

**Minutes of the WADA Foundation Board Meeting
15 May 2011
Montreal, Canada**

The meeting began at 8.30 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members to the Foundation Board meeting, thanked them for the efforts that they had made to attend and wished them a productive day as they dealt with the business of WADA. He also acknowledged the new members present at the meeting: from Ecuador, Ms Dávila; from the Seychelles, Mr Rose; from Guatemala, Mr Aguirre; and from Poland, Mr Giersz. He noted apologies from Mr Fetisov and Sir Philip Craven.

The following members attended the meeting: Mr John Fahey, AC, President and Chairman of WADA; Professor Arne Ljungqvist, WADA Vice-Chairman, IOC Member and Chairman of the WADA Health, Medical and Research Committee; Ms Tanja Vogel, representing Mr Joseph Blatter, President, FIFA; Dr Patrick Schamasch, representing Mr Willi Kaltschmitt Lujan, Member of the IOC; Mr Christian Thill, representing Dr Robin Mitchell, Member of the IOC; Mr Richard Pound, Member of the IOC; Mr Patrick Chamunda, Member of the IOC; Professor Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO; Mr Adam Giersz, Minister of Sport and Tourism, Poland; Mr Philippe Muyters, Flemish Minister for Sport, Belgium; Mr Attila Czene, Minister for Sport, Hungary; Ms Maud De Boer-Buquicchio, Deputy Secretary General, Council of Europe; Mr Nenad Dikic, representing Ms Snežana Samardžić Marković, Minister of Youth and Sport, Republic of Serbia; Mr Denis Rose, representing Mr Vincent Meriton, Minister of Community Development, Youth, Sport and Culture, Seychelles; Mr Carlos Sousa, representing Mr Pedrito Fulede Caetano, Minister of Youth and Sports, Mozambique; Mr Fujiwara, representing Mr Kan Suzuki, Minister in charge of Sports, Japan; Mr Ramlan Aziz, representing Mr Dato Ahmad Shabery Cheek, Minister, Youth and Sports, Malaysia; Mr Lamex, representing Mr Charles Bakkabulindi, Minister of State for Sports, Uganda; Mr Kamal A. Hadidi, President, Jordan Anti-Doping Committee; Mr Jiang Zhixue, representing Mr Duan Shijie, Vice Minister, State Sport General Administration, China; Mr Craig Reddie, IOC Member; Mr Richard Young, Representative, ANOC; Dr Tamás Aján, Member of the IOC; Mr Patrick McQuaid, President of the UCI; Mr Bill Rowe, representing Mr Mark Arbib, Minister for Sport, Australia; Professor David Gerrard, representing Mr Murray McCully, Minister for Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, IOC Member and President of the FIS; Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, President of the International Tennis Federation; Mr Anders Besseberg, President, IBU; Dr Rania Elwani, Member of the IOC; Ms Claudia Bokel, Member of the IOC; Mr Adam Pengilly, representing Ms Angela Ruggiero, Member of the IOC; Ms Beckie Scott, Member of the IOC; Mr Richard Baum, representing Mr Patrick Ward, Acting Deputy Director for Supply Administration, ONDCP, USA; Mr Lane MacAdam, representing Mr Gary Lunn, Minister of State (Sport), Canada; Ms Sandra Vela Dávila, President, CONSUDE; Mr Gerardo Aguirre, President, CONCECADE; Mr David Howman, WADA Director General; Mr Rune Andersen, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Mr Kazuhiro Hayashi, Director, Asia/Oceania Regional Office, WADA; Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Director, African Regional Office, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director, European Regional Office and International Federations Relations, WADA; Ms Maria José Pesce, Director, Latin American Regional Office, WADA; Ms Julie Masse, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin,

Science Director, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Education Director, WADA; Mr Alan Vernec, Medical Director, WADA; and Mr Olivier Niggli, Finance and Legal Director, WADA.

The following observers signed the roll call: Javier Odriozola, Bjorn Unger, Luis Madrid, Julika Quan, José del Busto, Du Lijun, Fan Yinghua, Rafal Piechota, Peter De Klerk, Akos Reinhardt, Françoise Dagouret, Andrew Ryan, Shin Asakawa, Ichiro Kono, Takumi Inoue, Kaori Hoshi, Marc Van der Beken, Patrick Ghelen, Yves Defoort, Pierre Masson, David Moreno, Nishel Kumar and Louis Jani.

THE CHAIRMAN suspended the business of the Foundation Board for a brief time. Everybody would have looked on at the tragedy in Japan, the earthquake and tsunami that had devastated the nation. WADA's friends from Japan had sought the opportunity to speak briefly about that and their commitment to the anti-doping movement and the work that everybody did. He thought that it was entirely appropriate to allow Mr Fujiwara to make a short statement in respect of that.

MR FUJIWARA thanked the Chairman for giving him an opportunity at the start of the conference to explain what was going on in Japan. The document to which he wished to refer had already been distributed among the members. The Great East Japan Earthquake had hit Japan on 11 March, and he thanked the Foundation Board Committee members for their expressions of concern and the letter from the Director General, Mr Howman, on behalf of WADA. He was truly grateful. After the disaster had hit, Japan had received support from all over the world and the Government of Japan, working with the whole nation, was doing its utmost to ensure recovery. He wished to share the current situation on progress towards recovery in Japan. He referred to the document distributed among the members and asked them to look at pages one and two. The Great East Japan Earthquake had hit Japan with unprecedented force and Japan had received support from 146 countries and regions and 39 international organisations. Japan had received assistance from the US Navy and Marines, and also the Australian Air Force. Referring to page three of the handout, as a result of all the help received, two months after the disaster, the major transport networks within Japan, including Tokyo, with the exception of the small area directly affected by the disaster, had been normalised. On page four, the members would see that Tokyo had not experienced major destruction of buildings as a result of the earthquake; therefore, hotel accommodation and services were being provided as previously. In other words, it was business as usual. On 10 May, the President of the IRB, Mr Bernard Lapasset, had visited Tokyo and emphasised that Tokyo was indeed safe. The USOC President had also visited Japan on 22 April, and had also emphasised that he found Tokyo to be safe. In Japan, there were many international sporting events and conferences planned in Tokyo as well as in other parts of the country and, in July, the General Assembly of the Olympic Council of Asia was to be held in Tokyo. Regarding pages six to eight, measured data showed that the environmental radioactivity levels and tap water radiation levels in Tokyo and many other parts of Japan had been found to be at normal level or lower than the normal level, and these values were at the same level or lower than those in major cities of the world such as New York, Paris and Beijing. The ICAO, speaking on behalf of six international organisations, including the WHO and the IAEA, had repeatedly stated that Japan was safe. He referred the members to pages 12 and 13. Japan had thus far given very strong support to the human resources development activities and projects conducted by the WADA Asia/Oceania regional office based in Tokyo and, despite this major disaster, intended to continue to extend its full support to the anti-doping activities of WADA, working very closely as before with the director of the regional office, Mr Hayashi. This was the commitment on the part of Japan.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Fujiwara and, on behalf of WADA, wished him all the best with the long and difficult task ahead of him, noting how much WADA appreciated the

support Japan was continuing to give to WADA and the work being done in Japan and Asia in general in the fight against doping in sport. He asked Mr Fujiwara to pass on the members' best wishes to Mr Suzuki upon his return.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 21 November 2010 (Montreal)

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Foundation Board meeting. Were they happy that he sign those minutes as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of the previous meeting?

MR ROWE noted that, in the list of attendees, Mr Mark Arbib had been listed as attending whereas, in fact, he had attended on behalf of Mr Arbib.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Foundation Board on 21 November 2010 approved (subject to amendment proposed by Mr Rowe) and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would highlight some issues in his report rather than go through it in its entirety. He reminded the members that 156 countries had ratified the UNESCO convention; three were in the legal pipeline, so WADA could safely anticipate that that number would increase to 159 shortly, leaving 33 to go. The members had a list of those countries remaining, and would see that some of those countries were in such a shape that it would be impossible to expect a government decision at that time. The voluntary fund now totalled about four million dollars. From that voluntary fund, there had been many applications for grants, and 750,000 dollars had been paid out to date by way of grants to countries seeking assistance. That was significant.

The relationship with Interpol continued in a very helpful fashion. Interpol had been most useful in facilitating enquiries conducted on national soil, in which national police required assistance from colleagues around the world, and that was something that had occurred on a number of occasions. WADA awaited the secondment of Mr Holz to be extended and looked to the French Government to do that as quickly as possible.

WADA had just completed discussions with the World Customs Organisation, and the members would see before them a memorandum of understanding that had been approved the previous day by the Executive Committee, which WADA would sign with the WCO in June. This was a very significant step, as it allowed WADA to work with that body in almost the same way in which it worked with Interpol, meaning that WADA could work with customs authorities to ensure that the information they received could be shared among customs officers around the world. In Australia, more than 40% of breaches of the Code came from information received through law enforcement agencies and not through testing, and that was a sign of the future.

WADA was assisting NADOs to ensure that large countries with significant sporting heritage had an up-and-running NADO, which would be effective and of good quality. The list of countries had been changed somewhat over the past twelve months; Jamaica had come off, Cuba had been put on and had since come off. WADA had visited Cuba and had pursued issues very quickly. A special initiative was under way with Russia, and there was another with Brazil, and work needed to be done in both of those countries, which were hosting very important international events in the coming years. WADA was

working closely with the IOC; a special team was responsible for reporting back to him and the members would see an updated report when they met again in November.

The player groups continued to advance, and WADA had noticed a continuation of what he had to describe as "unionisation" occurring with several player groups around the world. Some were very active. There had been a research report the previous week from the EU athletes' association looking at the area of statistics. WADA had to engage with these groups to ensure that the information they were putting out to the public was accurate and to ensure that they received appropriate information from WADA.

ANADO had regrettably gone bankrupt and had had to fold; therefore, there was currently no existing body representing the NADOs in the world. WADA was looking to the former ANADO representatives to form a new body and was encouraging them to do that and working with them in the hope that they would rise from the ashes as soon as possible, and would look to assist them in the same way as it had assisted the anti-doping unit of SportAccord if they needed assistance and provided they gave WADA a business plan and an appropriate budget.

Very good research had been conducted by ASOIF. WADA had replied to the recommendations made in that report, and had offered to work with ASOIF in implementing some of the initiatives, which WADA agreed should be furthered. Some of the issues raised had already been dealt with by WADA. Bearing in mind that the research had been conducted in 2009, over the past 18 months, WADA had advanced considerably, particularly in the area of education and providing education materials to IFs. That had been the highlight of the anti-doping organisation symposium held in March in Lausanne.

WADA had attended the SportAccord meetings in London, and they had been very useful because all of the presidents of the IFs had been in one place at one time, giving WADA an opportunity to make presentations to the collective bodies and also to engage with each federation in areas such as compliance and education and so on. The following year's meeting would be held in Quebec City, and WADA had rearranged the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings for the following May to coincide with the SportAccord meetings, so those wishing to go from Montreal to Quebec City could make one visit to Quebec and not two over a period of ten days. The following year, the WADA meetings would be held on Thursday 17 and Friday 18 May.

He had highlighted a particular initiative by the IWF, which had held a symposium in Istanbul, Turkey, just a few weeks previously, bringing together each national federation with the individuals responsible for anti-doping, to be in one place at one time. WADA had been invited, and its IF Director, Mr Donzé, had made a presentation. It was an initiative that had been good from all perspectives, to ensure that NFs understood the international rules, and that they implemented them, and that would help WADA as it went forward, as it had had trouble in the past with some national cases in which the NF had not adopted the IF rules.

WADA had received the recent report from the SportAccord anti-doping unit, which WADA funded and which was providing very helpful information and assistance to the smaller federations as anticipated.

The previous time, he had been asked to put in his report the issue of members attending meetings. Looking around the table, one could see that there were numerous alternates representing their members. He was looking for ideas and ways of attracting members to attend the meetings to ensure that WADA had the benefit of their wisdom and collective knowledge, so he looked forward to suggestions as to how WADA might structure the meetings to ensure that this occurred.

WADA still had a couple of concerns about the way in which appeals were proceeding at the CAS, notably appeals from national bodies involving significant costs, not only to WADA but also to the athletes. WADA had had a fruitful meeting with the new president of the international body. There would be a meeting of ICAS the following week, and the president, John Coates, had promised to meet with WADA again following the meeting in the hope that WADA might pursue the issues that might be usefully addressed by the court.

WADA was preparing a model of best practice for major games organisers. This initiative was one that he felt was very important, as WADA representatives had been to many events at which they had had to help the organisers write their anti-doping rules just before the start of the event, so WADA was preparing a one-size-fits-all model that could be adopted and adapted by organisers of major events. He had been told by Mr Ryan that, the previous year, there had been about 111 different multisport international events; that was a significant number, and it was increasing. WADA had to keep an eye on that, as did the IFs, but it was a growth area.

He had mentioned statistics. Many times around the table, there had been queries from members and requests for more statistics and analysis of what was going on. WADA could provide this, but it needed the information before being able to provide the analysis. Not everybody was using ADAMS. All of the laboratories were using ADAMS. WADA published all the information that it got from the laboratories. WADA needed regular reports from all anti-doping organisations on an annual basis. In the meantime, WADA was going ahead, and the members would see in his report a couple of details regarding what WADA was going to try to achieve, and he would report back to the Executive Committee again in September on that vital matter. If ADAMS were mandatory, most of WADA's problems would dissipate.

His report featured a list of matters put to the management as a result of the Executive Committee think-tank held the previous September. The list showed what the management had done to advance some of the issues raised, and the members would see that each one was pretty relevant in terms of what WADA had to do on a regular basis, but they would also see that, on the agenda that day, some of the initiatives had been recorded as being completed, and he thought that this was due to the detailed work undertaken by his management team over the past six to nine months.

An additional matter in relation to his report was that WADA had engaged in discussions with DHL, an international courier company. It had done so because it had had many requests from people to try to reduce the cost of transport. WADA had commenced these discussions, and then he had heard from a number of anti-doping organisations not to continue discussions because they had satisfactory and suitable arrangements in place already, on a national or international scale, but WADA would continue to do that, as it was looking at ways of helping its stakeholders and ensuring cost-effectiveness in relation to sample collection and analysis. He would report again on this matter in November.

MR BAUM commented briefly on the ADAMS issue and said, from the US point of view, that the USA strongly supported the idea of consistent statistics being reported to WADA and published. That was an important priority for WADA. Nevertheless, the USA also wanted to reserve the right to continue to use its system, which provided that data, and pledged to work with WADA to ensure that an adequate electronic interface could be developed. The USA was committed to providing the technical and financial means to help develop the interface. A considerable amount of work had already gone into developing that interface and the USA wanted that work to continue.

MR POUND thanked Mr Howman for a very thorough report. He wondered whether the Executive Committee had given any thought to the NADO issue; it was more the conceptual framework, in the sense that, if a NADO turned out to be non-compliant, did that mean that the government was in default or that an NOC was in default? He did not know whether the Executive Committee had sorted out that particular issue.

The second point was with respect to ANADO, which had thankfully collapsed. Before rushing around encouraging the creation of a new organisation of a similar sort, should WADA not give some thought to the purpose and mandate?

Regarding Foundation Board meeting attendance, he hoped that the Executive Committee might devote its attention to developing some kind of a response where there was consistent non-attendance by the designated person or official. For example, if a minister did not attend two consecutive meetings, perhaps that minister could be replaced by somebody who would undertake to be there. He did not suggest that as the only solution, but thought that the issue had to be dealt with.

He assumed that there would be a separate item on ADAMS but, to deal with the comment made by his US colleague, he hoped that ADAMS would be the system used and that it would eventually be made mandatory and, if there was another system out there being used, the responsibility for generating a working interface would rest with the USA and not WADA to make sure that ADAMS could interface with some other system. The onus should be clearly on somebody not using ADAMS.

MS SCOTT raised a point with respect to the development of NADOs in the larger countries, particularly Brazil and Russia. It needed to be said that there was a very low level of confidence among the winter sport athlete community that the upcoming Olympic Games in Sochi would be doping-free, fair and clean and ethical. There was currently a lot of pessimism, cynicism and scepticism that the anti-doping activities would be up to par based on history and experience thus far. It needed to be said that that was the general sentiment among the winter sporting athlete community.

MS DÁVILA thanked WADA and the Canadian Government for hosting the meeting. She represented South America and wished to reiterate the interest of her region in the fight against doping in sport. She acknowledged the important work done by Ms Pesce in her region, and she referred to item 16 of the written report to explain the problem of the non-accredited laboratories in South America. The Buenos Aires laboratory was currently in the process of accreditation and would be the third laboratory in the region to be accredited. She highlighted the importance of such accreditation for the region and requested that the process continue in the best manner possible. The report mentioned that there were currently unrecognised laboratories working in South America and that there was reluctance in the region to perform the analysis in accredited laboratories. She asked WADA to analyse this in depth and clarify the situation. There had been a ministers' meeting in Rio de Janeiro the previous week, which was why she wished to provide an explanation. In South America, those countries that had laboratories that were not accredited by WADA deployed huge efforts in the fight against doping. The problem was that the governments did not have sufficient resources to comply with all of the procedures necessary and conduct the tests required for laboratory accreditation. She referred to accreditation of the laboratories and recognition of laboratories. The countries she represented asked WADA to analyse the accreditation according to processes. The South American laboratories did not have the financial capacity to carry out all of the required tests. She was not requesting a reduction in quality but asked for recognition of those laboratories for those tests that they were able to conduct. This was important for the region. She asked WADA to organise a mission to South America to review those laboratories working there with a considerable amount of samples for

football, the most developed sport in South America, and requested the possibility of acknowledging only those laboratories for processes that they could perform adequately. This was very important for the region.

MR RICCI BITTI congratulated WADA on the progress made with the UNESCO convention signatures but, as always, reiterated the wish of the sport movement to receive information about the state of the legislation and countries signing the convention and the state of the constitution of the NADOs, which were the operating units in the countries. This would be much better information for operational purposes.

He shared the concern of his IOC colleagues about the situation regarding those countries about to organise top-level competitions, such as the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup in Russia and Brazil respectively. He supported the efforts of WADA. WADA needed NADOs operating in these countries and perhaps WADA should continue to monitor the countries with a common working group to assist on a political level, especially in Brazil, to create a unit that could serve WADA's purpose as best as possible.

Regarding statistics, they had two major advantages: transparency and data to follow the evolution of the global programme. He believed that WADA should be the body issuing such statistics as soon as possible. He strongly supported what the Director General had said and hoped that WADA would soon be able to issue these statistics instead of using statistics produced by third parties.

DR GERRARD endorsed and supported the intervention by his US colleague with respect to the question of SIMON as an alternative to ADAMS. His country, among others, had made a significant investment in SIMON on the clear understanding from WADA that there would be work on an interface, and he thought that that investment had been made at a time when ADAMS had not been satisfying the complete demands of the programme. He hoped to keep the dialogue open and added his support to that of the USA and other countries that found themselves in the same situation. He clearly wanted to activate the gathering of data and meaningful statistics, but he wished to signal his support.

