicals A, B, C, D, E, and F are not reported; Reported a non-scoring chemical G with insufficient data