One might also apply a rule that when the tested toxicity of the reaction mixtures falls within the category of super-toxic lethal chemicals, the mixture itself as well as the identified "key CW precursor(s)" be referred to this group of chemicals.

If the toxicity was already known, the categorization of the formed chemical would already be clear, and the established presence of it in the reaction mixture by means of chemical analysis would make further toxicity tests unnecessary.

Conclusions

The consequence of this reasoning is that also the "key CW precursor", which took part in the reaction and which decided the character of the toxic chemical, i.e. the chemical warfare agent, can be related, even if indirectly to the toxicity criterion. Thus, if a "key CW precursor" by means of a chemical reaction with other reactants gives rise to e.g. a super-toxic lethal chemical, the precursor itself should be subject to the same provisions under the convention as the super-toxic lethal chemical.

Another conclusion is that this reasoning applies also in the case of unknown and undeclared chemical warfare agents. (Since they should be declared under a convention, we are here talking about a possible violation of the convention). If a binary chemical warhead, containing different precursors and reactants, was found, it would be possible first to identify the precursors chemically, then to let them react with each other and analyse chemically the formed chemicals, and, finally, if necessary, isolate them (if unknown) from the reaction mixture and test their toxicities. It would then be possible to decide which one (or more) of the precursors would be characterized as the "key CW precursor" to be subject to the provisions of the convention.