MR ROWE supported the interventions made by his US and New Zealand colleagues, but also supported the completion as a matter of priority of the ADAMS upgrade and signalled his wish to work with others and WADA to achieve an effective interface between ADAMS and other systems, noting Mr Pound's comments on financial responsibility.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that he was fielding calls in relation to ADAMS and SIMON. This discussion had taken place the previous day at the Executive Committee meeting and the IT people had been quite clear. WADA had a mandate to develop and enhance the whereabouts provision in ADAMS and, if it was deflected from that, engaging in other work, that would be further delayed. WADA did not have the resources or the time. With four countries using SIMON in the world, he was afraid that it was not a priority for WADA, so it had to be put on the back-burner and it had to be considered going down the track, but it would not supersede the issue of whereabouts, which was vital.

He thought that Mr Pound had raised a very good point about NADO non-compliance. WADA reported on compliance or non-compliance, and that would be a matter for the Foundation Board to determine in November. What happened then would be left up to the stakeholder groups, be they sport or governments. What WADA needed to consider was what each might be able to do. WADA knew what the IOC had in its charter and therefore knew what it could do in relation to recognised federations. WADA was looking at ways and means of engaging governments in the same way in respect of NADOs,

remembering that some might be NOCs. WADA was going to report to the Executive Committee in September so that it would be very clear by the time the Foundation Board met in November to determine the final compliance report.

Mr Pound was absolutely right about ANADO and, in fact, WADA had already engaged in issues relating to its mandate. ANADO thought that its key mandate was one of advocacy and providing a service to its members by ensuring that it collectively discussed issues from the coalface, providing information to WADA and to its members. ANADO would not go back to undertaking a commercial programme of sample collection. That was where it had lost the plot and the money. He mentioned, for the record, that the only people hurt by its demise had been its own members. The money owed was to its members; nothing was owed to WADA or any of the IFs.

He took on board the suggestion in relation to attendance at Foundation Board meetings. WADA had a rule that stipulated that, if members did not attend, their nominated alternates could attend and WADA would meet the expenses of those alternates. If neither could attend, WADA would not meet expenses and did not automatically allow speaking rights, and certainly did not allow voting rights.

He told Ms Scott that he understood the athletes' view, which was why WADA was engaging in the exercise it was undertaking in those countries with events coming up. WADA's job was to make sure that the clean athletes were protected and could have confidence in the process, and part of that confidence was to ensure that the dirty athletes were brought to justice. WADA would work on that, and it was encouraging to know that the athletes supported that sort of work.

He understood the issue mentioned by Ms Dávila in relation to non-accredited laboratories. He had met with FIFA in 2005 and the representatives from the regional football federations in South America, and had explained carefully to them that they needed accredited laboratories; otherwise, the results coming from non-accredited laboratories could be appealed and athletes would succeed in overcoming sanctions. That had happened. Effectively, one was undertaking a programme, collecting samples, sending them to a non-accredited laboratory, and the cheats were getting off. The process had been clearly discussed, and that was why Argentina and Mexico were in the process of accreditation. Not every country had or needed a laboratory. WADA had to address this issue from a regional point of view but needed support in explaining to the member countries of the region as to how sample collection and delivery to the accredited laboratories could occur. He would be happy to hold further discussions with Ms Dávila after the meeting.

He thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for his support. Mr Ricci Bitti had raised issues that WADA was trying to proceed with. He noted Mr Ricci Bitti's comments in relation to NADOs and statistics. They were two key issues that WADA was addressing and it needed to report back at future meetings.

He had commented on ADAMS and SIMON and did not think that it was necessary to go any further regarding that topic.

MS DÁVILA said that six years had already elapsed and no solution had been achieved. As such, she requested that a WADA team to visit the region. It was not a lack of will; it was a lack of funding, so it would be useful if a team could go to the region to look for a solution because there had been no solution at all in six years.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that the Code drove laboratories, and standards had to be maintained in the interests of everybody. WADA would do everything it could to assist South America. It had been endeavouring to get the laboratory in Argentina accredited; the accreditation of the one in Mexico appeared to have stalled a little, but he did not

believe that this was from any lack of effort on WADA's part. The support was there. Everybody had to appreciate that the Code required standards to be maintained in the interests of justice. WADA had to continue down that track. He would nevertheless like to see additional laboratories in South America and suggested that further discussions take place outside the meeting as to how WADA could help that occur.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

3.1 Coordinating investigations and sharing anti-doping information and evidence

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that this was the culmination of an initiative that had been commenced in 2006. WADA had partaken in several symposia: one convened with the help of USOC and USADA in Colorado, one with the help of UK Sport in London and two in Sydney, Australia, hosted by ASADA and the Australian Government. The latest had occurred in Sydney at the end of April. The document in the members' files was the result of all that work. It was not part of the WADP; in other words, it was not an international standard or a model of best practice, but it was a guideline that indicated more specifically to NADOs how to get alongside law enforcement and other enforcement agencies in a country to ensure that the appropriate sharing of information occurred. It was also of benefit to the IFs, but they were the recipients of the way in which that initial relationship was established, and a good example of how it had worked was the BALCO case, whereby the law enforcement agencies in the USA had received information, shared it appropriately with USADA, and USADA had shared it appropriately with the IAAF, and that meant that athletes who might otherwise have gone to the Olympic Games in Athens had not gone, as sanction processes had been put in place in advance and the clean athlete had prevailed. He was very proud that this was now complete; the document was a good one. He expressed personal thanks to Jonathan Taylor, the lead draftsman in the exercise, but this was a joint project from people representing NADOs, IFs, customs authorities, police forces, major league baseball and, of course, the WADA management team and the IOC. It was a very good example of how it was possible to come together and produce a document of some significance. He was pleased to submit it for information.

THE CHAIRMAN endorsed the remarks made by the Director General. It was a user-friendly document and it was probably fair to say that lawyers sometimes drafted documents that were not that user-friendly. This one was, and it was a very useful resource. WADA had continually spoken about intelligent work and quality and not quantity when it came to testing, and the coordination and cooperation outlined in that paper led to that outcome, and he recommended it to all of the members and asked the public authorities in particular to see if it might be circulated and used for some productive purpose in their respective countries.

DECISION

Coordinating investigations and sharing anti-doping information and evidence update noted.

3.2 Executive Committee meeting update

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members about the decisions reached by the Executive Committee the previous day.

WADA had been asked to undertake an urgent inquiry into the leak of information including athlete names from the Tour de France 2010. It was doing this with the support and commitment of the UCI. It was an important principle that WADA had to uphold, so WADA was going to engage in that immediately.

As he had mentioned in his report, the Executive Committee had approved the memorandum of understanding with the WCO.

The Executive Committee had approved the tabled annex to the International Standard for the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information in relation to retention times, with one small amendment, which was that the "NADOs" referred to in the document should read "ADOs".

The Executive Committee had approved a new process for the review of research grants.

The Executive Committee had agreed to an amendment to the International Standard for Laboratories by changing the word "shall" to "should" in the clause relating to the time between the analysis of the A and B samples. For those seeking more detail, there was a clause in the standard stating that "there shall be seven days between the analysis of the A and the B"; it would now state that "there should be seven days between the A and the B".

The Executive Committee had agreed with the principle of keeping laboratories independent of anti-doping organisations and the practicalities of that would be considered during the Code review.

The Executive Committee had also agreed to the principle of storage of samples to be enhanced by intelligent storage of targeted samples; in other words, that storage should be longer than three months. Again, the detail was being worked on.

A condition was to be put on research grants to allow WADA to review the results of such research prior to publication and for WADA to be able to comment as appropriate.

The Executive Committee had agreed that there should be more emphasis put on double-blind testing for laboratories during the accreditation or reaccreditation process. That was seen as significant, but of course this came at a cost.

The Executive Committee had agreed that each approved laboratory would pay for the blood sample analysis process in the vicinity of 5,000 dollars per year to meet the requirements of the body that provided these samples.

That completed his report and the decisions from the previous day.

DECISION

Executive Committee meeting update noted.

4. Operations/management

4.1 Endorsement of Foundation Board composition for Swiss authorities

THE CHAIRMAN said that the members were required to endorse the Foundation Board composition and certify that by way of registration in Switzerland, where of course WADA was registered. The members had before them a list, which had been looked at the previous day by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee recommended that it be endorsed. A minor amendment had been made since the previous day: the word "honorary" had been added alongside Dr Aján's name. Were there any amendments that the members wished to bring to his attention?

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO said that France was mentioned alongside her name. She did not represent France. The Council of Europe just happened to have its headquarters in France, but she did not know whether the last column referred to the domicile of the representative or something else. She was puzzled and wondered whether a better solution might be found.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that it represented the domicile of the individual, not the country represented by the individual.

MR MACADAM noted that the information was currently accurate but, given the election in Canada, a new minister would be named in the coming days. At present, the Minister for Sport was still Mr Lunn, although that would change shortly.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that it was a peculiar thing in the British Empire that one remained a minister until such time as a new minister was appointed. The Canadian minister had unfortunately lost his job a few weeks previously, but remained a minister until the prime minister appointed an alternate. WADA would obviously seek an amendment as soon as a new minister was appointed.

He sought the members' approval of the Foundation Board composition.

DECISION

Foundation Board composition endorsed for Swiss authorities.

4.2 Strategic Plan

– 4.2.1 Plan review

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the plan was the result of some considerable work by the management as well as two external independent experts in planning, neither of whom had any relationship to any sport, government or NADO. It was a document to which changes had been made from the previous plan, which had run from 2007 to 2012. The changes reflected reality. A couple of issues had been highlighted, namely the rights of the clean athlete, necessary partnerships in which WADA needed to engage, such as the one mentioned that morning with the WCO, the international pharmaceutical industry and so on. It was an enhanced document. If anybody wished to see the red-line version, he had a copy. It had been discussed the previous day by the Executive Committee. It had been endorsed, but there had been a request from the European governments that there be a slight addition to the plan. It had not been possible to reach a conclusion on what that amendment should be but he understood that the request still prevailed, and he suggested that the request be considered by the management and referred to the two independent experts to see how it would fit in. It was a phrase related to cost-effectiveness. He was anticipating that intervention and he was suggesting that that might be a way forward in relation to it. Otherwise, he sought approval of the Strategic Plan.

MR MUYTERS congratulated the management on the Strategic Plan, which contained a vision, mission, values, strategic objectives, strategies and performance indicators. He was really charmed by the way in which the outcomes were formulated; it was a good way of formulating the outcomes. The European representatives had only one remark. The background note stated that the Strategic Plan was used to define the agency's strategy or direction and steered the decisions needed to allocate resources to pursue the objectives, including financial and human resources, and the strategy text on page 17 referred to cost-effectiveness. The European representatives thought that cost-effectiveness and efficiency should be one of the core values, since when WADA had to

make decisions, besides independence, accountability, innovation, integrity and respect, there should also be cost-effectiveness and efficiency, which was why he requested that these be included in the core values of the Strategic Plan.

THE CHAIRMAN accepted the proposal and said that the management would find a way, with the drafters and experts, to incorporate that request.

MR REEDIE referred to the suggestion under objective 3 that some wording be put in to try make sure that the relationship with UNESCO actually fleshed out the request made by Mr Ricci Bitti, that WADA find out through UNESCO just how many countries had efficient anti-doping legislation in place.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that WADA was engaged in a project with UNESCO, in which WADA had put some funds. That report would be made available later that year, and the management had been told by Barrie Houlihan, the key author of the report, that the work would be finished in the latter part of the year, so it would be tabled then, and that part would essentially be completed, although it would require updating from time to time.

THE CHAIRMAN sought the members' approval of the Strategic Plan with the minor amendment proposed.

DECISION

Strategic Plan approved subject to proposed amendment.

– **4.2.2 Operational Performance Indicators**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the Performance Indicators were for the members' information. That was not to say that he would not accept any comment that the members wished to make. It was important to understand that this was an assessment of the progress being made within the organisation.

MR POUND said that, for the most part, although he found the indicators a bit soft, it was fine, but who made the determination as to whether or not there had been successful or adequate performance? Was that an internal management decision, the Executive Committee, the Foundation Board, or outside reviewers?

THE CHAIRMAN responded that the Director General was responsible for the self-assessment and judging whether or not it was appropriate. From time to time, the Director General would refer certain things to him as the President, but WADA had no external assessment done on these indicators, and that was the usual commercial arrangement, certainly in his country.

DECISION

Operational Performance Indicators noted.

4.3 World Conference on Doping in Sport 2013

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the paper spoke for itself. It was just an interim report to show the progress that was being made and to remind the members of the generosity received by WADA from the South African Government in terms of hosting the conference, as there would be a significant saving for WADA in its budget for 2013 since it would not have to pay costs for the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings in November that year. It was a work in progress. The management was developing a conference agenda and so on, and would report again in November to update the members. The formal agenda was probably something that would not be

completed until the latter part of the following year, as that would be part of the Code review process, and then there would be a better indicator of what else would be on the agenda.

MR CZENE said that, as the European representative, he suggested to WADA to safeguard appropriate interaction between the governments and sport representatives as had been done in 2003 in Copenhagen. He proposed returning to the Copenhagen format, with a thematic approach allowing for debate between public authorities and sporting associations.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he understood that the European governments were suggesting one intervention from the government side and then one from the sport side, and so on. He would look at how this could be plugged into the process and had no problem with that.

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST confirmed that the Olympic Movement agreed completely with the proposal put forward by the European colleagues.

DECISION

World Conference on Doping in Sport 2013
update noted.

5. Legal

5.1 Legal update

MR NIGGLI said that he would highlight a few points from the written report that the members had in their files. He started with the good news, which was a decision from the French State Council, the highest administrative authority in France, the supreme court in matters of administrative law, including sport sanctions in France. This was the result of a case started by player unions, mainly FIFPro and the European Elite Athletes Association, which had gone to the court to protest against a decision taken by the French Government to implement the whereabouts provision in France as per the WADA recommendation, and they had been contesting whereabouts, arguing that they were against human rights, infringed the privacy of athletes, and so on. The good news from this decision was that the ruling was very clear, in which the court actually stated that whereabouts did not infringe the European Convention on Human Rights, and also that whereabouts were proportionate to the objective of the general interest represented by the fight against doping. This was very good. In a way, it was confirmation of two previous Spanish decisions on the same topic, except that the Spanish cases had been against UCI rules at the time, which had had even stronger requirements on whereabouts than the current ones, since they had stipulated 24 hours seven days a week, and it showed that the court appreciated the fact that, while whereabouts were a constraint to elite athletes, they were proportionate to what WADA was trying to achieve. This was likely to be appealed before the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg; that was what the union players had recently indicated during the CAHAMA meeting in Strasbourg. WADA had been informed by the Court of Human Rights that there were currently four pending cases related to sport before the court, relating not only to doping matters, but also to the transfer of players and commercial matters, all against Switzerland because they were all against the CAS and the way in which the CAS operated. In the meantime, WADA would certainly liaise with the CAS to make sure that it could provide the Swiss authorities, which would be defending these cases, with all of the appropriate elements. At present, there were no cases before the Court of Human Rights against whereabouts or data protection, which was good news.

The other item he wished to highlight was a decision handed down in relation to the athlete passport. There were now three decisions from the CAS in relation to passport cases. WADA had not yet received the motivation for one of them, but the outcome was positive and the UCI had prevailed in this case. In the two other cases, rather good motivation from the court had been given. In the first case, relating to Mr Cauchioli, the court had stated clearly that the passport was a reliable means of indirectly detecting doping, so it had recognised for the first time that the application of this new detection method was valid and provided for the possibility of identifying doping behaviour. As for the second decision, relating to Mr Valjavec, it had been interesting to read the finding of the court in relation to whereabouts. The court had insisted on the fact that it had looked not only at the variation in the medical or blood parameters, but had also put that in correlation with the whereabouts to identify doping patterns, saying that the coincidence between the blood manipulation and the athlete's racing calendar was striking, and that was important to bear in mind as it fully justified why WADA recommended in the data retention time keeping whereabouts for a longer period when associated with the passport. These needed to be looked at together if they were to be efficient. These cases were very good and the result of excellent cooperation with the UCI, paving the way for future passport cases and the efficiency of the passport.

Another case to which he wished to draw the members' attention was that of Mr Keisse in Belgium. The members would recall that the case had been all about the recognition of a CAS decision in Belgium, and the Belgian judge had decided as an interim decision not to recognise the CAS decision, to free the athlete to ride despite the fact that he had been sanctioned by the CAS for two years, on the grounds that the CAS was merely a disciplinary body of the UCI. That had been quite an extraordinary decision. There had since been a final decision on this one and the case from the athlete had been dismissed. Unfortunately, the judge had not discussed the recognition of the CAS decision, handing down a decision going around the issue and dismissing the case on various grounds, as he obviously had not wanted to contradict himself.

Another case discussed many times around the table was that of the Spanish rider, Mr Valverde. The members would recall that WADA had gone to the CAS. Mr Valverde had been convicted; he had appealed all of the decisions before the Swiss Federal Court, but all of his appeals had been dismissed by the court, and therefore the matter was over.

He wished to highlight one important issue in relation to the CAS and the amount of costs that doping organisations could hope to get from the CAS when they prevailed in cases. This was becoming a real issue for WADA. In the Valverde case, in which WADA had had to fight a lengthy procedure and had invested a substantial amount of money, above 300,000 Swiss francs, it had been awarded by the CAS about 61,000 Swiss francs in costs but, out of this amount, it had been asked to pay about 40,000 Swiss francs to the CAS to cover the costs of the CAS, so the difference between the two was 20,000 Swiss francs in compensation to the UCI, which was less than 10% of the investment made, and which was very small given that this was an athlete who was wealthy and had made a lot of money. He was not talking about athletes who had no money to defend cases. Another concrete example of that situation with the CAS was the recent Valjavec passport case, which had also been an expensive case involving a lot of medical expertise, bringing witnesses and so on, and the costs awarded by the CAS had been 2,500 Swiss francs, which bore no relationship to the investment made by the organisations prosecuting these cases, and he did not think that this was adequate in cases in which the athletes actually had financial resources.

Operación Puerto was finally going to trial in Spain; the public prosecutor in Spain had requested two-year jail terms for a number of people involved in the case, and WADA would follow up closely.

He wished to draw the members' attention to a very unusual case, number 25 in his report, in which an athlete had been desperately trying to get his case heard in South Africa by the anti-doping organisation and had been unable to get the South African anti-doping organisation and the government to form a panel to hear his case so, after months of trying to get his case heard, he had gone to WADA and asked WADA to help. WADA had tried to help by reaching out to the South African Government but, despite its efforts, nothing had happened. For the first time, WADA had used the provision in the Code under 13.3 and had brought the case directly to the CAS in order to create a forum to enable the athlete to get his case heard. WADA did not intend to prosecute the case or be an active party to the case; it would leave that up to the South African Athletics Federation, but at least WADA had ensured justice for an athlete trying to get his case heard, and he thought that that would be of interest to the members.

