

**SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP FOR THE
ANALYSIS OF SEIZED DRUGS
SWGDRUG CONFERENCE
AUGUST 2-4, 2005
VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Attendees:

Nelson Santos, Drug Enforcement Administration, Chair
Scott Oulton, Drug Enforcement Administration, Secretariat
Susan Ballou, National Institute of Standards and Technology
Sylvia Burns, Forensic Science Service, England
Gary Chasteen, Southwestern Association of Forensic Scientists and California Association of Criminalists
Richard Gervasoni, American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors
Linda Jackson, Mid-Atlantic Association of Forensic Scientists
Tohru Kishi, National Research Institute of Police Science, Japan
Richard Laing, Health Canada
Jack Mario, Northeastern Association of Forensic Scientists and ASTM
Jerry Massetti, Northwestern Association of Forensic Scientists and California Association of Criminalists
Iphigenia Naidis, Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Richard Paulas, Mid-Western Association of Forensic Scientists
Catherine Quinn, Victoria Forensic Science Center, Australia
Conrad Roberson, Southern Association of Forensic Scientists
Erkki Sippola, European Network of Forensic Science Institutes
Eileen Waninger, Federal Bureau of Investigation

Not present:

Maria Forero, National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Science, Colombia
Tshepo Shole, South African State Police
Chris Tindall, Metropolitan State College, Academia
Udo Zerrell, Bundeskriminalamt, Germany

1. Introductions and Member Reports

The meeting was opened by Nelson Santos, SWGDRUG Chair, who welcomed all of the participants. Nelson Santos reintroduced Scott Oulton, SWGDRUG Secretariat, and thanked him for organizing the meeting. No new members or guests were present.

2. SWGDRUG Website

Scott Oulton discussed the revamped and updated SWGDRUG website (www.swgdrug.org) and solicited input and comments. Core committee members expressed their appreciation for the new, user-friendly, organized website. Additional suggestions included the following:

- Addition of a short survey
- Addition of a meeting list where SWGDRUG information will be disseminated
- Clearly marking current recommendations and separating them from either draft documents or archived documents

3. Logo

Scott Oulton led a discussion regarding a logo for the SWGDRUG organization. This logo would appear on each page of the website as well as SWGDRUG documents. The logo should be reproducible and relatively simple. The international aspect of the core committee should be emphasized. Several logos were designed and displayed. A logo with a circular shape, a map of the world with "SWGDRUG" in the center, and "Scientific Working Group for the Analysis of Seized Drugs" around the edge was agreed upon.

4. Bylaws

Scott Oulton had prepared and disseminated to the core committee official bylaws of SWGDRUG for consideration. The purpose of the bylaws is to clarify the mission and objectives of SWGDRUG, formalize the membership and responsibilities of SWGDRUG, as well as the recommendation process.

The mission statement and objectives were discussed. An additional objective was added "to consider existing relevant international standards".

After discussion and revision, a motion was made and duly seconded "to accept the bylaws as currently written." The motion passed unanimously.

The bylaws will be available on the SWGDRUG website.

5. Discussion of the Addition of Botanical Analysis to Part III B, Methods of Analysis/Drug Identification

The following proposed addition to the Methods of Analysis/Drug Identification recommendation was discussed.

3.6 An identification of botanical material may be made utilizing morphological characteristics alone provided sufficient botanical features appropriate for identification are observed. Such examinations shall be made by analysts competent in botanical identifications. Identifications of chemical components contained in botanicals (mescaline, opiates, psilocin, etc.) should rely on principles of chemical identification set down in Table 1.

Comments which had been received from the forensic community were discussed. Edits were made to include a statement regarding botanical competence.

A motion was made to formally vote to add the following to the Methods of Analysis/Drug Identification recommendation. The motion was duly seconded.

3.6 An identification of botanical material may be made utilizing morphological characteristics **alone** provided sufficient botanical features appropriate for identification are observed. Such examinations shall be made by analysts competent in botanical identifications. In this context botanical competence applies to those examiners recognized as professional botanists or those assessed to be competent by such. Identifications of chemical components contained in botanicals (mescaline, opiates, psilocin, etc.) should rely on principles of chemical identification set down in Table 1.

The motion passed with 15 in favor and one abstention.

6. Validation Appendices/Examples

The appendices to the Validation recommendation that have been out for comment by the subcommittee were discussed. Substantial comments had been received regarding the NMR section of Appendix A. A motion was made and duly seconded to publish Appendix A as “Version One” of this “work product” with a place marker for the NMR section. The edited NMR section will be added at a later time. The vote passed in the affirmative with a 68% majority.

The validation appendices were further discussed as being examples or resources and not actual recommendations. A motion was made and duly seconded to call these types of documents “supplementary documents” which will be kept separate from recommendations. The motion was passed unanimously. The document formerly listed as Appendix A of the Validation Recommendation will now be regarded as a supplementary document.

The following wording was agreed upon as prefacing the supplementary documents on the website.

- Supplementary documents are not SWGDRUG recommendations.
- Supplementary documents are intended to be a resource for individuals responsible for implementing SWGDRUG recommendations.
- These documents are not inclusive and SWGDRUG recognizes that there are many ways of implementing the recommendations.
- These are living documents and as such, SWGDRUG invites comments. Send comments to swgdrug@hotmail.com.

The content and purpose of Appendix B were then discussed. Mr. Santos, SWGDRUG Chair, sent the document back to the subcommittee for revision. Appendix B will be taken off of the website at this time.

7. Glossary

Mr. Mario led a discussion of the SWGDRUG glossary. He restated that the goal was to use definitions from internationally accepted sources whenever possible. Only terms found in the text of the recommendations will be listed in the glossary.

The following wording was agreed upon as an introduction to the glossary:

This glossary of terms and definitions has been developed and adopted by the SWGDRUG core committee from a variety of sources that are listed in endnotes. In some instances, the core committee modified existing definitions or it created definitions where none could be found in standard references.

A motion was made and duly seconded to adopt the glossary as edited. The motion was passed unanimously.

8. Updates to Current Recommendations

Two modifications were made to existing recommendations for clarification.

In Part IV B, Quality Assurance/Validation of Analytical Methods, a motion was made and duly seconded to clarify section 2.4.7 to read:

“Ruggedness may be determined for either qualitative or quantitative methods. Ruggedness should assess the factors external to the method.”

The motion passed with 14 voting in the affirmative and 2 abstentions.

In Part IV A, Quality Assurance/General Practices, a motion was made and duly seconded to clarify section 5.1.7 to read:

“When analysts determine the identity of a drug in a sample, they shall ensure that the result relates to the right submission. This is best established by the use of at least two appropriate techniques based on different principles and two independent samplings.”

The motion passed with 13 voting in the affirmative and 3 dissenting.

9. Core Committee Business

Mr. Santos led a discussion about publishing possibilities for the new “book.” He pointed out the limitations of a hardcopy publication versus a web-based publication. If the full document/book was published only on the web, it would be available in “.pdf” format with a cover page that would mimic the previously published brown book. The editorial committee was assigned to update the introduction from the brown book.

The subcommittee chairs were tasked with sending a report via email to Mr. Oulton every 60 days to give an update on the activity of the subcommittee. Each subcommittee should create a work plan by the end of October for their first report.

The next meeting of the core committee will in January or February, 2006.

Mr. Santos closed the meeting and thanked each member for their efforts.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Linda Jackson, September 7, 2005.