



**NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL**

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

1. The Director-General wishes to inform the Member States of the results of the Fortieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test, which was conducted by the Technical Secretariat (hereinafter “the Secretariat”) from October 2016 to March 2017. 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 3, Revision 0, dated 1 April 2016));
  - (b) “Work Instruction for the Preparation of Samples for OPCW Proficiency Tests” (QDOC/LAB/WI/PT02 (Issue 3, Revision 0, dated 1 April 2016));
  - (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 2, dated 1 April 2016)).
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. The Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (DSTL), Porton Down, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, assisted the Secretariat in preparing the test samples and FOI, Swedish Defence Research Agency, Sweden evaluated the results of the Fortieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test.
4. The preliminary evaluation report was discussed at a meeting between Secretariat staff and the test participants on 8 February 2017. 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 16 March 2017.
6. The principal results of the Fortieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test can be summarised as follows:
  - (a) All 23 regular test participants and one trial participant submitted their analytical report within the test period.
  - (b) Fourteen regular participants identified and reported all of the spiked chemicals with sufficient analytical data for all of the spiked chemicals.
  - (c) One false positive chemical was reported.
  - (d) Four non-scoring chemicals were reported.
  - (e) The sample preparation and the evaluating laboratories submitted their report and are awarded the maximum performance rating of "A".
  - (f) No score is assigned to one trial participant.
  - (g) There are sixteen As, four Bs, one C, one D and one F in the test score for the regular participants, including the two As of the assisting laboratories.
  - (h) One additional laboratory, that did not participate in the test itself, is awarded a performance rating of "A" as the additional guidelines in decision C-20/DEC.4 are applicable.
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 Fortieth Official OPCW Proficiency Test

## Annex

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

<b>Participant Laboratory Code</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals<sup>1</sup> Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Australia</b> Defence Science and Technology Group (17)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>#</b>	Reported non-scoring chemicals F and G; spiking chemicals B, C, D and E were not reported; no score for trial participation
<b>Belgium</b> Defence Laboratories Department (5)	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>B</b>	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical B; reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>Brazil</b> CTEx, Laboratório de Análises Químicas (22)	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>B</b>	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical B; reported non-scoring chemicals F and G
<b>China</b> Laboratory of Toxicant Analysis, Academy of Military Medical Sciences (9)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported non-scoring chemicals F and J
<b>China</b> The Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry, Research Institute of Chemical Defence (8)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	-

1

The spiking chemicals were as follows:

Sample 739:	(A)	BZ (3-Quinuclidinyl benzilate)
Sample 742:	(B)	n-Butyl methylphosphonic acid
Sample 742:	(C)	sec-Butyl methylphosphonic acid
Sample 743:	(D)	Benzilic acid (2,2-Diphenyl-2-hydroxyacetic acid)
Sample 743:	(E)	Quinuclidin-3-ol

<b>Participant Laboratory Code</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals<sup>1</sup> Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Finland</b> Finnish Institute for Verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (VERIFIN) <b>(10)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	-
<b>France</b> DGA Maîtrise NRBC, Département d'analyses chimiques <b>(7)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported two non-scoring chemicals F and J
<b>Germany</b> Bundeswehr Research Institute for Protective Technologies and NBC Protection <b>(3)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported two non-scoring chemicals F and G
<b>Hungary</b> Hungary Hungarian Defence Forces Medical Centre <b>(21)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>C</b>	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals A and E
<b>India</b> Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Indian Institute of Chemical Technology, Centre for Analysis of Chemical Toxins <b>(14)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>B</b>	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals B; reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>India</b> Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology <b>(18)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>B</b>	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemical C; reported non-scoring chemicals F and G

<b>Participant Laboratory Code</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals<sup>1</sup> Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Netherlands</b> TNO Defence, Security and Safety (2)	5	5	A	Reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>Norway</b> FFI, Norwegian Defence Research Establishment, Protection Division (15)	5	5	A	Reported non-scoring chemicals F and H
<b>Pakistan</b> Analytical Lab, DESTO Labs complex (16)	5	5	A	Reported non-scoring chemicals F and J
<b>Republic of Korea</b> Chemical Analysis Laboratory, CB Department, Agency for Defence Development (13)	5	5	A	-
<b>Romania</b> Chemical Analysis and Testing Laboratory Scientific Research Center for CBRN Defence & Ecology (28)	5	5	A	reported non-scoring chemicals F and H
<b>Russian Federation</b> Laboratory for the Chemical and Analytical Control of Military Research Centre (1)	5	5	A	Reported non-scoring chemical F

<b>Participant Laboratory Code</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals<sup>1</sup> Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<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” <b>(12)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>Singapore</b> Verification Laboratory, Defence Medical and Environmental Research Institute, DSO National Laboratories			<b>A<sup>2</sup></b>	-
<b>Spain</b> LAVEMA Laboratorio de Verificación de Armas Químicas, INTA Campus La Marañosa <b>(11)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	Reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>South Africa</b> Protechnik Laboratories, a division of Armscor Defence Institutes (Pty) Ltd. <b>(23)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>F</b>	reported non-scoring chemicals F, G, H and J; reported false positive chemical I

2

Laboratory was not a test participant but was awarded an “A” grade based on the criteria in decision C-20/DEC.4

<b>Participant Laboratory Code</b>	<b>No. of Spiking Chemicals<sup>1</sup> Reported</b>	<b>No. of Chemicals Scored</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Sweden</b> FOI, CBRN Defence and Security, Swedish Defence Research Agency	-	-	A	Evaluating laboratory
<b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</b> Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Chemical and Biological Systems, Porton Down	-	-	A	Sample preparation laboratory
<b>United States of America</b> Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (6)	5	5	A	Reported non-scoring chemical F
<b>Vietnam</b> Centre of Technology Environmental Treatment (20)	2	0	D	Insufficient data for reported spiking chemicals A and D; spiking chemicals B, C and E were not reported