MR POUND said that the question of the CAS awarding costs in appropriate cases was clearly a big issue for those involved in trying to enforce anti-doping rules. Had WADA done anything to try to set up a conceptual framework as to when costs should be closer to what had actually been spent? The CAS or ICAS would need to work out some guidelines on this. His feeling was that, when things had started off, and the cases had not been as complicated as some of them currently were, the idea had been to encourage the use of the CAS and try and keep costs as low as possible. With some of the current well-financed appeals, it was quite different and perhaps some guidelines should be established in cooperation with the users to say that, if one was dealing with something that had no merit, was being well financed and the whole objective was to do nothing but delay, and such party lost, there had to be a price for that. If it was a disciplinary case with an impecunious athlete, that was a different thing. It seemed to him that the users and the CAS or ICAS needed to work out some guidelines so that everybody would know going in that, if there was a case without merit, there could be a price in terms of costs. He did not think that the CAS would do it on its own without help from the user groups.

MS SCOTT said that she had a comment regarding sanctions and length of time. She remembered in 2009 when the four-year sanction had been brought in and ratified in the Code, and had been heralded as a big step forward and huge success, and she looked through the current cases and did not see any four-year bans and did not ever actually hear or rarely heard of a federation imposing a four-year ban, so she wondered whether this needed to be revisited or made mandatory, or if something needed to be done so that four-year bans were actually imposed, because it seemed to her that there was no point having this as part of the Code if nobody was handing down a four-year ban for aggravated cases of doping.

MR PENGILLY referred to case number 19 (Wickmayer-Malisse), which was obviously challenging the structure of the CAS quite strongly, and he wondered whether Mr Niggli could highlight the level of risk to that structure through the case.

DR AJÁN said that he wanted to give Ms Scott and the members information that the IWF had, for eight years, been imposing a four-year suspension period and therefore maybe it was the only IF that implemented the four-year period. To date, there had been some court cases, but the IWF had won every case.

MR DIKIC said that he was replacing Ms Snežana Samardžić Marković and passed on her regards, as she had been unable to attend. He thought that the report was excellent and hoped that the future director of the Legal Department would continue to provide such good reports in the future, since Mr Niggli was leaving.

He asked about the cases brought before the European Court of Human Rights. He was not sure that either regarded whereabouts, as the Wickmayer-Malisse case was

somehow connected to that, and it was important to pay close attention and find out why all the cases were being brought before the European Court of Human Rights. He supported any actions that sought to gain a clearer picture.

MR MCQUAID said that, as one of what Mr Pound had described as the user groups of the CAS, he supported what Mr Niggli had stated about the awarding of costs and what Mr Pound had said as well, that WADA should try and find some way of ensuring that the CAS did consider in an appropriate way the costs laid out by federations and WADA in defending these cases, which were, a lot of the time, cases that had been prolonged by lawyers and, to some extent, naïve athletes.

In relation to the comment on the four-year ban, his federation wanted to introduce the four-year ban and, every time he spoke to the lawyers and the anti-doping department about it, he was told about proportionality and that the CAS would end up going back to two years on the basis of proportionality, and this was something that needed to be looked at, particularly with the review coming up, to get a clearer picture as to how to introduce four-year bans, as there was a very strong desire on the part of the IFs for four-year bans, since it had been realised that two years was not enough to stop an athlete, who could go back in after two years at the same level as he or she had left.

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO said that she saw some contradiction between the various interventions heard about the CAS. On the one hand, the CAS was being challenged before the European Court of Human Rights on the alleged lack of impartiality and independence and it would not comply with the requirement of an independent tribunal. WADA assumed that the CAS did meet the requirements. At the same time, a number of interventions had been made, including in the report of the Director General, on discussions with the CAS on how unnecessary cases could be avoided, somebody had suggested that there should be a discussion on guidelines for the awarding of damages, and she had heard Mr Niggli refer to liaising with the CAS on various contentious issues, but she did not understand. On the one hand, they were talking about an independent institution and, on the other hand, WADA claimed to be able to influence the modus operandi of the CAS, and she would really like some clarification on that.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that WADA was very conscious of the fact that this judicial body was an independent body and, to the extent that WADA was a party that was frequently before it, WADA had to remain at arm's length. Having said that, there were informal discussions on how operations might assist outcomes that were the objectives of the CAS in its structure and in the way in which it had been established and, of course, WADA's objectives as well. He had been asked at the November meeting to make contact with the new president of the ICAS because he was an Australian (Mr Coates), and they had met the previous December, and further discussions of a constructive nature had been held somewhat informally at the SportAccord meetings in London by the Director General and WADA would continue those discussions; nevertheless, WADA would remain proper in the manner in which it sought to bring about an outcome. WADA was not telling the CAS what to do; it was asking the CAS to consider the way in which this was evolving, including the question of costs and what it saw as being a disadvantage. The CAS had been established on the basis of providing access, affordable justice and decisions in an expedited manner but, at the end of the day, the CAS was its own body, governed under its own rules and would make its own decisions; nevertheless, input was being provided by WADA as one of the participants in that particular area of justice. He assured Ms De Boer-Buquicchio that WADA was not attempting to control the manner in which the CAS operated; it had no right and would not try to exercise such right without having it. Mr Pound, as a member of ICAS, might be able to provide further clarification, for which he would be grateful.

MR POUND said that it was important to understand that arbitration was a consensual arrangement: the parties and user groups all got together and tried to figure out the best way to administer a particular set of rules, and so of course one discussed that. The CAS would make its own decisions but it certainly sought input, and in fact that happened in the ordinary courts too – even in the statutory courts there were regular processes of consultation between the judiciary and the bar associations as to how best to deliver the administration of justice, so that kind of contact was not unusual; in fact, what would be unusual would be not having such contact.

Returning to the issue of the four-year ban, PROFESSOR LJUNGOVIST said that he was just as frustrated as Ms Scott about the fact that four-year bans had rarely been imposed, with the exception of the IWF, and he reminded the members that the reason for the extension to a possible four-year ban had been based on the discovery that the benefits of steroid use could occur over more than two years, so that was why the extension had been discussed and finally decided upon and had been included in the Code as of 2009. There had been a number of steroid cases over the past two years for which a four-year ban should have been imposed but had not been. This had been discussed at WADA, and it was waiting for a suitable case to appeal, and it was necessary to be careful to choose a case that WADA would not lose. The four-year ban should have been exercised quite frequently over the past two years and that had not been done.

MR POUND said that, when WADA had changed the rule to go back to specified substances and give a lot more flexibility at the low end of the sentencing range, it had also got advice from very prominent lawyers, primarily in Europe that, against that profile, a four-year sanction for a first offence would not be disproportionate, so that particular Rubicon had already been crossed, and it was very disappointing that, all of a sudden, there were IFs saying that perhaps it was not proportionate. Against the medical evidence and legal advice received, there was no reason whatsoever in appropriate cases for those four years not to be imposed and, if that had to be tested out with the CAS, fine, but WADA could be fairly confident that the legal issues and the reasons for it were quite clear.

MR NIGGLI responded that he would be happy to work with the CAS on some reasonable guidelines that would help ensure that proportionate costs were awarded.

On the four-year ban issue, there had been a number of cases for which four-year bans had been handed down, in weightlifting and a few other sports. In the recent passport case, four years had been requested but had not been granted. WADA would probably try to see that more often. There had been a whole period of time during which decisions had been taken prior to the entry into force of the new Code, and the new rules had not been applicable to the cases, but the situation had since changed.

In response to Mr Pengilly's question about case number 19, this was a complicated case in Belgium. A number of different instances had been opened, and it was clear that the athlete's lawyers were trying to have a go at the system rather than simply defending the interests of their client. The same had happened with the Kisse case: the lawyers had been trying to get some kind of precedent without taking into account the best interests of their client, but WADA now awaited a decision from the state council in Belgium. There was a risk that some of the questions put in the case would be referred to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg, not Strasbourg, the idea being to get some decisions from Luxembourg on matters of principle, which would probably include recourse to arbitration, whereabouts and so on, and the decisions could have an impact on the entire system, so this was a case that had to be monitored as closely as possible. WADA had not yet been admitted to all of the procedures and was fighting that, but he

did not know how much WADA would be able to participate. The Flemish community had been admitted, so he would ensure appropriate communication just in case.

He confirmed what Dr Aján had said.

He told Mr Dikic that the pending cases in Strasbourg were not about whereabouts; they were about the CAS, so they were different to the Wickmayer-Malisse case, which would be brought before the European Court of Justice and in which WADA might intervene. He did not have much detail about the ones in Strasbourg. As he had said, these cases were against states and not against parties, and therefore it was up to Switzerland to defend these cases. States were generally pretty well organised in terms of presenting the cases, but the only reason WADA would talk to the CAS would be to make sure that it provided the relevant information to those in charge of defending the cases at Swiss Government level.

He did not have anything to add to what Mr McQuaid had said.

He told Ms De Boer-Buquicchio that Mr Pound had answered her question. Arbitration was different and ruled by an agreement between the parties, and the CAS had its own rules. WADA never discussed individual cases; it discussed the principles in the rules of the CAS.

DECISION

Legal update noted.

5.2 Interpol

MR NIGGLI informed the members that he had nothing to add to the activity report from Interpol that was in the members' folders. He simply said that WADA's relationship with Interpol and the seconded officer there continued to work well, and it was very operational; a number of activities had been organised by Interpol to facilitate the work of various law enforcement agencies around the world, which was a very good outcome of WADA's investment in Interpol, showing that this was not only an administrative effort, but also a very concrete and operational activity.

DECISION

Interpol update noted.

5.3 Conflict of interest policy

MR NIGGLI said that the document spoke for itself. The Executive Committee had wished to formalise a conflict of interest policy for WADA. It applied to all Foundation Board and Executive Committee members, officers and employees and consultants. It was based on the principle of transparency and the fact that everybody should be in a position to announce any conflict before taking part in any decision. The whole process was described in the document. It was for the approval of the Foundation Board. Once approved, it would be implemented. It would be a yearly exercise for everybody and would be managed by the Director General's office.

MR POUND observed that everybody was sitting around the table as a representative of something or somebody. When one drew up a conflict of interest policy, one had to overlook that part and ask whether there was something special in relation to any conflict. He had been named by and represented the IOC. He did not know that that was a conflict, but this issue should be agreed upon.

THE CHAIRMAN assured Mr Pound that this had been accepted. Perhaps he was the only one in the room who was not representing any particular public authority, although

he represented the public authorities. The members were there because they were the nominees of some body, and it was from that point that they moved to the more direct or exceptional areas when considering what they should disclose.

On behalf of Europe, MR GIERSZ warmly welcomed the conflict of interest policy introduced by WADA in the document. It was fully consistent with the ethical approach and core values of WADA's activities presented in the newly revised Strategic Plan. It was good that, for an organisation such as WADA, a conflict of interest policy was a transparent priority.

MR MACADAM clarified that it had also been brought to light the previous day that this also applied to deputies.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, in practical terms, if there were no more interventions, with the Foundation Board members' approval of the policy, a letter would be written to them by the Director General seeking their declaration as per the document in their files. At every meeting, there would be a standing item early, after looking at the roll call, to give an opportunity to anybody, which he suspected would be dealt with in seconds rather than minutes, to address any conflict that might recently have arisen since sending back the declaration. The Director General would be responsible for keeping that declaration. The members should note that the policy had been written in respect of the areas in which grants were being made, and it was known that there were scientific and social science grants. In that regard, there was an opportunity for a real conflict, and it was therefore necessary to take the steps to ensure that the knowledge was available and appropriate steps taken to avoid the conflict. It was the management's view that, to settle it down, there should probably be some supervision from the firm of lawyers who had helped to put the policy together. Having said that, there was a clear understanding of how it worked, and WADA might simply have more support given in terms of the grants at the beginning of those meetings. He hoped that it would assist the members to know that, going forward, they would be required to respond to a letter, provide information and sign it, and that would be sent to the members annually, to update; in most cases, it might not require any updating, but the opportunity would be given annually by the Director General writing to the members and making that request. Was the policy acceptable? He thanked the members for their support.

DECISION

Conflict of interest policy approved.

6. Finance

6.1 Government/IOC contributions

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members to note that there would be a brief presentation from Mr Felix Roth of PricewaterhouseCoopers on the audit in order to enable the members to make a decision on the approval of the 2010 year-end accounts and that, at the latter part of the next section, an opportunity would be given to the members to look at the draft budget. He asked them to do so bearing in mind that it was a draft proposal and not a decision document, and he knew that the Finance and Administration Committee would appreciate any suggestions that the members might wish to make, but the committee would take away the draft with the members' comments and suggestions to its meeting in July before coming back with a firm proposal for the following year's budget.

MR REEDIE observed that, after the complexities of the legal report, this was the easy bit, talking about money. The first item was the current update on contributions as at 10

May. WADA had been able to collect from its stakeholders just under 18 million dollars, which represented about 68% of the total invoiced. He invited the members to look through the continental payments and, if they happened to be particularly friendly with the treasurer of the finance department of any particular country, perhaps they could have a word as, the earlier WADA received the contributions, the better it was. This was done routinely and, in general terms, contribution payments that year were slightly slower than they had been in previous years, but the world was rather complicated and changing at that moment, and maybe that was the explanation.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

6.2 2010 year-end accounts

MR REEDIE informed the members that the accounts were prefaced by a financial overview and the accounts entitled "Final draft" were before the members, and the Foundation Board would be invited to approve them. They were presented by the WADA Finance Department with the assistance of the auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers, as well as under the IFRS, the accounting system used by the IOC and which the IOC had been quite keen that WADA use as well. The really significant figure there was that, over the year, there had been a deficit of just under 643,000 dollars, but that was significantly better than the budget approved the previous year, when WADA had thought that there would be a deficit of around 1.1 million dollars, and that was a combination of good management, watching expenses and also a complicated situation of financial currency movements, in which WADA had benefited from a strengthening of the US dollar against the Canadian dollar for a period, but unfortunately the US dollar had fallen back again.

There was, from the auditors, a document called an "Assurance", which was a report on the quality of the audit, which was about as clean a piece of paper as he had seen over the years. He did not think that there were any major issues at all; it was all green. The only item, and he repeated his apology of the previous day to the Executive Committee, was the placing in the accounts and the definition of an investment, which had moved from being current to non-current assets. He had told the Executive Committee that the amount was 1,300 US dollars; in fact, it was 1.3 million US dollars, so the figure was higher but the error was minor, and it was the same.

He would formally submit the accounts for approval, but he suspected that the Chairman would like Mr Roth to speak to the accounts and the audit, and then any questions could be taken before seeking formal approval.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed to proceed as suggested by Mr Reddie.

MR ROTH said that he would give the summary of the audit report and a few comments on the financial statements themselves. On the report of the statutory auditor on the financial statements, he could conclude that, in his opinion, the financial statements for the year ending 31 December 2010 gave a true and fair view of the financial position, the results of operations and the cash flows in accordance with the IFRS and complied with Swiss law and the foundation deed. He also confirmed that an internal control system existed which had been designed for the preparation of financial statements according to the instructions of the Foundation Board, and recommended that the financial statements submitted to the members be approved.

Looking very briefly at the balance sheet and the statement of activities, they were presented in US dollars and Swiss francs. For Swiss legal purposes, they had to be presented in Swiss francs, but the accounting as such was kept in US dollars. The members would see that the total balance sheet in US dollars was remarkably stable, at

35 million from one year to the next; in Swiss francs, there was a slight decrease and also a slight decrease in equity, and this was essentially related to the strengthening of the Swiss franc compared to the US dollar.

As to the statement of activities, although total income was relatively stable from one year to the next, there was a slight increase overall in operating expenses, which stemmed mainly from salaries and other personnel costs, and also travel and accommodation expenses, leading to an excess of expense over income for 2010 of about 600,000 dollars, compared to an excess of income over expenses in 2009 of 1.7 million dollars. This concluded the report of PricewaterhouseCoopers. He would be happy to take any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN sought questions from the members of the Foundation Board.

MR REEDIE asked the members to accept the accounts for WADA and all of the financial statements for the year to 31 December 2010. He expressed his thanks to Mr Roth and PricewaterhouseCoopers for the help that they gave to WADA.

MR REEDIE said that, as the members were aware, the next piece of paper (attachment 3) was his favourite. It was entitled "Budget against actual", and showed over a period of the whole year what budget the Finance and Administration Committee had thought that WADA would attain in income and expenditure and the actual figures. He had gone through for the year to the end of 2010 in some detail and thought that there were two or three issues that he was honour-bound to bring to the attention of the Foundation Board. On the income side, WADA had been rather less successful in laboratory accreditation than budgeted, principally due to the belief that it would receive an application for accreditation from the Mexican laboratory, which had not actually come forward. If the application did not come forward, WADA certainly could not charge any accreditation fees. WADA had also been less successful in the amount of interest that it could attract from cash and investments that it held. Market rates had been extremely low (the lowest he could ever remember), and WADA had a policy, supported by successive Executive Committees and Foundation Boards, that it did not invest in any speculative investments; it kept public money safe in the main and, the safer one kept it, the chances were that it would be difficult to raise higher rates of interest, so that had cost WADA narrowly in income terms.

Going on to the expense side and looking at all of this department by department, the first big one was litigation and the costs involved. Mr Niggli had taken the members through the number of cases with which he was dealing. In money terms, in the past 15 months, WADA had spent around 1.7 million dollars on litigation, in addition to the 1.5 million that it had as a reserve. Whether or not WADA used the reserve was a financial decision. Thus far, it had not used it, although in one case it had been thought that it might have to; but, the members should be aware that, as Mr Niggli had said, if there were people out there attacking the system of arbitration, it frequently started with an anti-doping case and WADA found itself at the very sharp end of this, so it was meeting very substantial costs. The 64,000-dollar question was whether or not it was going to continue and, in general terms, he believed that it would.

WADA had purchased the source code for the ADAMS project, and had made additional developments there. WADA had run a bit over budget on the outreach programme at the Commonwealth Games in India, and a little bit over budget on the outreach model. The Finance and Administration Committee found that meeting costs were variable, depending frequently on the home base for those serving on committees. Those who travelled a lot would have noticed that the airlines charged rather more for tickets than previously, and that was reflected in the costs to the agency. Under operational costs, he had to confess to an error. WADA had incurred about 140,000

dollars of legal and consulting costs for the negotiation of the new lease on the premises in Montreal. The Finance and Administration Committee simply had not spotted that or budgeted for it; had it done so, it would have been about right. However, WADA should see a substantial reduction in municipal taxes and the contract had been very favourable to WADA with payments from the landlord. Unusually, WADA had also been involved in some additional recruitment fees and relocation costs over the past year. People had left WADA and moved, and WADA had had to meet these costs. He had noticed that there were slight pressures regarding travel costs in the regional offices; certainly, as WADA asked the regional office staff to become more active and involved them in travel, it simply had to meet the deficits.

