## AC.CEP

## **EUROPEAN CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE**

## CONFÉRENCE EUROPÉENNE DE L'AVIATION CIVILE

When replying, please quote:

EC 9/8.3/82 - 0422

18 April 2012

TEL: 33 (0) 1 46 41 85 44

FAX: 33 (0) 1 76 73 98 57

**EMAIL:** secretariat@ecac-ceac.org

**Subject: ECAC Common Evaluation Process of security equipment (CEP)** 

## **Explosive Detection Systems - Test results**

Dear Sir,

I refer to the ECAC Common Evaluation Process of security equipment (CEP) applied to Explosive Detection Systems (EDS) and to your submission of equipment for testing in this framework.

In accordance with the ECAC Common Testing Methodology for EDS, TNO Defence, Security and Safety (Netherlands) completed the test of the following equipment on 20 March 2012. The test was a simulator re-test of a new software configuration using data obtained in an earlier full test of the equipment.

Model	MVXR 5000
System Hardware	Number of generators: 3 Generator: TA551 30-CERB Voltage: 170 kV Amperes: 1.2 mA Type detection system: Dual energy photo-diode array Detectors type: Cadmium Tungstate scintillator with photo-diode detector Reference: Detector board 1310882 / low energy crystal 6610508 / high energy crystal 6610509 (Detection Hardware Version: Revision 4)
Algorithm Version	Reference of machine software: 6.1.2 Reference of detection software: 6.3

The results of the test were considered by the ECAC CEP Management Group, which endorsed on 12 April 2012 that this EDS in the tested configuration met the performance requirements of **Standard 2** for EDS, as defined in ECAC Doc 30, Part II (13<sup>th</sup> edition/May 2010). These performance requirements are identical to the performance requirements in the EU aviation security legislation currently in force. I understand that the Test Centre provided you with relevant technical information on the test proceedings during a debriefing meeting after the test completion.

Mr Ken Mann Aviation Technical Director Rapiscan Systems Ltd X-Ray House, Bonehurst Road Salfords, Redhill RH1 5GG Surrey United Kingdom This evaluation is valid only for this type of EDS in the configuration described above, unless otherwise explicitly indicated.

As provided for by the CEP Administrative Arrangements, the report of the test results has been communicated, with the appropriate confidentiality protection, to the ECAC Member States which are signatory to these Arrangements<sup>i</sup>.

Information on the CEP test results on the ECAC website will be updated accordingly. For this purpose, I would be grateful if you could confirm your agreement to the publication of this information in the details mentioned above, to Ms Alexandra Alexis (<a href="mailto:aalexis@ecac-ceac.org">aalexis@ecac-ceac.org</a>) cc Mr Olivier Ardouin (<a href="mailto:oardouin@ecac-ceac.org">oardouin@ecac-ceac.org</a>).

I look forward to the continued participation of your company in the ECAC Common Evaluation Process of security equipment.

Yours sincerely

Salvatore Sciacchitano Executive Secretary of ECAC

Administrative Arrangements in relation with the adoption of a common evaluation process of security equipment open for signature in Yerevan (Armenia) on 28 August 2008.

The Administrative Arrangements have been signed to date by the following forty-three (43) ECAC Member States: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.