That gave the members a very accurate statement of every cent raised and spent in 2010, and there had been a deficit of 640,000 US dollars when a much larger deficit had been expected.

DECISION

2010 year-end accounts approved.

6.3 2011 quarterly accounts

MR REEDIE said that the members could see the quarterly accounts to 31 March for the operation of WADA. As was always the case and as the members would have heard, at the beginning of the year, traditionally WADA collected a high percentage of contributions from the public authorities which were then matched by the IOC, so the income was very high and of course regarding the expenditure, if it were all on a quarterly basis, WADA would spend only about 25% of its annual costs, so both the balance sheet and the profit and loss account showed a healthy figure, but this was explained simply by the times at which income was received and costs met.

Yet again, the members got to go into the budget against actual figures, and those figures were also before the members for the three months to 31 March and, again, he had asked the finance people to give him a breakdown of what had been happening. Again, litigation fees were highly noticeable and were much higher than would have been expected on an irregular basis over a 12-month period. The total litigation budget for the year was 900,000 dollars, and WADA had already spent 420,000 dollars. There was a slightly higher figure on information resources. WADA had got a little ahead of budget on some of the programme developments for RADOs, but that was more a timing issue than anything else and, again, he noted the recruitment expenses and relocation costs. He hoped that the members understood that these figures, which came to him very regularly on a monthly basis, prepared by the WADA finance team, allowed WADA to know exactly how it was doing over the year, how income was coming in and how expenses were going out, and how these compared to the budget prepared, so that the Finance and Administration Committee knew that what it thought might happen had happened.

DECISION

2011 quarterly accounts noted.

6.4 2012 draft budget – preliminary planning

MR REEDIE informed the members that the Finance and Administration Committee had been told at the meeting in November that the public authorities wanted some advance notice of what it thought might happen in 2012. This paper had been prepared by the WADA management. It was not that the management was not good at it, but it had not been through the star chamber of the Finance and Administration Committee,

which would meet in Europe at the end of July. The basic assumption was that there would be an overall level of salary increase of 3%, that the science research and social science research budgets would remain at the same level, and a separate budget would be created for capital expenditure; the expenditure budget now included a depreciation cost. Significantly, it was necessary to look at what might happen to currencies. The Finance and Administration Committee thought that the exchange rate impact on the salaries, which were paid almost entirely in Canadian dollars, was about 7% and, for those paid in Lausanne in Swiss francs, it was about 10%. The hard facts of the matter were that the Canadian dollar had improved strongly against the US dollar. WADA was paid in US and spent in Canadian dollars, so that had a pretty significant impact.

The paper had been prepared on the basis of the previous meeting and previous discussions on an increase in contributions of 2% or 0% per annum and the members could see the impact of both of these figures on the draft budget before them. He did not think that there was any doubt that there had to be a question mark about WADA's ability to collect 96% of contributions. This was currently a very complex world and it might not be as easy to collect contributions as it had been in the past. WADA had been very successful at contribution collection, and that had allowed WADA to build up a fund, or what he had always called unallocated cash, which currently stood at around 9 million dollars, and that had allowed WADA to meet deficits year by year. If WADA did not have an agreed level of regular contribution increase, WADA would spend that money very quickly and, if WADA spent it very quickly, to balance the books in two years' time, there would have to be a very substantial contribution increase to run a balanced budget, so the Finance and Administration Committee would be looking at that very closely and would come back to the Executive Committee in September with clear views on what it should do. It would then be up to the Executive Committee to decide on the budget that went to the Foundation Board in November the following year but, as things got tough, and they had been tough, and it had been possible to run WADA pretty well over the years on modest contribution increases, it was getting to the stage whereby that happy philosophy could not go on indefinitely.

Going back to his original budget against actual comparisons for 2010, in almost every heading, as the members went through the expenses, WADA was up around 98%, 99% and 100%. This seemed to him to indicate that the organisation and the various departments and individuals working there were fully employed and fully engaged in delivering everything that the members wanted them to deliver, so there was not all that much slack. People kept saying that WADA should do all kinds of things; he would want to do that but, at the end of the day, WADA was going to have to be able to fund it. Rather than him producing any more moral financial comments, he would stop there and would be happy to take any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN invited questions and comments in respect of the quarterly accounts and draft budget.

MR MUYTERS said that, knowing that it was only an initial exercise for the 2012 budget, the authorities in Europe had the same concern as that already mentioned by Mr Reddie, which was that, looking at the results, starting in 2009, when there had still been a profit of 1.7 million, in 2010, the budget had initially shown a 1.1 million dollar loss but was actually only a 643,000 dollar loss, the budget for 2011 showed a loss 2.382 million dollars and, for 2012, in this very preliminary draft, there was a loss of between 3.3 or 3.6 million dollars. As Mr Reddie had said, Europe was also concerned that the profits from the past would be eaten up very quickly, which was why the European public authorities had asked at the November meeting for a 0% increase, but he thought that they had asked to see if there would be a possibility of a 0% increase in income and expenditure. Europe understood that, with 2012 being an Olympic year, this would be

very tough, but thought that the management should carry out an exercise up to July, to see where expenditure could or could not be cut, but this was a very tough exercise. If this was not done, the income would have to increase, and a budget balance of more than 10% would be needed, and he did not think that, in times of crisis, the authorities would be able to make contributions above 10% to WADA. This was something that needed to be looked at very carefully, with different scenarios in terms of what could be done and what choices should be made by the management by July. Even if WADA did not increase income and expenditure, there would be a loss of 1.2 million dollars, so probably this was not enough and it was certainly necessary to see what could be done in the future in order to avoid eating up all of WADA's capital quickly.

MR POUND said that he had a couple of comments. He was not a banker, so somebody who knew these numbers would be able to tell, but, with the currency changes that WADA had experienced which were quite dramatic in relation to the US dollar, if one gave the same amount of euros that year to produce that number of US dollars, one was actually getting a significant decrease in the contribution, so somebody should have a look at that, because he thought that the members were playing mind games with themselves there.

The second, larger, question was, given the importance of the fight against doping in sport, and given what was known about what was going on, and given that the members knew what was required to make a meaningful inroad into this, why were the members talking about 0% and 2%? It was just nonsense to have a budget that low, given the responsibilities that everybody around the table had for the fight against doping in sport. His experience in organisations was that, when the amounts were ridiculously low, people used percentages and, frankly, 29 million dollars was nothing in terms of what was really needed for the fight. He thought that WADA had given away too much power to the Executive Committee on this, because these things came to the Foundation Board pretty complete. What were the members thinking about when they even considered discussing 0% or 2%? He had to say that, as a Foundation Board member, he did not get it.

MR MUYTERS responded to Mr Pound that, in most countries, there was no budget increase at all, so at that moment, every minister of finance was trying to avoid costs and had to cut expenditure, which was why every increase could not be given. He understood completely what Mr Pound was saying about the fight against doping in sport; everybody around the table thought that this was right and had to be done but, in a time of crisis, every euro would be turned over two or three times and those departments in which there was no decrease in money could be very happy, so zero growth as requested for the WADA payments was an exception. For most departments, there was a decrease, and certainly no increase; a zero budget increase from one year to the next in most European countries at that moment was already good. He assured Mr Pound that every minister in every country would say, "But not in my department, do you know how important education is/do you know how important health is/do you know how important anti-doping is?" Everybody was saying the same thing. This was why the European authorities had been requesting a zero increase in income and expenditure.

MR AGUIRRE said that, apart from examining expenditure, because the financial situation was perhaps leading towards a crisis, the members should review the criteria for contributions to WADA. He did not think that there was currently any clear criterion with respect to how the different countries would contribute. He saw a list of contributions from different countries, and could see that there were countries whose contribution was perhaps not proportionate to their capacity, so it would be interesting if criteria could be established by using certain indicators, for example, the level of participation in the Olympic Games, national population, GDP, etc. The fight against

doping in sport would require more resources as time went on, so the contribution criteria should be examined carefully.

THE CHAIRMAN appreciated that there could be many formulas, but noted that this had been a matter of considerable discussion, and the governments in particular had wrestled with this back in 2001. Regional responsibility was set out in the UNESCO convention; it was not a WADA formula. A change to the contribution method would require an amendment to the UNESCO convention. It had been canvassed significantly and there were many at the table who could explain that, as they had been there. He did not think that this could be renewed, as it had been decided on the basis of international agreement through the United Nations Organisation.

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO said that she also wished to express the concern witnessed in Strasbourg at the Council of Europe among the member states to reduce contributions to international organisations, taking into account the difficult economic situations each was currently facing. In the Council of Europe, there was also a need to establish priorities and sacrifice activities initially regarded as essential to the achievement of the mandate and objectives of the organisation. This was a very painful exercise, and she therefore fully understood what was being said by Mr Pound and undoubtedly the WADA management and Chairman, but she suggested that it might be useful to consider alternative sources of financing of certain activities regarded as important and which could not be covered in the future. The Council of Europe had resorted to a device known as voluntary contributions, going outside the quota referred to based on the UNESCO convention, enabling stakeholders to make a contribution in relation to a particular activity regarded as essential and which could not be financed through ordinary budgetary contributions. That would probably require a resource mobilisation strategy, which could be considered, and perhaps in light of that, when it really came to making decisions, that could be an initial source of inspiration for the decision-makers.

MR POUND apologised for intervening again, but said that Ms De Boer-Buquicchio's idea was a very good one and he thought that it had worked in the UNESCO context. There were two things: he thought that there were alternative sources of revenue over and above voluntary contributions. When WADA had explored them many years ago, saying that it might be able to get sponsorship or other kinds of revenue of four or five million dollars a year, the response (with the greatest of respect) from the governments had been that they would therefore reduce their contributions, so there would have to be some kind of an undertaking that incremental revenues would not affect contributions by the stakeholders, and he did not mean only governments, as the Olympic Movement was just as bad. The thing that was perhaps different from contributions to other international organisations was that WADA was dealing with a problem that was international; it was not sufficient to have a domestic solution to doping in sport because it crossed borders, so an international organisation was absolutely critical to making the necessary progress. WADA needed better advocates at the council and cabinet tables to make that point, and he appreciated that, in many respects, it was a zero-sum game for taxes and it was a matter of making the case, but part of WADA's problem was that it had a legacy of this approach. Even in the years of huge expansion, from the screams of anguish heard when a 3% increase was requested, it had appeared that all sorts of people would be starving in the streets because of that. It was just not the case. If WADA were to explore these alternative sources of revenue, fine; if they came from the governments, great, if they came from the private sector or elsewhere, that would also be great, provided that this was not an excuse for the current stakeholders to reduce their contributions. Then, he thought that there were significant possibilities, because there was a lot of money out there.

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO reacted to Mr Pound's intervention. Obviously, if the result was that the governments reduced their contributions, the purpose would be completely lost. This was not the case in the Council of Europe; it was on top of statutory obligations. Mr Pound had made a comparison, saying that WADA dealt with international issues and that what she had been suggesting was perhaps more domestic in nature, but the Council of Europe was dealing with a lot of global issues, which were obviously not limited to the member states alone, for example, corruption, cybercrime, trafficking in human beings. The Council of Europe dealt with cross-border issues that covered the entire international community.

MR RICCI BITTI said that it was the Foundation Board's duty to give a direction to Mr Reddie and the finance staff for the following year's budget before the September and November meetings. Having heard the governments' views, he was somewhat confused, but he totally supported Mr Pound's approach, in that the members had seen the budget presented very brilliantly in terms of explanations. There were unexpected or unpredictable costs, in particular legal and litigation and currency volatility. To do the activities that WADA wanted to do, it clearly needed more money. His suggestion was that the Foundation Board decide either to stick to a 0% increase (and then decide what to cut, remaining consistent with the general economy), or increase the budget by at least 5%. A 2% increase was a very conservative solution and did not respond to the concerns expressed, so the Foundation Board had to decide one way or another; otherwise, it would have to recommend that the Director General and staff work out what activities to cut for the following year.

MR ROWE said that there seemed to be an assumption that there would be a move to 0%. He had spoken to a colleague from Oceania and would be happy to consider a 0% budget increase to see what that looked like; indeed, that exercise might well illustrate some of the points that had been made around the table and the unsavoury nature of some of the cuts that might need to be made and help to clarify the situation. So, without any suggestion of support for one level of funding or another, it might well be a useful exercise to see what the result of that produced.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that the committee would no doubt consider that in light of the guidance given to it that morning.

MR REEDIE observed that it had been a splendid discussion. For a moment, he had been thinking of co-opting Mr Pound on to the Finance and Administration Committee, but had resisted that temptation. Mr Pound had been very helpful in one sense, when referring to currencies. If the stakeholders paid WADA in US dollars, the European public authorities would be 8% better off than they had been the previous year. That was certainly the effect of currency changes. Mr Pound had always been absolutely clear that WADA was under-funded, and that was for sure but, as Mr Muyters had said, governments had been consistently reluctant to pay WADA the kind of increases that everybody would like to have. He was afraid that that was reality, and somehow WADA had to try to get round that. The suggestion from the Guatemalan member was, if it was a UNESCO convention issue, to change the method of making contributions to WADA. WADA had always allowed the governments to decide how to allocate their payments around the world. If it was now done through the UNESCO convention, he did not think that WADA would be capable of doing it; with a bit of luck, UNESCO might be.

He understood all of the comments (they had been made year after year) that things were tight out there. The problem with international organisations such as the Council of Europe was that, if they paid WADA an extra 2%, they would have to pay everybody else with whom they dealt an extra 2%, and he understood that. He also understood the alternative sources argument. He had been engaged with Ms De Boer-Buquicchio's

predecessor at that meeting the previous year in a discussion about precisely that, and as yet had been unable to bring it to fruition. He would speak to Ms De Boer-Buquicchio and see if that discussion might be encouraged.

The one thing that was helpful was a clear understanding that, if WADA did find alternative sources, governments would not then say that they would reduce their contributions. That genuinely encouraged members to go out and try to raise money, as opposed to the previous assumption, which was that, if another two million dollars were raised on a sponsorship deal, the governments would then cut their contributions. If that was no longer the case, that was good news.

He told Mr Ricci Bitti that 5% was a nice number and asked him to come to the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings in September and November, as he would need all the help he could get.

He told Mr Rowe that the Finance and Administration Committee went through every penny of expenditure to see how much could be reduced, but it was now at the margins. It could fiddle about with travel expenses and one or two other things, but it would not be able to save meaningful amounts of money. The only way, on a zero increase and a balanced budget, would be by stopping activities. The IOC still believed that the fight against doping in sport was one of its major issues and would be very reluctant if that were to be considered, and that was perhaps why the Finance and Administration Committee fiddled around with small figures, to make sure that WADA could continue to do what it was currently doing, and the problem was when more was requested.

He thought that he would try to bring a menu of contribution increases to the next meeting so that, over a period of three or four years, WADA would be in a situation whereby it could still hold on to some of its unallocated cash, increase contributions in a modest way and, in the hope that the world economy recovered slightly, so that higher contributions could come at a later date, which would perhaps allow the Finance and Administration Committee to phase in expenditure that people said it must incorporate. He was grateful to everybody for the contributions; it was always a healthy debate. The Finance and Administration Committee would continue to work at it.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it would be helpful in the context of the value of euros, or the value of Australian dollars, or whatever the currency versus US dollars; the reality was that, if WADA got the same euros the following year as it had got that year, which was a 0% increase, it would be quite happy. The members should also bear in mind the fact that, for the wages bill, which was paid in the main in Canadian dollars, there was an 8% increase based solely on the exchange rate, so there was an increase on the one side, and a reduction was sought on the other. However, if the members saw it in the context of the currency exchange and the benefits at that point of time in the cycle for all currencies against the US dollar, it might well be that the same dollars would get WADA over a small hump in the near-term, not the long-term.

MR REEDIE noted that there was a complication, in that one of the major stakeholders received its income in US dollars and paid WADA in US dollars. It was actually quite an important funder.

THE CHAIRMAN said that it was certainly worthy of examination. That was the point he was making at this point in time. He appreciated the discussion and said that this would be dealt with through the recommendations brought back to the Executive Committee in September.

DECISION

2012 draft budget approved.

7. World Anti-Doping Code

7.1 Interim Code implementation and compliance report

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, as the members were aware, they were given an update on compliance at each of the meetings, as they had requested.

MR ANDERSEN said that the members had two updated papers on the table before them. The progress report detailed progress since the papers received by e-mail on 18 April to Friday 13 May. In this period, two more summer Olympic IFs had become fully compliant, along with three IOC-recognised IFs and one European country.

He first took the members through an overview of the IFs' and NADOs' current status. Needless to say, monitoring was one of the key areas WADA was required to undertake, as stated in the mission statement. It was at the very heart of what WADA did. It was also important to take a couple of steps back in terms of the history of where WADA was regarding Code compliance reporting. According to the 2003 Code that had come into force in 2004, WADA had been supposed to report to the Foundation Board at the end of 2006. In 2006, the progress report had been tabled and approved as an implementation review. It had then been decided to postpone the compliance report until November 2008 and, in the meantime, interim compliance reports had been tabled at every Executive Committee and Foundation Board meeting. In November 2008, the official compliance report had been tabled but the decision had been deferred to May 2009. In 2009, no decision had been taken on non-compliance due to the fact that the 2003 Code was a past document, so the official compliance report had been tabled and acknowledged. Moving to the 2009 Code, the first interim report had been tabled at the same meeting in May 2009 and subsequently at each Executive Committee and Foundation Board meeting, and it had been decided that the official Code compliance report should be deferred to November 2011. The report before the members was an interim report.

WADA was monitoring 303 signatories. The 303 signatories included Olympic IFs, the IOC-recognised IFs, SportAccord IFs, Paralympic IFs, NADOs and NOCs acting as NADOs. WADA had issued two reports, which were on the table. The so-called "dot report" (green or black dot report) comprised two elements, the rules and compliance with the rules, and anti-doping programmes and compliance with these programmes. The other report was one that had been requested by the members. It was the summary report in four categories: in compliance, in progress, not yet compliant, and a category for exceptional circumstances.

The dot report consisted of one section concerning anti-doping rules. WADA had given all possible assistance to its signatories in order to accommodate the creation of these rules. WADA had created model rules for IFs, NADOs and RADOs, and had also, in cooperation with ANOC, created a declaration, which was a simplified way for NOCs to subscribe to the additional elements in the Code for NOCs. One should recall that, when talking about anti-doping rules, it was not necessarily a simple set of rules adopted by sports in a country. It included issues with legislation in many countries and, in some places and parts of the world, sports rules. In the third category of countries, there was a mix of the two, in which there was legislation in place and also sporting rules applicable to the fulfilment of the requirements of the Code. WADA had had all rules and legislation for the 303 signatories reviewed by applicable departments within the agency, in addition to seeking external legal advice, and had given assistance to those requesting it. In terms of the anti-doping programme, the members had specifically asked the management to look into four different areas. There were many areas in the Code into which the management could have looked, such as statistical reporting. The

management had not been asked to do so but might do so at the next crossroads. For this Code review, the management had been asked to look at the education programmes for a doping-free sport (mandatory in the Code as of 2009), how the signatories were doing in terms of in- and out-of-competition testing programmes, and the existence of a TUE system and a result management system. Those were the four areas that the management had been asked to look into.

It was important to emphasise what was stated on the front page of the dot report, on the compliance status of signatories: "The present document is not an indicator of quality. It refers only to the level of compliance required. All signatories are encouraged to aim for a higher standard than the minimum ones in their day-to-day anti-doping activity". This was important because there might be suggestions that the compliance report was a report on the quality of each of the signatories, and it was not.

He had been making a compilation from the two reports that the members had in their folders in order to give them an overview of where the various categories of IFs and different regions of the world were.

The slide showed an overview of progress made by IFs between May 2009 and May 2011 in terms of getting the rules in line and carrying out anti-doping programmes on a day-to-day basis. The left-hand column showed the status in May 2009, and then the members would see the status in May 2011. The members would see the other groups, the International Winter Olympic Federations, the IOC-recognised IFs, the SportAccord IFs and the Paralympic IFs. The picture was the same: there had been considerable progress since May 2009. The next slide showed the same picture but it combined the rules and the programmes for the different groups, and the members could see the same picture for the International Summer and Winter Olympic IFs, which were doing quite well in terms of Code compliance; some were in progress, but it was felt that not much remained in terms of getting them compliant, although there was somewhat more to do for the recognised SportAccord and Paralympic IFs. In terms of NADOs, these had been divided into the five Olympic regions, and the members would see the same progress as they had seen from the previous slides. There had been huge progress in Africa in terms of getting rules in place and programmes. This region had 44 countries that were RADO members and nine that were not members. In the Americas, progress was being made in both fields, and this region had two RADOs, with 22 countries that were members and 20 that were not members. In Asia, progress was being made in terms of rules and programmes. In Europe, progress was also being made in terms of rules and programmes. Many countries in Europe were complying in terms of programmes, which meant that they carried out good anti-doping programmes on a day-to-day basis, but some did not have rules in place. This was generally because of pending legislation, and that took time. The situation was the opposite in other regions, in which many had rules in place but had no legislation, and their anti-doping programmes were more limited. The same results could be seen (programmes and rules together) for the five Olympic regions.

Combining all 303 signatories, the IFs and the 205 NADOs, the picture was that 94 signatories were compliant, 128 (42%) were in progress and 81 (27%) were not yet compliant. He had tried to carry out a little exercise, comparing the performance and medals awarded at Olympic Games, so had looked at the correlation between Olympic medals awarded from the Olympic Games in Sydney in 2000 up to the Olympic Games in Vancouver 2010, and the NADOs or countries, and those that were compliant or in progress. 3,545 medals had been awarded in this period; of the 48 countries in which NADOs existed, 2,685 (76%) medals had been awarded. Combining the compliant category with the in-progress category, there were 141 countries with NADOs, representing 92% of the medals. The figures were facts and he had attempted to place

them in the bigger context of sporting performance in those countries that were compliant and in progress.

WADA assistance to signatories was something that it was important to emphasise, as every effort had been made to assist stakeholders and signatories with becoming Code-compliant. The WADA management, together with all of the WADA departments, including regional offices and RADOs, had contributed to get this in place. This had been at the top of the agenda of the WADA management over recent years. An online questionnaire with targeted questions had been submitted to everybody and most of the signatories had completed this. A lot of information had been obtained through ADAMS, since hundreds of ADOs used the system. WADA had also had great assistance from the IF relations office in Lausanne, as well as ASOIF, the recognised federations and SportAccord, which had been invaluable in approaching IFs and ensuring Code compliance.

Finally, he wished to acknowledge the considerable progress made by the signatories. This could not be emphasised enough. That being said, there was a long way to go between then and November for many to achieve compliance, and he encouraged them to do that as quickly as possible. He encouraged everybody, as this was not only a WADA issue. If November came around and WADA had to declare signatories non-compliant, it was something that was the business of the Foundation Board and everybody involved in anti-doping, so he would encourage full cooperation from everybody to take part in that endeavour.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE said that he thought that the report was very important and worthy of debate but that it should be based on real facts. Regarding Brazil, his country, he saw that the report mentioned as the Brazilian NADO a Brazilian doping control agency that did not exist, as it had never been approved, and did not mention the NOC agency approved by WADA and which was on the WADA website as the Brazilian doping control agency. If WADA started to accept facts and not ideas, the report would be based more on the truth and would be more accepted worldwide.

MS BOKEL said that it struck her that only one-third of the NADOs were able to meet those basic criteria. What criteria were missing in order to make this an indicator on quality as well? Would Mr Andersen also be able to provide statistics on that?

MR CZENE thanked Mr Andersen for mentioning Hungary, the one European country that had achieved full compliance. Nevertheless, it was his job to request on behalf of the other European countries some clarification on the possible consequences of non-compliance. When a NADO was non-compliant did that also mean that the laboratory in that country became non-compliant? He stressed that Europe felt that the report did not provide for any indications on the quality of the anti-doping programmes as it was important to look beyond regulations and focus on implementation and quality.

MR POUND said that he shared the views expressed on quality. The report seemed to be saying that signatories were compliant but a lot of the programmes were really terrible, and he did not know how that got WADA anywhere. It was nice to see progress but, quite frankly, progress was not the issue. The issue was to determine whether there was compliance or not, and he thought that one was either compliant or one was not. Progress was irrelevant to that. This was not rocket science. It was eight years since the Code had been adopted. There had been a few amendments, but nothing earth-shattering. There was no reason at all why any country, IF or NOC should not be Code-compliant at that point. Who was going to monitor the quality? Who was going to say that an anti-doping programme was really good or really bad and ineffective? He had been interested to see the statistics and percentages on Olympic medals, etc. but, frankly, that did not mean a thing in his view. He would favour issuing a report that said

that a signatory was compliant or not compliant. The progress was really the problem of a body that was not compliant. It would have to find some way of becoming compliant by November, and he had to say that he was not filled with confidence that full compliance would be achieved. WADA's job, and he hoped that WADA was committed to that, was that, in November 2011, it would issue a compliance report and then let the chips fall where they might. The IOC, an IF or a government had to put its money where its mouth was, but WADA could not avoid the responsibility of not making those calls.

MR RICCI BITTI voiced the frustration of the sports side on the matter and went back to what he had said that morning. When joining in the fight against doping in sport, the sport authorities had been asked to be compliant before the Olympic Games in Athens, and the governments had been asked to sign the UNESCO convention at the time. The contribution was not only a matter of money or signing the convention; it was also about putting in place legislation and effective NADOs, and this was clearly not the case. He also qualified, in defence of the IFs, what this exercise meant, and he was sure that non-compliance on the part of the IFs was basically administrative or formal matters. Unfortunately, non-compliance on the part of the NADOs was more substantial. The contribution to the fight against doping in sport was not a matter of a 2% budget increase; it was also about doing all these other things.

MR PENGILLY said that, from an athlete's perspective, when one went to the start line, one wanted to know that one had a fair opportunity, and harmonisation was absolutely central to this. Therefore, there was a real danger that, if countries or sports were not compliant, or if compliance measurements were not sufficiently robust, or if non-compliance was not sanctioned effectively, as an athlete, one was not getting that fair opportunity. What confirmation or information could the athletes have that these compliance issues would be handled robustly, so that they did have a really positive impact on doping in sport?

MR ANDERSEN told Professor De Rose that the only thing he could say about the facts was that the information received had come from the government, that an agency, called ABCD, had been established with rules but no programme. These were the facts WADA had received. He knew a little bit more about Brazil and he would not go into that at present. WADA would be going there in the near future to assess the situation and talk to the government about it, so he would leave it at that.

He told Ms Bokel that there were no statistics on which NADOs had not applied to certain elements of the rules section of this and the four different areas in the programme section of this but, in general, for many of the countries, there was an issue with rules specifically when legislation was involved: this took time and it might be a reason for a country not being compliant. In terms of the programmes, most of the signatories had education programmes in place, as that was not so difficult. The question of course was about the quality of the programmes, but he was not going directly into that. It was the in- and out-of-competition testing, which involved financial contributions and commitment, and that was where was the greatest lack of consistency in terms of reaching Code compliance.

He told Mr Czene that the ISL stated that a NADO and country would have to be Code-compliant in order to have a laboratory in a country and, if that was not the case, it would be brought forward to the Foundation Board to be dealt with.

Mr Pound had raised many issues that had been raised several times and discussed at length by the WADA management. How far should WADA go in declaring that a signatory was or was not compliant? How far should this be qualified in terms of what was actually being done? He was not sure that WADA would be capable of qualifying and looking at some sort of a quality assessment for 303 signatories, as it would be a huge

commitment. He had been carrying out quality assessments for anti-doping organisations and significant resources were required for just one organisation, so he would hesitate if asked to carry out assessments on such a huge scale. In terms of the comments on black and white, he thought that the report was black and white. It stated clearly that one was not compliant without the ten dots. The in progress category had been included in order to indicate that a body might step up and become fully compliant but, if one was not in the compliant category, one was not compliant; it was as simple as that.

He told Mr Ricci Bitti that different signatories had different qualities. Mr Ricci Bitti's federation was doing much more than most of the other IFs, and that should be made known. Looking at the list and the federations, one could see that some were compliant but, as mentioned before, WADA was not measuring the quality of the programmes.

He told Mr Pengilly that he thought that the WADA Foundation Board would have to clearly tell the athletes in November 2011 who met the criteria set by WADA for Code compliance. Those who did not meet the criteria would be declared by the Foundation Board as not compliant and this information would be made public, as stipulated by the Code.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there was much to be done; that was clear. There would be a final progress report in September and the obligation was to produce a compliance report in November. He would find it totally unacceptable to hear a motion from the Foundation Board in November to delay, postpone or otherwise do something that was not WADA's obligation. WADA's obligation was to produce a report and make it available to its stakeholders. He expected that this was what WADA would do. He asked the members to bear that in mind, along with the efforts that they (not just WADA) would have to make to get the organisations in their countries or the sports they represented or had influence over, to that compliance point. It was not a matter of quality, but WADA was obliged to produce a report and he believed that the delays of the past had damaged the integrity of WADA and he could not imagine that the members would want to cause any further damage by doing other than having a report, and if it showed that there was non-compliance, so be it, but he wanted to see the report tabled in November, after which WADA would send it to its stakeholders in accordance with the Code.

DECISION

Interim Code implementation and compliance report noted.

7.2 Code review process and timeline

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the issue was just to provide an outline of what WADA would do at the end of the year. The plan had been modified a little bit following suggestions made by the Executive Committee the previous day. The first consultation period would commence on 20 November, and it was important to note that, at that stage, the WADA management would be receiving submissions from all and then drafting the first draft of appropriate revisions, and it would then look to having consultation in relation to the standards. It was important to understand that it was not just the Code, it was also the standards, but the standards followed the Code, and the management would ensure extensive consultation in relation to all. The second consultation phase had been extended to 10 October, as it covered the period of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in London. The management would be undertaking the task in the same way as it had done in 2006 and 2007, with a small tight Code revision team, hopefully with the same composition as in 2007, as it was important to have the same drafting styles in relation to the language used in all of the documentation, so the

management was looking at that and would be asking people to be part of that in the coming weeks, and he would report in September. Those were the issues he had wanted to clarify. He would be happy to receive questions or comments.

MR POUND admitted that he was curious as to whether he had understood what had been discussed earlier by Ms De Boer-Buquicchio and Professor Ljungqvist. It had sounded as if there would be some kind of a debate, that the governments would say something and then the sports movement would say something. He hoped that this would not be a confrontational process, as WADA was trying to find the best Code. By the time WADA got the third consultation phase finished, it ought to be 95% or 99% clear and WADA should not need a whole bunch of polemics at the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Johannesburg. The more work that could be done beforehand, the better. WADA should not be drafting in a room full of 800 people. How the input got in was more essential to the consultation process than it was to the conference.

THE CHAIRMAN agreed with Mr Pound.

MR GIERSZ said that, as a representative of Europe, he welcomed the Code review process being launched by WADA. He stressed that Europe had already carried out some work on Code review at European level and the governments of the European Member States would contribute to the Code review process in due course.

DECISION

Code review process and timeline approved.

8. Athlete Biological Passport

MR VERNEC said that he would provide an update on the ABP. It was a programme that tested for biomarkers of doping rather than specifically testing for prohibited substances or methods. It had already been used as a valuable tool for target testing, and it had also been proven as a means to an anti-doping rule violation, validated by three recent rulings in the CAS, as described very nicely by Mr Niggli earlier that morning. The technical guidelines had been published in 2009 after a few years of consultation, and it was a complex and ever evolving area, so the management was continuing to look at the guidelines and, in that vein, WADA had had a haematological expert meeting in Lausanne in February that year. The mandatory elements of the technical guidelines had been found to be solid and robust, and perhaps just a bit of tweaking would be going on, particularly for administrative matters. Along these lines, a group of IFs and NADOs that were key players using the passport was being put together in Montreal; it would be a small group and hopefully there would be lively discussion, again, always looking for ways to enhance the programme in every possible way.

An increasing number of anti-doping organisations were engaged in the ABP programme; it was clear that there were only half a dozen doing the full programme following all the WADA technical guidelines and going all the way to result management, but there were others in different phases of implementation of the programme. There was already cooperation between different anti-doping organisations and, once some of the new guidelines were in place at the end of that year, particularly with an upgrade to ADAMS, some of the small issues about how to coordinate and get information back from a NADO to an IF would be solved very nicely.

The software would be incorporated within ADAMS, and this was a crucial element for the ABP. Unfortunately, the ABP would be in line, along with others, behind whereabouts, so he could not give an exact date for this; but, for the programme to be functional, it really had to be working through ADAMS. All of the anti-doping

organisations were encouraged to deal with whatever data protection or privacy issues that they might have so, once this was implemented in ADAMS, they would be able to participate fully.

Regarding software, looking at the blue lines in the middle, these were the actual data points; as the laboratories put information on blood parameters into the software, it would generate these profiles. What was nice about the ABP was that the upper and lower values were normally considered population reference values, but this adaptive model referred to inter-individual reference values, the athlete's own values that created his/her upper and lower values, and the members could see what this meant in the next slide, which showed an abnormal passport. Looking at the bottom right-hand side of the slide, the blue lines popped up above what would be a normal highest threshold for reticulocytes or immature red blood cells. The programme would generate a number and the ABP management unit would be notified and, if there was a number like 99.9% popping up, it meant that there was really only a one in 1,000 chance that this particular profile had been generated as a result of a normal physiological variation.

With regard to the APMUs, the members would see some of the administrative areas WADA was looking to try and change and enhance that year. WADA was trying to get some of the APMUs that would be WADA-associated and laboratory-associated, and some of the independent experts would be associated with the laboratories, the idea being, with the athlete passport management manager, as well as the experts, that there would be very rapid real-time feedback to the organisations. Some of the feedback would be that everything was under control and that they could decrease testing on a particular athlete, which would result in savings, and some would be that it was necessary to do some intelligent targeting and also, in some cases, if something looked disturbing on the passport, such as a possible pathology or illness, the ADO or the athlete would be advised rapidly.

The steroid module was still being worked on; it was still in the hands of the scientists and, when this was done at the end of the year, WADA would probably try to put together the technical guidelines in a full package the following year. This did not mean that there were not already some anti-doping organisations using the steroid module on their own and using some of the software to help them with targeting.

WADA had an endocrine module working group that was working with the IAAF to try and develop the endocrine module.

In summary, the ABP had already demonstrated that it was another valuable tool in the fight against doping in sport; not only was it useful as a standalone programme, but it should also be considered as an integrated aspect of other anti-doping programmes. It could enhance the analytical elements of somebody's programme, as well as working with intelligence gathering to work towards non-analytical anti-doping rule violations. WADA continued to engage with many ADOs on a regular basis to help them develop cost-efficient and effective programmes, always stressing quality over quantity.

MR DIKIC said that he believed that the ABP was very important in terms of anti-doping and also controlling the athletes. There was a sentence in the data protection section that said that it was of paramount importance that ADOs use ADAMS and not be inhibited by data protection laws. As a European representative, he requested some clarification on this.

DR SCHAMASCH said that, in London in 2012, the IOC would apply the ABP and he wanted to know when the ABP would be incorporated in ADAMS in order to start training people. It was obvious that the ABP would lead to new result management as it would be necessary to wait at games-time for the final results from the federations in order to

start its own result management process, which would lead to late results at the Olympic Games. That was obvious and normal, but it might lead to a new form of result management at games-time. In London, the IOC would start with four IFs, which was why he wanted to know when this would be incorporated in ADAMS.

MR VERNEC said that he would let Mr Niggli talk further about data protection, but the software was currently being distributed outside ADAMS and, for all of the reasons of security and the ability to transfer information in a secure fashion, WADA would be looking to have the ABP and software distributed only through ADAMS in the future so, at that point, certain countries not using ADAMS would obviously have some difficulty. The question of timing was something that would be discussed further when talking about ADAMS later that afternoon. For his group and the ABP, it was an absolute priority, but this would not realistically happen before 2012, and he could not give a date, and everybody understood that, for the athletes and everybody in WADA, whereabouts would take priority over putting the ABP into ADAMS.

There would be some exciting progress with elements of the passport programme that would really be part of the Olympic Games. It was nevertheless necessary to bear in mind that the passport was really a longitudinal profile, so it would not be possible to say that, during the Olympic Games, there would be a "bing", a point similar to an adverse analytical finding; nevertheless, there would be notifications and work with the IOC and IFs, and these were things that would have to be discussed again over the next few months.

MR NIGGLI said that, in relation to data protection, WADA should be very careful about inferring that there might be issues without having identified specific issues regarding the passport. Data protection had been discussed and he did not think that there were issues that were specific to the passport. The other thing that had been said many times was that data protection should not be mixed with ADAMS. These were two totally different things. ADAMS was only a tool. He thought that ADAMS was the most secure tool available on the market and he encouraged people to use it as he thought that it was the best way of fulfilling the requirements of data protection, but data protection was a different, legal issue and concerned any kind of transfer.

He thought that it was very good that there would be blood collection during the Olympic Games, but it was necessary to realise that passport cases were a totally different ball game to an AAF; it was not that one got a result and acted on it. One got a result that was reviewed by experts and so on, so there was no way that this would be dealt with during the Olympic Games; this was a process that would take time and the IF would have to deal with it. It was only an additional point in a longitudinal study during the Olympic Games, so whether it was part of ADAMS or not, he did not think that it would change anything as far as the ABP was concerned during the Olympic Games.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport update noted.

9. Anti-Doping Administration Management System (ADAMS)

MR KEMP referred the members to the details in the paper provided. He wished to highlight the developments related to the Athlete Whereabouts Module in particular and present a status report on that development, as well as provide a brief demonstration of the prototype of the new system.

By way of background, the Foundation Board should recall that, prior to 2009, there had been no standardised whereabouts rules and, in this respect, ADAMS had had to be a

flexible tool to collect whereabouts for all ADOs inasmuch as it needed to reflect the various rules and requirements of different sports. That said, the whereabouts module in ADAMS had been available since 2004, and had been built in consultation with 26 different ADOs, including NADOs, IFs, NOCs and major event organisers. It was also important to recall that most athletes had not been subject to whereabouts requirements at all and, certainly, the emphasis on whereabouts and the need for improvements to the system had in part been a consequence of the much larger number of athletes now subject to whereabouts, regardless of how they provided the information following the introduction of the 2009 IST. Following 2009 and the revised IST, which had included harmonised and standardised whereabouts requirements for all athletes for the first time, ADAMS had had to be updated accordingly, with one set of requirements in the system, so that athletes across sports and countries were providing the same type of information in the same fashion. In order to make the changes, the first step had been for WADA to consider the technical requirements of the IST, and have the system reflect these, and it had also continually received feedback from ADOs and athletes on what was working well and perhaps not as well prior to 2009. Once the revised requirements had been built into the system, WADA had convened a formal solicitation of feedback on the system and tried to incorporate that quickly. That review had resulted in more than 700 formal suggestions and recommendations for changes to the system, of which over 40% had related to whereabouts, so WADA had identified that improvements to the whereabouts module were of the highest priority.

The review had told WADA that it needed to have an updated look for the system, something that was more in line with best practice for online calendars and up-to-date software, and so the old system had been improved and updated. It had been important to increase and improve the usability of the system so that it was a more intuitive interface and athletes need not understand the system from a technical point of view but the system could guide them in an appropriate way to comply with requirements as easily as possible. WADA had actually added a substantial section to the new whereabouts module, the Whereabouts Guide, to do just that: guide the athletes through the process in a step-by-step fashion. The revision process, in order to achieve all of this, had included engaging a web development firm with experience in the look and feel of websites, as well as best practice about online interfaces. WADA had also taken the opportunity to improve the technical requirements in terms of what athletes needed to submit in the system at the same time, so he was confident that the new module better reflected the requirements of the IST. WADA had incorporated many of the comments from athletes and ADOs, and had finished a prototype of the interface, which would be presented to the Foundation Board. Throughout the process, WADA had introduced the prototype and draft requirements to a modest sized testing group, which it engaged on a regular basis to get feedback from direct users of the system. That testing group comprised the IAAF, the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, the IRB, UK Anti-Doping, the IRF, the UCI and the ISF. The revision process had also sought to engage athletes directly in the process. WADA had relied on ADOs to liaise with their own constituents and athletes for feedback, and that had been helpful, but the WADA Athlete Committee had also been quite helpful in the process. There had been multiple rounds of development of the prototype, although it still remained a draft. It had also been presented for the first time in late March at the ADO symposium hosted by WADA in Lausanne, and feedback had been quite positive.

MR WEINSTOCK showed the members the current whereabouts interface, with the whereabouts control panel, in which the athlete provided location descriptors, such as postal address, overnight residence, training and competition locations, and the monthly view, a visualisation in calendar format of the whereabouts entries that the user had put

into the calendar. The submission area typically presented the user with a list of error conditions that had to be corrected before whereabouts could be successfully submitted.

He showed the members the proposed interface, starting with the login screen. As the members would see, the team had generally improved the look and feel, usability and overall experience of the system, using technology and techniques consistent with modern web design. The members could see before them the homepage, and the team had organised the different modules into a grid format, with the names of the modules as well as the status associated with each module, so, looking at the whereabouts module in the top left-hand corner of the screen, one could see the name of the quarter, and the status, in this case not yet submitted. A new module had been added to ADAMS, called the Address Book. This was a list of all of the addresses or locations that athletes could use for submitting whereabouts. This was a centralised location, enabling users to maintain a list of location descriptors rather than having to re-enter the information each time. The members could see a sample screen for editing an existing address. The next step was actually submitting whereabouts. The team had introduced a new piece called the Whereabouts Guide. This was an instructional component that gave the users step-by-step information about the whereabouts submission process, such as why it was necessary to supply information, how to do it and where to go to find additional information, so the first step was an introduction, and the second step was the postal address. Users simply had to select an address from their address book and click in a check box to confirm that it was their mailing address for the quarter. The next screen showed overnight accommodation. The users started out with an empty calendar in the monthly view. To add entries, they simply had to click in a blank area, and a new dialogue would pop up enabling them to provide the relevant details, selecting the category, address, start time and 60-minute time slots. Once the entry was created, it appeared in the calendar, as could be seen on the screen. Users were also able to enter recurring entries, or multiple entries that would appear on several days, consecutive days or arbitrarily during the quarter, through the similar type of dialogue. In this case, a weekly recurring entry would be created from Monday to Friday for the entire month. The result of all this was essentially a fully populated calendar but, before users could actually submit their information, they could view immediately on the screen any errors preventing submission. The members would see on the left-hand side of the screen the mini-calendar, a representation of every single day in the quarter. Those days that had no problem appeared in black, but those days with an issue appeared in red, and users simply had to take the mouse and put it over the number to receive an additional error message telling them exactly what the problem was and exactly what they had to do to correct it, in which case, they had to move back to the calendar, click on the appropriate entry and make the changes that were necessary. Alternatively, users could return to the guide and they could see a summary in terms of which requirements had or had not been met for the submission of whereabouts. A green tick box indicated that everything was fine and a red X indicated that there was a problem and was accompanied with additional information.

The team had also added some features to the interface, such as, for advanced users, preventing the Whereabouts Guide from appearing when they went into the whereabouts module each time, as well as a weekly view and a daily view, which provided more precise and detailed information. Finally, there was the filter, which allowed users to display only certain types of entries in their calendars in order to eliminate clutter and more easily find information in the system.

MR KEMP said that he hoped that the members would agree that the look and feel were obviously far better than in the previous system, but he was aware that it was important to implement the system in a practical way and that it did not just look good,

but that it also worked well, so some additional steps had to be taken. There was a modern look and feel, the interface was more constructive for athletes, helping guide them through the process rather than acting punitively by identifying what they had done wrong, but it was necessary to make sure that it was implemented appropriately so that it was really workable for athletes. The next step was to work with the IT developers engaged in the system. WADA had now begun to hand off the work done by this web development firm to the existing IT service provider used for ADAMS development, so that it could incorporate the new look and feel into the entire system. This transfer of knowledge was ongoing and there would be several rounds of feedback with these different partners.

The target was to implement this no later than 15 November, because WADA would want it to be fully effective going into the New Year, and it was also necessary to find a date that did not interfere with other major events going on at the same time, and it needed to be built in and effective at such a time that it would not interfere with athletes. In other words, WADA did not want an athlete going into the system one day and seeing the old module, and then going into the system the next day and seeing something completely new without having been given advance notice and training on how to use the system, so, by having an implementation date late in the quarter, it was assumed that most athletes would already have provided information in the old system, and perhaps only some modest updating of information would be required. In addition to that implementation date, WADA was also committed to providing at least three months' notice to all ADOs and users of ADAMS as to the specific date, so that they could make the necessary changes within their own programmes as well as avail themselves of complementary resources that would be made available to them both for athletes and ADAMS administrators, and then there would be ongoing testing to see that the system was working as it should and evaluate any possible changes thereafter.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any questions or comments.

MS BOKEL said that she was happy that something was finally happening, but believed that the middle of November was rather late, as the IOC athletes' forum would be taking place in October, and she hoped that this would be up and running by the beginning of October so that it could be presented to the athletes. This suggestion had also been made at the meeting of the WADA Athlete Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had noticed Mr Reddie nodding his head in agreement, but would let Mr Kemp answer in due course.

MS SCOTT asked if there was a hotline available on the website that athletes could call if they were having difficulties. She knew that a lot of websites had that option in the event that people got so frustrated that they could call a number and somebody would walk them through the process. As to the communication strategy once the new format was released, how would that take place and how would that get to the athletes using ADAMS? Could the IOC Athletes' Commission be incorporated to really effectively communicate the new changes?

MR YOUNG said that he had suggested that the athlete representatives be involved in the trial process since they would be the ones hearing if people were happy or unhappy.

MR KEMP agreed entirely with what Ms Bokel had said. He would certainly like to implement this as soon as possible. The 15 November deadline was the latest target date, and he was hopeful that it might be sooner, but he was aware of the fact that WADA wanted to deliver a quality product. WADA did not want to rush something in that would have to be remedied later on, and he was confident that good progress was being

made in the right direction, and WADA had certainly shown that concrete progress was being made. In that respect, he stressed that quality was necessary prior to implementation. Also, WADA wanted to build time into the development process for adequate user testing. It was one thing for WADA and IT developers to be using the system, and they were becoming overly familiar with it, but an objective evaluation of the system was also necessary, so WADA would like to build in adequate testing time for athletes and ADOs, and that also related to Ms Scott's point about communicating the changes to athletes. WADA was committed to this three-month period to advise ADOs as to what these changes would be, and in some respects WADA would leave it to them to use their existing communication strategies to convey the information to their athletes. However, he pointed out that one current weakness with whereabouts systems and in particular ADAMS was that there was a very disparate level of support provided to athletes within different registered testing pools at the various NADOs and IFs, and that was the reason that the guide had been built into the system, so that there was a basic level of support and guidance provided to athletes regardless of the support provided to ADOs, and the current hotline would remain for the system; it tended to be more technical, although he was hopeful that the hotline would be used less as the system would be more intuitive and provide more information. He agreed that athlete involvement in the process would be key, and had been pleased that four members of the WADA Athlete Committee had been engaged in the testing group itself and WADA had received valuable comments from them, and there would be expanded opportunities for all ADOs to test the system and, if anybody could identify individual opportunities for athletes to be providing further feedback, he would be very open to those opportunities.

MR REEDIE said that, from a credibility, financial and every other point of view, it was now crucial that WADA make this work no later than 15 November and, if there were major athlete forums, Mr Kemp had to be able to run it though that format in October, but WADA had invested enormous sums of money and this had to be made to work on a credibility basis. As he understood it, the difficulties for people who used other systems were very modest and could be overcome, and the certainty of doing this through the Olympic Games in London seemed to him to be absolutely important, and then WADA could move on, but WADA really had to make it work.

THE CHAIRMAN said that that sentiment had been echoed at the Executive Committee meeting the previous day.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the next WADA Athlete Committee meeting would be held in Colorado Springs at the same time as the IOC athletes' forum, courtesy of the IOC Athletes' Commission, giving WADA an ideal opportunity to do exactly what Ms Bokel wanted it to do, and WADA would certainly take advantage of that occasion.

MR POUND observed that none of these systems was ever perfect, so WADA should not let perfection get in the way of really really good in terms of the launch.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE noted that the Pan American Games would be held from 15 to 30 October, and ADAMS would be used, so changing ADAMS during the event might be somewhat difficult.

THE CHAIRMAN clarified that ADAMS would not be changed; it would be made more user-friendly.

MR PENGILLY asked whether Portuguese would be included in the new system and, for athletes not having the nine languages as their first language, would there be some sort of support, and how would that work? Would it be through the IFs and their relevant ADO or through WADA?

MR KEMP thanked Professor De Rose for his support during the Pan American Games.

Language was an important issue with ADAMS and WADA was trying to assess which languages were most important to the system. This involved an evaluation of which athlete populations were providing whereabouts, so that WADA could ensure that ADAMS was a viable tool for them. There were currently nine languages in the system, but Portuguese was not one of them, although it was at the top of the list of the next languages to come into the system. There was a delicate balance whereby WADA needed to finalise the new whereabouts module and do language at the same time, and there was an argument to be made that WADA wait until the new system was developed so that it knew exactly what all the terminology, expressions and terms used in the system were before implementation, as much of the language in the system was contextual; it was not a quick translation but rather how the word was used on that particular page, so it was a matter of broader consideration for WADA, not only in terms of how to evaluate what languages should be built into the system, but also how to do that, and it also related to quality, in that, every time WADA made a change to the system, it needed to go back and ensure that all of the language remained of a high quality so that the support was being provided to the athletes. If there was good language in the system, the support was there for those athletes using it in their language, but what additional support was necessary? WADA tried to make ADAMS available in as many languages as possible; however, ADOs themselves could dictate what language an athlete was to provide whereabouts in and, in this respect, ADAMS could be a limitation if it did not include that language, but ultimately it would be the rules and operational procedures of the individual ADO that would determine the language in which the athletes had to provide their whereabouts and, beyond that, WADA would look to the anti-doping community to let it know if it felt that an additional language should be incorporated, and then WADA would assess the viability of that.

DECISION

ADAMS update noted.

10. Department reports

10.1 Communications

– 10.1.1 Athlete Committee chair report

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that Mr Fetisov was absent from the meeting and, in his absence, the report would be given by Dr Elwani.

DR ELWANI said that the WADA Athlete Committee had met on 22 and 23 March in Lausanne. The first day of the meeting had included participation in the anti-doping symposium and, on the second day, the committee members had met on their own. She was happy to give the members an overview of the meeting discussions on behalf of the chairman of the committee.

Regarding the ABP, the members strongly suggested that the WADA guidelines specify the sharing of the analysis of the blood profile with the athletes. Keeping blood analysis information from the athletes for three months as suggested by an ADO at the symposium would be wrong and ethically questionable. The passport should be promoted as a clean athlete tool. A universal passport would breed trust in the anti-doping system.

Regarding ADAMS, an overview of improvements on the whereabouts module had been presented, and four members of the committee had been involved in the focus group's work that past quarter. On the whole, the comments had been positive. Navigation, ease of use, flexibility and modern look and feel had been highly appreciated. It was suggested that the module be presented at the next IOC athletes' forum in October.

Regarding laboratories, a concern had been raised about the perception that WADA-accredited laboratories were not harmonised with analysis. The athletes felt that information about the laboratories was insufficient and, in order to help raise trust in the system, an awareness campaign should be considered.

Following a discussion about reported unethical behaviour by DCOs, the committee recommended that WADA standardise training programmes for DCOs and include an ethical code of conduct. Applying a harmonised approach would help instil trust in the anti-doping system.

"Say No! to Doping" was an awareness campaign that sought to engage sport and anti-doping communities in demonstrating their commitment to clean sport. The committee recognised the importance of the campaign and fully supported it. It was recommended that it be kept general, and it should not be individualised to one athlete or a specific athlete ambassador.

The members had been asked to provide opinions on an issue that would also be presented to the anti-doping community for consultation: the need to continue taking two samples, the A and B. Science experts had expressed their views that both A and B samples were not necessary. The committee's points of discussion on the subject had been as follows:

Removing the B sample was a matter of trust and, if the athletes trusted the anti-doping system, there should not be any difficulties in doing so. Testing had greatly improved over the past two years. The paperwork was universal and the chaperoning much better. One sample should be trusted. For the time being, there was peace of mind with having the B sample. It was about trust and making sure that everything happened correctly. The right to a fair hearing would be quicker and less complicated without the B sample. WADA needed to enhance laboratory accountability.

Mr Miller had presented the no-needle policy initiated by his team over one year previously. Needle injection had never been proven to have a needed benefit outside of a justifiable medical need. No child who had ever dreamt of being an Olympian should have to deal with needles unless he or she had a medical problem. Mr Miller and his team believed that banning any kind of needle use in cycling could help in the fight against doping, as well as close collaboration with criminal investigators and the police. The members supported the no-needle policy.

There had been several occasions that year on which WADA had partaken in governmental meetings at which the heads of the European Elite Athletes Association had been present. WADA had also asked to respond to queries from their president. Over the past year, they had become more vocal and organised with other athlete groups. The anti-doping topic seemed to be one of the latest levers that they were using to showcase their arguments. Some of the athlete members believed that WADA should not be engaging with the player unions.

Members had raised concern about the CAS applying prohibitive additional fees to the standard filing fee of 500 Swiss francs when the appeal came from a national decision. Some fees had recently been as high as 7,000 Swiss francs. The committee wished to be updated on this matter.

The next meeting was scheduled to take place in October 2011.

MR YOUNG said that one of the things that he would like the athletes to consider on the issue of sharing blood profile information with athletes was that the profile and passport system were most important when dealing with those sophisticated athletes who were successfully avoiding testing positive, and those were the very last people in the world one would want to share the information with, as that would help them beat the system. He understood that there were a lot of reasons why athletes might want to see that information, but one would not want to give some of the bad guys he had to deal with in his life that advantage in the process.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Elwani for the report.

MS BOKEL said that she thought that the bad guys would have their own passport anyway and the good guys would be happy to see something that they might not have noticed, such as a disease; therefore, it had been felt that it would be useful to share information with the athletes.

– **10.1.2 Communications update**

MS MASSE informed the members that the main objective of the 100 Free programme was to distribute the Prohibited List to core stakeholders early in the year. WADA covered all costs for the programme, including shipping and handling. That year, 146 organisations had received the programme compared to only 30 organisations requesting the material the year before. ADOs could request 100 copies of the Prohibited List in wallet card size in English, French or Spanish, and the booklet size had also been supplied. More than 13,000 wallet cards and 1,500 booklets had been distributed to date. These numbers made 2011 the year of the widest distribution of the Prohibited List since its introduction. The Prohibited List was also the most downloaded or viewed document on the website. In addition, WADA had included 100 copies of the "At A Glance" series in English, French and Spanish in the package, including a CD-ROM with design files for future reproduction and translation.

The iPhone application launched in December had been widely accepted, with more than 3,500 downloads, which exceeded the department's initial conservative objectives. Following numerous requests, the department was looking to make the 2012 List available for other mobile applications, budget permitting.

The members would have received a folder containing the new outreach model presented the previous November to the Foundation Board. It had been launched in February after extensive redesign and marketing efforts. The model offered stakeholders an easy way to deliver outreach in their own countries and sports. It was a comprehensive turnkey programme provided at no cost, available in English French and Spanish. Since 2008, the department had seen an average increase of approximately 20% uptake per year, and 2011 had already exceeded that mark. 100 organisations were now using the model, 30 more than last reported in November. The latest organisations and countries requiring it were as diverse as Botswana, Seychelles, Romania and Australia. The model required limited resources from ADOs, and it could be adapted to different levels: gold, silver and bronze. Those were detailed in the folder. The bronze was the basic setup and could be delivered using the free starter kit with the items listed on the screen. The success of the programme was largely due to promotional efforts made by the RADOs and the regional offices. Following a presentation of the model at WADA's symposium, WADA had received many requests, indicating that it had to pursue marketing efforts in that area.

The "Say No! to Doping" campaign was an awareness campaign launched in 2010. It sought to engage sport and anti-doping communities in demonstrating their commitment to clean sport by incorporating green elements in sporting equipment and competition venues. The campaign provided for an opportunity to highlight the importance of fair play and respect. It was a starting point for meaningful anti-doping education programmes. The concept was simple to implement, inexpensive, and opportunities were endless. Following the successful pilot programme in Finland with the International Ice Hockey Federation, the "Say No! to Doping" campaign had been launched in May 2010 at the Ice Hockey World Championships in Germany and later adopted by FIFA for the Football World Cup, followed by the International Archery Federation at the Youth Olympic Games and the International Floorball Federation.

The previous autumn, the Brazilian NADO had showcased the campaign at the national youth games, and the ITU would feature it at its championships in London that summer. Thailand, New Zealand and Nepal had also introduced the campaign. WADA had received numerous calls for interest from other organisations for implementation in 2011, and she would report on those in November.

Tools had been created for stakeholders to implement the "Say No! to Doping" campaign and they were provided at no cost; they were all part of the outreach model.

The objectives for 2011 and 2012 were to make the "Say No! to Doping" campaign easily accessible to all stakeholders and to raise awareness globally. The members could see on the screen a sneak preview of the "Say No! to Doping" campaign website, which would go live in the next few days. It incorporated the latest functionalities to help disseminate the anti-doping message. The web concept was to call to action ADOs, as well as athletes and the public, encouraging visitors to write a comment to show their support to the "Say No! to Doping" campaign, and to share these on the website, Twitter and Facebook. It was hoped that, through this action, when athletes and the public were at sporting events, they would already have seen the campaign and immediately recognise it. The aim was to ensure a high level of awareness. Other actions under way included an athlete brochure, a marketing brochure and a short clip to support the viral effect. All of these programmes and projects were designed and delivered within the current budget, which had not been increased over the past few years. As the members could see, the department was being creative and doing more with less.

DECISION

Communications report noted.

10.2 Education

– 10.2.1 Education Committee chair report

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that, for the first time, the USA was chairing the Education Committee that year.

MR BAUM said that the Education Committee had met the previous week in Montreal and he was delighted to provide a report on the outcomes in nine subject areas.

First, the committee had discussed the 2012 social science research grant programme budget, and had agreed to recommend to the WADA Finance and Administration Committee that the budget for social science research be maintained at 400,000 dollars as opposed to increasing it to 500,000 as previously discussed.

An overview of the outcomes of WADA's social science research grant programme had been provided at the meeting and the following recommendations had been made:

research outcomes should be provided to NADOs so that they could be used to assist them with the development of their education programmes. An overview of the research projects and progress had been provided for comment and would be taken into consideration when looking ahead and planning the 2012 programme.

The committee had been encouraged that an action plan was being developed by the department as a result of the outcomes of the 2010 Social Science Research Symposium.

The committee had also discussed other areas for potential additional target research, and had suggested considering exploring the following topics: why athletes say no to doping; impact and risks of using athlete role models as deliverers of education; and how to increase social science research in other areas of the world on doping subjects.

The committee had supported the concept for the 2012 funding of a literature review as part of the target research programme

The committee had committed to explore possible areas for the 2012 target research programme during the social science research conference call in October 2011.

The committee had identified a need for more effort in promoting research in Africa and Asia, and had also identified a need to increase efforts in South America from an education and research perspective. Recognising the challenges associated with only accepting research reports written in English and French in areas of the world in which these languages were not the official languages, the committee suggested allowing researchers to include the costs of translation of their reports into English or French in their research budgets.

The IOC had agreed to promote the IOC young investigators award with education contacts within Olympic Games and Youth Olympic Games organising committees.

The committee had identified a need to work with NADOs to encourage more education in schools, recognising that NADOs must take the lead. The committee recommended that the Education Department define a strategic plan to find ways of engaging countries and integrating education in schools.

The International Paralympic Committee had thanked WADA for its involvement in regional games through outreach and education programmes. WADA had been asked to consider how to make material accessible to athletes with disabilities and that all programmes continue to be culturally sensitive.

The committee had supported the development of the learning object repository in order to make it easier for different groups to download and get materials on education that could be tailored to the needs of different groups. The committee had committed to assisting the development of the repository.

The committee recommended that the Education Department look at creating an ad-hoc youth advisory group, possibly made up of young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 years. The committee recommended making the youth zone section of WADA's website more dynamic for youth, and suggested developing an education application for smart phones in the future

– **10.2.2 Education update**

MR KOEHLER informed the members that there was a detailed report in the members' papers, so he would not go into every point, although there were two items he wished to highlight, one of which was not in the report. On 15 April, the WADA Education Department had attended the Council of Europe education advisory meeting and, from a WADA standpoint, it had been a fruitful opportunity to engage ADOs in developing and

sharing ideas on how to further advance programmes for youth. In line with youth, the members had heard at the previous Foundation Board meeting that the Play True Generation programme, a new programme for young people, had been launched at the Youth Olympic Games in Singapore. This event and programme had received the highest amount of visitors at the Youth Olympic Games and had been rated the top culture and education programme, and he thanked the IOC for producing a very interactive video that highlighted the activities in Singapore.

DECISION

Education report noted.

10.3 Governments (including UNESCO convention)

MS JANSEN informed the members that she would be giving them a short update on the completion of the UNESCO convention and information relating to UNESCO. To date, 156 governments had completed the convention, representing an increase of six since the previous Foundation Board meeting in November, and it was higher than expected. The biggest jump was in the Asian region, with three completing; one had completed in Africa, one in the Americas and one in Oceania. WADA was still tracking at UNESCO record pace for completion. Those countries that had and had not completed were published on the website, and the aim was to achieve 100%. In terms of world population, based on a UN population figure of 6.7 billion, WADA was now at 95%, an increase of 1% since November the previous year. The breakdown of the 5% showed that Asia and Africa had the most yet to complete in terms of population, with the remainder from the Americas, Europe and Oceania. For the 37 yet to complete, there were 20 in the "In progress" category, and three of those, Uzbekistan, Micronesia and Gambia, had sent their instruments to UNESCO for verification. That was the final step in the process. There were 17 countries for which very limited to no information was available, and that could be due to elections, changes in government officials, or ongoing economic and political crises. WADA strongly encouraged finalisation through its regional offices, Foundation Board members, RADOs, at sports meetings and governmental meetings.

The UNESCO voluntary fund had been set up under the convention to assist governments with carrying out their anti-doping responsibilities. Only states parties that had completed the convention could apply. Currently, just under four million dollars were available, and countries could apply for 20,000 for a national project and 50,000 for a regional project. To date, 47 applications had been approved. Speaking with her colleagues, they knew that this fund did provide an incentive, particularly for the RADO countries to complete the convention and use the funds to good effect for anti-doping projects. In terms of the number of applications made, in 2008, there had been four, in 2009, eight, in 2010, 24 and, that year, 11 had been approved. A total of 750,000 US dollars had been spent to date and the approval committee that made decisions on applications to the fund would meet again on 9 June.

With regard to UNESCO, the third conference of parties meeting would be taking place from 14 to 16 November, and the intention was that the invitation to the meeting would be sent via UNESCO delegates. The President and Director General had been invited to make a speech and open the meeting. It coincided well with the Foundation Board meeting, which would take place the following weekend on 19 and 20 November. One of the agenda items would be the UNESCO convention compliance report. The UNESCO convention questionnaire would be available for completion by governments in June and they would have around three months to respond to that.

MR FUJIWARA said that Japan had continued its efforts, including sending government officials accompanying Mr Hayashi, the WADA Asia/Oceania Regional Office Director, to the embassies of non-contracting countries in Tokyo and requesting that their ambassadors persuade their governments to sign the convention. Since the Foundation Board meeting the previous November, four more countries had ratified the convention: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Sri Lanka and Turkmenistan. He believed that this was the result of ongoing efforts and Japan continued to work proactively with Mr Hayashi to increase the number of countries ratifying the convention in the region.

His second point regarded additional contributions. In previous years, Japan had paid through JADA an additional contribution to support RADOs in the Asian region. Japan would continue this support for anti-doping activities in the region.

THE CHAIRMAN acknowledged the tremendous support provided by Japan to the Asian region and the regional office which was very much appreciated by WADA.

DECISION

Governments report noted.

10.4 International Federations

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that Mr Donzé was the Director of the WADA European Regional Office and also responsible for IFs, so perhaps Mr Donzé might like to address both issues in his report.

MR DONZÉ informed the members that he would combine his reports on the European regional office and IFs for a very obvious reason, which was that the primary mandate of the European office was to act as a liaison with the IFs.

The office was set up and operated as an interface with IFs and IF umbrella organisations and a number of major games organisations, including the IOC, IPC and other major games organisers, such as the International World Games Association. The role of the office was reflected in its location. As the members were aware, it was based at the Maison du Sport Internationale in Lausanne, and this allowed the office to have close relationships with many IFs based in Lausanne or Switzerland or Europe. A number of umbrella organisations were also located in Lausanne or Switzerland along with major event organisers, as he had pointed out earlier.

The role was very specific in terms of IF liaison, but the scope of work was fairly broad. As the members could see from the chart, the office dealt with more than 90 highly diverse IFs of different categories (summer and winter IFs, recognised and non-recognised, members of SportAccord), but all had a very diverse nature, very diverse needs and were at diverse stages of development in terms of anti-doping, so the office really had to tailor its approach to make sure that it could provide valuable support to each of them.

The European office had been through a reshuffle over the past few months. Mr Fairweather, his predecessor in Lausanne, had joined the IHF and Ms Bousigue, the IF manager, had joined LOCOG. He had taken up his position in early February in Lausanne and had been joined at the beginning of April by Ms Zumbrunnen, who had previously been the anti-doping and medical manager at the FIG; together, they worked to make sure that they could cooperate with IFs.

In light of the new configuration of the office and based on the anti-doping agenda that year, a number of priorities had been established for 2011 which were fairly straightforward. The first priority was to be sure to build and maintain mutually

beneficial relationships with all IFs and, in the lead-up to the Code compliance report in November that year, the office would strive to support IFs to achieve Code compliance and help them implement or sustain effective anti-doping programmes. More generally, the office would strive to further coordinate actions with IF umbrella organisations, and he thanked Mr Ryan at ASOIF and Françoise Dagouret at SportAccord in particular for the great cooperation that would continue to help WADA support IFs. Of course, the office strove to provide strategic and technical advice, support and expertise to IFs, and also strove to share anti-doping resources and best practices in the best possible way. WADA had numerous free resources available for stakeholders and he wanted to make sure that these resources were properly promoted among IFs.

How did the office work with IFs? There were obvious channels, one of which was to establish contact and, when there was a new team in place, it was easy, as it was necessary to meet the IFs and introduce oneself. The office received a significant number of queries on a daily basis, ranging from operational matters to more political matters, and it tried to answer them in cooperation with the headquarters, and it had a number of discussions with IFs in various settings and worked in close cooperation with SportAccord, which helped reach the IFs.

The office also tried to make the most of a number of events. The members would receive a short report on the WADA ADO symposium that had taken place in Lausanne in March that year. The Director General had mentioned the SportAccord convention, which provided WADA with an ideal opportunity to meet with IFs, and WADA also organised or took part in a number of events at which it could convey its message or answer IF questions. One of the examples given earlier by the Director General, the IWF conference in Istanbul, had been a significant success.

IFs shared a number of challenges, some of which were specific, some of which they shared with other anti-doping and WADA stakeholders. These challenges had a certain impact on WADA's work. It was no mystery that the fight against doping in sport had to be carried out with limited financial resources and the office was doing its best to work with IFs to find ways and means to make the most of available resources. A number of small IFs also suffered from a lack of expertise, and that was also where the Lausanne office could try to help as much as possible, and this was also being done by further developing a number of tools and avenues for support.

Sports and IFs had an issue and faced a challenge that many other pyramidal organisations faced, which was to push the information to the NFs and make sure that they could reach all athletes with the anti-doping message, and the office was there to try and help as much as possible. One recurring challenge mentioned by IF representatives at a number of previous meetings was cooperation and synergy between IFs and NADOs. This was something that the office tried to address on a continual basis, in particular once a year through the WADA ADO symposium, but it was something that he would bear in mind, along with all of the other challenges, so as to factor it into his work in the coming months.

Looking ahead, not only did he want to factor these challenges into his work, he also wanted to further strengthen cooperation with the IFs, in particular by addressing their concerns in concrete ways and, to a certain extent, the timing was ideal, because of the review of the Code and international standards, which would provide a good avenue for IFs and WADA to cooperate and make sure that the fight against doping in sport for the IFs could be conducted in the best possible way.

DECISION

International Federations report noted.

10.5 Programme development

MR KOEHLER told the members that he wanted to give them an overview of why and where the RADOs had started. As the members would recall, when the Code had come into force in 2003, there had been very limited involvement from the majority of countries in anti-doping and, as a result, WADA had had to look at what it needed to do. Before doing that, it had had to look at the frame conditions and the reality had been that very few countries knew about WADA, very few knew about the Code, they had no idea what the UNESCO convention was, anti-doping processes were something that was featured in books but not in practical applications, and the majority of the countries WADA was working with had competing social and economic priorities. Therefore, it had been realised that sustainable development was not going to happen overnight. It was a difficult thing to accept, as WADA had wanted to see action overnight; however, recognising that development did take time. That was when programme development had been introduced through the RADO programme. It had started in 2005 with five RADOs, followed by four more in 2006, an additional five in 2007, and one in 2008. This programme had been an offer to assist countries and regions and had not been forced upon them, so it had been a voluntary programme. The key to its success had been inviting governments and NOCs together to ensure buy-in from both bodies. There was no question that there had been an investment in time and resources to assist the countries and regions, from their side and WADA's side. It was a mutual investment. The programme had been moved forward due to the strong leadership and involvement of the WADA regional offices; they knew what was happening in the regions and how to deal with it, and their leadership had helped achieve the current situation. Partnerships had been crucial as well: 122 countries through 15 regions. WADA could not have done it without partnerships in the region. More importantly, while there were 15 RADOs, they were not dealt with in the same manner; they were dealt with as individual regions with individual needs and requirements, which was why each had individual plans in place.

When WADA had started the programme, it had not jumped into anti-doping; it had established a structure, and had had to start from the basis of getting people involved, understanding their roles and responsibilities, and what framework conditions they would work under. WADA had had to compose a board with governments and NOCs, develop simple and basic terms of reference, a strategic plan and operational plans before getting into the whole concept of training, board meetings and looking at developing structures and priorities for the regions. The RADO office was a very unique structure that combined involvement of governments and NOCs, where one representative per country was identified to sit on the RADO board. From there, the RADO office had been established, and training sessions had been carried out. Every country had had DCOs trained, TUE committees had been established, and result management panels and appeals panels had been established, all of which made up an ADO, but not individually – these were shared resources among the regions and the countries. Those were the outcomes but, to move forward, WADA had developed RADO rules, whereby rules were shared by the region. He was pleased to say that all countries with the exception of a few had RADO rules in place, with committees established to be able to function as an ADO, and the last element (as had been asked earlier that day), for some of the regions, had been out-of-competition testing. This involved help and assistance with the support of the WADA Standards and Harmonisation Department to make sure that athletes were being tested in each of the regions.

He did not think that the Foundation Board members could not underestimate the great opportunity that the RADOs had afforded to WADA. There were 15 regions with direct contact with 122 countries. Looking at the framework, it had been realised that it was easing the burden of NOCs and governments, helping them to establish

programmes. WADA could not have done it without partners, as he had mentioned. Some 15 NADOs had helped with training, there had been involvement of governments (Australia had helped fund the Oceania RADO through the employment of a staff member and the provision of education funds, Canada was employing the Caribbean RADO staff and providing education funds, and Japan supported all of the RADOs by providing funds, assistance and training throughout Asia). WADA also had the support of other organisations, which were listed, although he had left out the UCI, the latest sport to help out with training. It was a programme that engaged a lot of organisations to help development. The members would see on the screen the situation in 2004, when WADA had started to develop, and the landscape in 2011, which was very different, with countries engaged and involved in anti-doping – 15 RADOs encompassing 122 countries.

These organisations and countries were developing, working and doing testing, but there was more, and the matter of reducing costs had been discussed. These RADOs were ready to do work for themselves as well as help IFs. There were 15 regions that they could reach out to in order to coordinate testing in 122 countries and get their education materials out. Through effective partnerships with 15 regions, they could reach 122 countries, and he hoped that this would help the IFs and other organisations in need of support as well as help the RADOs grow and get more up to speed in terms of expertise.

DECISION

Programme development report noted.

10.6 Medical

MR VERNEC informed the members that he would be extremely brief, as most of the information could be found in the report. The Medical Department, after overhauling the method in which it had screened TUEs the previous year, continued to do this on a regular basis. WADA used ADAMS to generate reports and this was extremely useful to look for inconsistencies, as well as to be able to look for particular substances in which it might be interested.

The TUE Expert Group worked on a regular basis on the guidelines or medical information to assist TUE committees. Some of the projects on which it was presently working were ADHD, intravenous infusions, some cardiovascular issues, and the difficult subject of hypogonadism or low circulating testosterone levels.

DECISION

Medical report noted.

10.7 Regional offices

– 10.7.1 Tokyo

MR HAYASHI informed the members that his report focused on recent anti-doping developments since the previous November. Highlights included an intergovernmental meeting to be held the following week in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and RADO development, especially Code compliance progress, as well as improvements to the ratification process for the UNESCO convention and regional cooperation development and other initiatives of the advanced NADOs in partnership with WADA.

The main focus of the agenda for the Riyadh meeting was on issues relating to contributions to WADA. The intergovernmental meeting was the only governmental framework in the region to discuss and decide on anti-doping policy direction. It was

expected that an agreement would be reached on the new formula of contributions and also issues regarding the non-payment of countries and the establishment of an anti-doping foundation, based on the recommendation by the Asian finance committee, headed by Mr Hadidi, a Foundation Board member. The goal was to make an agreement for all governments to continue contributions to WADA for sustained anti-doping development programmes in Asia.

The previous year, the Asian region had achieved 96.1% of contributions, which was a relatively improved figure, but still almost one-third of the 42 countries had not yet paid for the previous year. This was a very serious situation, and the Riyadh meeting was expected to promote the situation.

Six RADOs in the region were moving into the next stage from the stage of establishment of the system, training human resources and making rules relating to practice. Through regional and sub-regional games and WADA out-of-competition testing programmes and doping control programmes, testing and result management, TUEs were actually implemented in all countries under the RADO framework.

Regarding the UNESCO convention, as already mentioned, six countries had completed in the region and six were making progress. Regarding the UNESCO fund, the national education programmes of four countries, as well as Palau, had been approved by the UNESCO Secretariat. At the forthcoming meeting in Riyadh, the invitation of a UNESCO Secretariat guest speaker would provide a good opportunity to make governments pay attention and apply their anti-doping programmes to UNESCO and also invite contributions to the UNESCO fund.

JADA and ASADA continued to assist other NADOs in the region through providing seminars and training courses on NADO management, science and research policy, as well as investigation policy, which were challenging issues in the region.

He was also pleased to report that CHINADA (the Chinese anti-doping agency) and KADA (the Korean anti-doping agency), as well as ADAMAS (the Malaysian anti-doping agency), would continue to support other anti-doping developments in the region.

– 10.7.2 Montevideo

MS PESCE thanked the governments and NOCs for their efforts regarding Code compliance. The issue had been a priority over the past few months and, as the members could see on the slide, the previous year, 19 countries had had rules in line and, one year later, 37 had rules in line, out of 88 countries in the region.

Regarding the Code compliance survey, 30 countries had completed it, and work in the coming months would be targeted to those countries that were not yet compliant or were in progress so that they could achieve full compliance.

Regarding the UNESCO convention, 30 out of 35 countries had ratified, representing 97.61% of the population in the region. Five countries were still in progress: Belize, Costa Rica and Honduras in Central America, and Dominica and the Dominican Republic in the Caribbean. Since the previous meeting, Chile had ratified, and she thanked Chile for its commitment in this regard.

Regarding the UNESCO voluntary fund, 13 countries had applied the previous year and, to date, 16 projects in the region had been approved. The office was currently working with the countries shown in red on the slide and expected that they would be able to apply to the next UNESCO approval committee meeting in June. She congratulated those countries currently implementing these projects, most of which

targeted anti-doping education among athletes and their entourage, and also encouraged them and the rest of the countries in the region to apply.

There were two RADOs in the region, involving 22 countries. The Caribbean RADO had held its board meeting in February in Suriname, and the Central American RADO had held its board meeting in April in Panama. The outcome of both meetings had been successful. At both, WADA had organised extremely successful TUE and result management seminars, considering that attendance of the representatives of the countries had been 100%.

A university education project had been implemented in Uruguay successfully the previous year and would be part of the university curricula again that year. The office was working to replicate the experience with universities in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

The outreach model had been implemented in Barbados, St Kitts and Trinidad and Tobago within the UNESCO project and targeting youth games. It would also be implemented at the Youth Central American Games in El Salvador in September, the CONCECADE Games in Panama in November, with the attendance of more than 5,000 young athletes, and the South American Beach Games in December in Ecuador.

As far as meetings and events were concerned, she had visited the NADOS of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia and Panama; she had given talks and participated in anti-doping seminars in these countries, and she highlighted the high attendance of the seminars and the quality of their work. She had also attended a number of governmental meetings. She welcomed the new representatives of the Latin American region to the Foundation Board from Guatemala and Ecuador, and wished them success in their mission. She had recently visited countries from the Andes region, and had chosen typical music from the region to share some pictures with the members, whom she thanked for their ongoing support.

– 10.7.3 Lausanne

Lausanne regional office report provided as part of the IF report (item 10.4).

– 10.7.4 Cape Town

MR SWIGELAAR thanked the Chairman for giving him the opportunity to highlight some of the progress WADA had made in the African region since he had last reported in November.

Adherence to the tenets of the Code and the need for countries to actively pursue full compliance was a key area that the African regional office was advancing. Through WADA's most recent involvement in the six RADOs in Africa, notable progress had been achieved, especially in terms of capacitating the RADOs and national programmes through training in result management and TUEs. Because of the training, zones 2 and 3, 4 and 5 and the Indian Ocean RADOs had result management and TUE committees in place. Since February that year, 28 experts from 31 countries had received instruction in TUEs and 31 experts from the same number of countries had completed result management training. Due to the political situation in certain North African countries, it had not been possible to extend the training as planned to zone 1 or the North African RADO and, because of the current process of reconstituting and restructuring the zone 6 RADO, training in the Southern African region had also been postponed until later in 2011. Thanks were due to the South African Institute for Drug-Free Sport, as well as the UCI, for providing expertise.

He stressed the critical need for partnerships, especially in Africa, to promote and advance anti-doping. Resources for anti-doping remained scarce and would continue to

pose challenges. The role of the UNESCO voluntary fund for the elimination of doping in sport provided vital resources where none or very few were available. To date, 14 African states parties had benefited from the initiative, while others awaited consideration and approval. RADOs were well placed to assist countries with developing proposals and even deliver tangible and substantive projects at the national and regional levels. He ventured to suggest that much more assistance to RADOs through the voluntary fund, including support for day-to-day administrative needs, would add more value to regional and anti-doping interests. Others had also expressed this to UNESCO. The African regional office continued to assist countries and RADOs in their attempts to access these funds. It also continued to work with CONFEJES on the management of the funds made available by CONFEJES to its African members for anti-doping educational projects. The process was slow but also rewarding when considering the many innovative projects already implemented in countries and through the RADOs. That year, the RADOs were the key implementing agents, an arrangement that had already been proven to be successful, as efforts were better coordinated and delivered more rapidly. In conclusion, partnerships were key and political astuteness in support of anti-doping had to be fostered and encouraged.

DECISION

Regional offices reports noted.

10.8 Science

– 10.8.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee chair report

PROFESSOR LJUNGQVIST said he would be brief, as the Health, Medical and Research Committee had not met since the previous meeting of the Foundation Board. It would meet in late August that year at its annual meeting to decide upon the allocation of research grants. The application phase had just finished, and WADA had received 81 applications for research grants, and they would be reviewed through an improved review system decided upon the previous day by the Executive Committee to reduce unnecessary conflicts of interest. He believed that the committee would be successful in its work and present recommendations to the Executive Committee in September for a final decision.

The members had a written report in their files, but he wished to highlight two items that showed the importance of the research grants and how they could be used for the benefit of WADA's work. One related to gene doping. He had reported at the previous Foundation Board meeting on two research projects supported by WADA that had seemed to suggest ways to detect gene doping. These had been quite groundbreaking and commented on a great deal in scientific literature. The two teams that had independently found different approaches for the purpose of identifying gene doping were currently working together in order to find the best practical application of the detection methods that they had discovered one year previously.

The other example of the importance of research related to Hgh, which had been around for a long time. The first positive case had not been detected until 2010 because, in the absence of funding for research for decades, there had been no detection method available until the WADA research budget had become available to researchers. There had been an attempt to detect gene doping by the IOC in the nineties. A project entitled Growth Hormone 2000 had been initiated by a famous endocrinologist in London who had hoped to have a method in place for the Olympic Games in Sydney in 2000. Not unexpectedly, the project had turned out to be too expensive for the IOC to continue funding and had more or less ceased, but had since been reactivated with the assistance

of WADA funding. In the meantime, alternative detection methods had emerged, and the first positive case had been detected in 2010, followed recently by a number of others, so a workable method was currently available for the detection of Hgh, and that was very encouraging. Those were the two specific examples he suggested that the members read through carefully in the report.

– **10.8.2 Science update**

DR RABIN informed the members that he wished to emphasise from the Science Department report the aspects related to relations with the industry. This was a matter that had been discussed in the past, but it had certainly gained a lot of momentum over the past few months. In particular, WADA had signed a cooperation agreement with the Swiss company Hoffman-La Roche, following the very successful cooperation for the detection of CERA, and he was pleased to report that WADA had developed with Roche a template model for the pharmaceutical industry to work with WADA and that this model of best practice would be used by the IFPMA, which represented the top pharmaceutical companies and associations of pharmaceutical companies in the world as a model on how to interact with WADA, so this was great progress. WADA was involved in increasing numbers of bilateral relationships with the industry to discuss substances in development that were not yet on the market, and he was happy to say that, almost every week, there were discussions on new drugs in development with doping potential that WADA needed to carefully monitor.

He had been very happy to hear what Ms De Boer-Buquicchio had said about the joint symposium, and WADA would certainly be very happy to contribute with its operational experience and contact with the industry developed over the past couple of years in particular.

The biotech industry was increasingly interested and involved in the discussions and WADA would be actively involved in a session at the next US bio meeting to be held in June in Washington DC, at which a specific session would be devoted to the abuse of drugs and how the biotech industry in particular could work with WADA to prevent this from happening, so both the pharmaceutical and biotech companies were joining forces to support WADA's activities.

In June, the science symposium would be held in conjunction with the Italian Federation of Sport Medicine to discuss in particular the challenges related to detecting hormones and peptides. This was a real challenge with the advent of other new substances, new hormones and peptides, and he was happy that that year's science symposium would be devoted to the topic.

MS BOKEL said that she had been working on a study on the contamination of nutritional supplements. Was there any plan to look into the contamination of food, which had sometimes been used as an excuse for a positive test?

THE CHAIRMAN remarked that this had been often used.

DR RABIN said that the issue of food contamination was not new; there had been many issues in the past related to norandrosterone contamination in particular. Fairly recently, there had been cases involving clenbuterol. He mentioned a combination of two factors. The first factor was that, in some countries, and he knew that Mexico and China had been mentioned in the press, clenbuterol was being used by some farmers to increase the muscle mass and decrease fatty tissue in cattle. It was obviously not the case in all countries and on all continents. The other factor was that two laboratories had incredibly enhanced their level of sensitivity for clenbuterol and, currently, one fraction out of one trillion (part per trillion sensitivity) could be detected by the laboratories, so

the combination of the two had shown that more clenbuterol cases had been reported. The difficulty was that it was not possible to distinguish between clenbuterol taken for doping activities and food contamination. A lot of information had been collected from the laboratories, and WADA was now discussing with its expert groups how this could be addressed in terms of trying to find a way or a process not to reject the information, as it was known that low levels could also be related to doping cases (there was proof of this), but to find a process to allow for the collection of more information when needed and if justified to really distinguish between doping cases and food contamination, and this would be discussed the following month with the Laboratory Expert Group.

– **10.8.3 Draft 2012 List update**

DR RABIN informed the members that the draft 2012 List had been released for consultation. He emphasised that, that year, comments were expected by 8 July, earlier than usual, because the List Committee and the Health, Medical and Research Committee meetings would be held earlier that year, so it was necessary to compile all of the information ahead of time so that it could be made available to the experts.

DECISION

Science reports noted.

10.9 Standards and Harmonisation

– **10.9.1 Anti-Doping Organisation Symposium**

MR DONZÉ said that he had the honour of presenting the report on the ADO Symposium, which had taken place on 22 and 23 March, the fifth edition of the symposium for ADOs organised by WADA, in Lausanne. He would be fairly brief, not only because it was the end of the day, but also because the members had a fairly comprehensive report from Mr Andersen in their files.

He highlighted a number of key facts about the symposium and shared a number of remarks. The first one, which was pretty encouraging, was the fact that the symposium was always growing in popularity, with nearly 300 participants that year, a record number, representing 192 ADOs, including 83 IFs, 73 NADOs, a number of major event organisers such as the IOC and the IPC and, on the first day, he had been quite pleased to have the presence of members of the WADA Athlete Committee who had met the following day in Lausanne as well.

The second point he wished to highlight, which was directly related to the first point, was that it had been decided some years previously to mix representatives of IFs and NADOs at this symposium, which was a unique opportunity provided by WADA to IFs and NADOs to gather and share experience and try to further cooperate in the global fight against doping.

The third element he wished to mention related to the agenda. Again that year WADA had made sure to factor in the latest trends and discussions about the global fight against doping to set up a programme, and many of the presentations had been based on the premise that anti-doping had reached a stage whereby emphasis had to be given to quality programmes rather than quantity, and a lot of the presentations from WADA staff and staff from ADOs willing to share their experience with the participants had focused on the need to use intelligence to foster quality programmes and continually challenge themselves on how to be more cost effective.

The presentations made had focused a great deal on potential avenues for intelligence gathering. The symposium that year had included a presentation on the ABP, not only

from WADA's perspective, but also from the perspective of IFs and NADOs that had actually already implemented an ABP programme. A part of the symposium had also focused on blood testing. He had been very pleased to have a presentation from the Interpol liaison officer, Mr Holz, who had made a presentation on what Interpol did and his activities to the participants, and Mr Kemp had made a presentation to update the audience on the latest ADAMS updates, including whereabouts (the same type of presentation made that day).

A significant proportion of the symposium had also focused on the importance of information and education; at a time when the costs of anti-doping were significant, it had been a good example to see Mr Koehler present the resources that WADA had developed in terms of education and information, from the Athlete Outreach model to e-learning projects and so on that were available to stakeholders free of charge. This presentation had made quite an impact because, in the weeks following the symposium, WADA had received more than 25 requests from ADOs for such material and continued to receive requests on a frequent and regular basis.

There had already been some formal and informal feedback from participants, most of which had been very positive, but of course it was necessary to try to improve and respond to the very diverse expectations and very diverse level of knowledge of the participants. Of course, the symposium brought together representatives from ADOs who were not all at the same stage of development and knowledge, and this had to be factored in for the 2012 ADO symposium. That was why he was looking to find a venue that would allow WADA to hold break-out sessions in addition to plenary sessions. If not for the following year, at least for 2013, he had been looking at a venue other than the Lausanne university hospital, the Chuv. He had been in contact and already visited the Palais de Beaulieu in Lausanne, which would be an ideal location for the following year's symposium, but a better venue meant a larger budget, so these were all elements that had to be taken into account for the next symposium, and WADA had already started to consult on the agenda, as the aim was for it to be an avenue for ADOs to find what they were looking for in terms of information and expectations in general, so he would be more than happy in the coming weeks and months to receive more feedback from ADOs. He would also engage ADOs in getting that feedback and recommendations for the 2012 agenda, and hoped to be able to organise a very successful ADO symposium the following year.

– **10.9.2 Out-of-competition testing update**

MR ANDERSEN said that he wished to make a few remarks to complement his report, which was in the members' folders. The aim of the out-of-competition testing anti-doping programme was to test athletes in countries in which there were limited programmes or systems. It also assisted IFs on a daily basis in less advanced programmes to progress, develop and succeed through ongoing communication with the IFs and WADA on advice. The programme was meant to be in addition to the IF programmes and not a substitute. As of 31 December the previous year, ANADO had ceased to exist, along with its anti-doping programme, and WADA had been seeking contracts with other agencies, including NADOs and private companies.

DECISION

Standards and Harmonisation reports noted.

11. Any other business/future meetings

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO referred to item 5.4 on the agenda of the Executive

Committee. She wished to state that she was very happy that a solution had been found to the problem of retention times. In May 2010, she had raised this issue, believing that there was a need for further discussion. A proposal had been made by the Council of Europe; WADA had circulated this to all stakeholders and had come up with a proposal to translate this into the annex to the International Standard on the Protection of Privacy and Personal Information. In that annex, there was a differentiation between the various categories of data involved in anti-doping, and she thought that this was a very good example of how WADA and the CAHAMA expert group had worked together and found a solution to an issue that had initially been controversial. She simply wished to commend WADA on that.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms De Boer-Buquicchio. He also acknowledged the work of the CAHAMA under the chairmanship of Mr De Klerk, who was an observer that day, and noted that this was another example of how good outcomes could be achieved through talking.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that Ms De Boer-Buquicchio wished to make an announcement in respect of an initiative involving the Council of Europe.

MS DE BOER-BUQUICCHIO thanked the Chairman for giving her the opportunity to inform the members about a joint initiative of the Council of Europe and the French Ministry of Sport, about which there had been some discussion with WADA, which was interested and would definitely have to be a partner. It was about organising a high-level conference between the public authorities and the pharmaceutical industry in order to raise awareness on cooperation with the pharmaceutical industry so as to have early information about substances coming onto the market that might be used illegally in sport. It was clear that this cooperation would have to be voluntary, in that it would not be in anybody's interest to solve the problem through a purely regulatory or legal approach. The intention was to organise the event; the French Government had offered to host the event at the beginning of February the following year. It would have to be a high-level event, involving European ministers; the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe would be invited to participate, along with relevant EU commissioners, the pharmaceutical industry and CEOs of leading companies, and WADA and high-level representatives of IFs. This was an ambitious plan, but it was very important that contact was being made and that something could be done about potentially dangerous substances at the stage when they were being developed by the pharmaceutical industry.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the initiative was very much appreciated by WADA. He was happy to accept the offer and participate in the event, and looked forward to further details going forward.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that there had been a change of venue in the context of the accommodation and meeting venue in Montreal. The management would appreciate any feedback on the accommodation and venue for future planning.

He thanked all of the members for their contributions; he indicated to the Foundation Board that the Executive Committee had worked through until some time after 5.30 p.m. He felt that the day had been very productive and an enormous amount of work had been done. He thanked the Foundation Board members very much for their efforts to be constructive and make helpful suggestions; they frequently left the WADA management and finance experts with dilemmas as a result of those suggestions but, without that guidance, it was not possible to achieve the outcomes that everybody sought. Every meeting told him that there was much to be done and, as the day had unfolded, it had

become apparent to him that WADA did a lot of things well, but there were a lot of things that it could do better. That challenge lay before the members and he hoped that, at each meeting, when issues were brought to the members' attention, there was a renewed energy that flowed from it to the point of the roles that the members played when the members returned home, and he asked them to continue to do their best as Foundation Board members representing the fight at the very top against doping in sport.

On behalf of the Foundation Board members, he thanked the staff. At meetings such as these, a number of staff members who had no obligation in their job descriptions to attend the meetings voluntarily turned up to try and make them as smooth as possible for the members and, of course, in the weeks leading up to the meetings, an enormous amount of effort went into producing papers on time to give the members the appropriate opportunity to get the necessary advice and study the papers in order to be prepared before actually turning up at the meetings. He believed that the work that the staff did was of an enormously high standard and he thanked them for that on behalf of the members. He also thanked the interpreters.

He drew the members' attention to the meetings ahead in November. Many of the members would be at the UNESCO conference of parties in November, but the next get-together formally as a Foundation Board was on 19 and 20 November. The Director General had mentioned earlier a slight change to the dates of the May meeting in order to reduce travel for many associated with the Foundation Board and SportAccord meetings.

He wished the members safe travel and continued good health, and looked forward to working with them on the next occasion.

DECISION

Executive Committee - 17 September 2011,
Lausanne;
Executive Committee - 19 November 2011,
Montreal;
Foundation Board - 20 November 2011,
Montreal;
Executive Committee - 17 May 2012,
Montreal;
Foundation Board - 18 May 2012, Montreal;
Executive Committee - 22 September 2012,
Montreal;
Executive Committee - 17 November 2012,
Montreal;
Foundation Board - 18 November 2012,
Montreal.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

JOHN FAHEY, AC
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA