

Note: The Executive Committee meeting minutes are published on WADA's website once they have been approved by the Executive Committee, generally at its subsequent meeting. The minutes are intelligent third-person verbatim transcriptions, i.e. slightly edited for readability.

Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting 12 September 2024, Belek, Republic of Türkiye

The meeting began at 9.00 a.m. GMT+3.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

The following members attended the meeting, either in person or virtually: Mr Witold Bańka, President and Chairman of WADA; Ms Yang Yang, Vice-President of WADA; Professor Ugur Erdener, IOC Member, President of World Archery; Mr Jiri Kejval, President, National Olympic Committee, Czech Republic, IOC Member; Mr Nenad Lalovic, Executive Board Member, ASOIF, UWW President, IOC Member; Mr Ingmar De Vos, Council Member, ASOIF, IOC Member, FEI President; Mr Humphrey Kayange Emonyi, IOC Member, representing the IOC Athletes' Commission; Ms Minata Samate Cessouma, Commissioner for Health, Humanitarian Affairs and Social Development, African Union, Burkina Faso; Dr Rahul Gupta, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, USA; Dr Koji Murofushi, Commissioner, Japan Sports Agency, Japan; Ms Roxana Maracineanu, France; Mr Peter Miskimmin, representing Mr Chris Bishop, Minister of Sport and Recreation, New Zealand; Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Independent Member, Italy; Ms Venetia Bennett, Independent Member, Australia; Dr Patricia Sangenis, Independent Member, Argentina; and Mr Ryan Pini, Chairman of the WADA Athlete Council.

The following permanent special committee and standing committee chairmen attended the meeting, either in person or virtually: Mr Ryan Pini, Chairman of the WADA Athlete Council (also a member of the Executive Committee); Mr Henry Gourdji, Chairman of the WADA Compliance Review Committee; and Professor Lars Engebretsen, Chairman of the WADA Health, Medical and Research Committee;

The following WADA management representatives attended the meeting, either in person or virtually: Mr Olivier Niggli, Director General; Ms Aisha Ayinde, Human Resources Director; Mr René Bouchard, Senior Advisor, Government Relations; Ms Dao Chung, Chief Financial Officer; Mr Kevin Haynes, Compliance, Rules and Standards Director; Ms Karine Henrie, Head of Athlete Engagement; Ms Amanda Hudson, Education Director; Ms Angela Iannantuono, Corporate Services and Sustainability Director; Mr Stuart Kemp, Chief Operating Officer; Ms Florence Lefebvre-Rangeon, Deputy Chief Operating Officer; Mr Francisco León, Director of the WADA Latin America and Caribbean Office; Ms Catherine MacLean, Communications Director; Mr Marc-André Matton, Chief Technology Officer; Mr Tom May, Engagement & Development Director, WADA; Ms Chaya Ndiaye, Head of Digital Insights; Mr Rafal Piechota, Director, Office of the President; Professor Olivier Rabin, Science and Medicine Senior Director; Mr Tim Ricketts, Testing Director; Mr Julien Sieveking, Legal Affairs Director; Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Director of the WADA Africa Office; Mr Ross Wenzel, General Counsel; Ms Shannan Withers, Chief of Staff; Ms Mayumi Yaya Yamamoto, Director of the WADA Asia/Oceania Office; and Mr Gunter Younger, Intelligence and Investigations Director.

The following observers joined the meeting, either in person or virtually: Anna Thorstenson (Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds), Snezana Samardzic Markovic (Independent Expert), Eric Cottier (Independent Prosecutor), Hannah Grossenbacher, Michael Vesper, Richard Budgett, Jane Thornton, James Carr, Gaby Ahrens, Sophie Kwasny, Jamie Brown, Amandine Carton, Richard Baum, Ali Bokhari, Robert Auguste, Yumiko Nakajima, Shin Asakawa, Chika Hirai, Yuji Kakizawa, Darren Mullaly and Jane Mountfort.

THE CHAIRMAN greeted the members of the WADA Executive Committee and kindly invited the attendees to take their seats. He welcomed the members and observers and noted it was good to see everyone in Belek. Before commencing the agenda for that day, he wished to start by giving the floor to the hosts for their welcome remarks. It was his pleasure to invite the Minister of Youth and Sports of the Republic of Türkiye, Dr Osman Aşkın Bak, to take the floor.

DR BAK greeted the distinguished guests and noted that, as the Minister of Youth and Sport of Türkiye, it was a great pleasure to be there that day. He welcomed the attendees to Türkiye. Before he began, he wished to thank everyone who had put significant effort into organizing that important meeting. As everybody knew, WADA's Executive Committee had the crucial responsibility of running all the activities of WADA, and Türkiye had great confidence in WADA's anti-doping activities. Sport fostered quality time with friends and family while bringing even strangers together around a shared goal. So it was crucial that everybody had the opportunity to experience the benefits of participating in sport. It should be enjoyable, fair and inclusive for all. Therefore, he had strived to protect sport from being undermined by doping for over 20 years. During his presidency of the Turkish Wrestling Federation, he had led campaigns designed to provide broad awareness about anti-doping among young athletes. In 2014, he had chaired the Parliamentary Research Commission when he was a parliamentarian, established for the purpose of identifying the necessary measures to be taken through investigation of the doping problem in Turkish sport in recent years, and contributed to the preparation of the report. The Turkish Ministry of Youth and Sports had implemented a strict zero-tolerance policy against doping to foster a safe and fair sport environment. In that regard, Türkiye had started to allocate a generous amount of funding to fully support the activities of the Turkish Anti-Doping Commission. It continued to provide any necessary support to the Turkish Anti-Doping Commission at the highest level possible to carry out an effective national anti-doping programme, while ensuring that operational independence was respected at all times. That year especially, educational campaigns and testing activities had intensified, primarily focusing on the Olympic and Paralympic athletes and their entourage. As a result, the Turkish Anti-Doping Commission had become a driving force in the region thanks to its successful initiatives and effective activities. Türkiye was also working hard to increase the capacity and technological capability of the Ankara Doping Control Laboratory, accredited by WADA. The aim was to ensure that the laboratory provided high-quality services, not only for Türkiye, but also for other countries worldwide. In addition, he believed that the involvement of governments was vital for the fight against doping. To ensure the effective implementation of a robust anti-doping programme and enhance the public perception of the anti-doping system, collaboration with the relevant stakeholders was essential. The Ministry of Youth and Sport was taking the initiative of facilitating the exchange of information among participating public authorities in Türkiye to get them involved in anti-doping activities. Governments could also address issues that the sport movement, National Anti-Doping Organizations (NADOs) or WADA alone could not resolve. For that reason, it was essential to ensure that government actions against doping complemented the efforts of WADA by maintaining a strong governance system nationally and globally. One important action necessary was to lay down the legal foundation for clean sport. Therefore, Türkiye had been diligently working on drafting national anti-doping legislation, which was nearing its final stages. Considerable effort had been invested to ensure that the legislation aligned with the current needs and trends of the anti-doping system, including the new version of the World Anti-Doping Code (Code) being updated. WADA's support throughout that process had been immensely valuable. Another important part of that process was listening to the needs of the athletes. He did his best to create as many opportunities as possible to engage with athletes. He highly valued their opinions and took them into account to develop the right policies that would strengthen their faith in clean sport. He took every possible opportunity to send a strong message that cheating in sport would never be tolerated. Recent high-profile doping cases that had captured global attention had revealed a critical issue: many athletes and the general public remained insufficiently informed about anti-doping processes. That gap in knowledge had unfortunately facilitated the spread of misinformation and rumours, which could be used to manipulate public opinion and to exploit the situation for various agendas. Once again, those developments highlighted the importance of anti-doping education and awareness-raising initiatives. Ever since its establishment, WADA had always handled every case with high professionalism and objectivity. Therefore, at that time, it was important to show support and restore general trust in the anti-doping system.

WADA was doing its best in good faith within the limits of current resources, and he advocated continuing to trust the global anti-doping system despite its small flaws. He was confident that the decisive actions taken

together would improve global anti-doping efforts. Türkiye was a state party to the Anti-Doping Convention of the Council of Europe and the International Convention against Doping in Sport, supported UNESCO and played an active role at European and international levels. Türkiye's Deputy Minister of Youth and Sports had been elected as the vice-chairperson of the UNESCO COP9 Bureau. Also, the Director General of Sports Services had joined the open-ended working group to increase the impact of the UNESCO convention. The country also actively participated in the Council of Europe Monitoring Group of the Anti-Doping Convention and CAHAMA meetings. Europe played a significant role and had an influential position within the governance of WADA. Therefore, he was confident that European representatives could provide substantial benefit through their practical and feasible solutions to effectively address existing challenges. As the members knew, Türkiye had always been a bridge between Europe and Asia, both culturally and economically. As such, it had the desire and capacity to transfer the expertise and experience of Europe to other regions that were indeed in need of them. He looked forward to collaborating with everyone in the room to advance the shared commitment to the doping-free sporting environment.

He also wished to thank his colleague Professor Erdener, who was a WADA member and was the president of the Turkish National Olympic Committee (NOC). Professor Erdener had put much effort into that and Türkiye was collaborating with him and he was also learning many things from him. He also wished to thank Professor Rustu Guner, who was his advisor. They had known each other for some 20 years and worked in the parliamentary anti-doping commission. Also, former minister Mr Mehmet Kasapoğlu was also on WADA's Foundation Board. They were working very closely and he wished to thank those friends. He had also visited Mr Bańka in Poland two months previously and he had shared his views about doping issues with him. As he had mentioned, he had been the president of the Turkish Wrestling Federation and during that time it had implemented a zero-tolerance approach to doping and support for clean sports and clean athletes, supporting the efforts of WADA. He reiterated his welcome to Türkiye, which was a sport-loving country. President Erdogan was from a sport background and supported all those issues. He hoped the members enjoyed Antalya in Türkiye and thanked them for coming. He wished them good luck and reiterated Türkiye's support for WADA's activities.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the minister warmly for his opening remarks and amazing hospitality. On behalf of WADA, he wished to convey sincere thanks to the Turkish Government, the Turkish Olympic Committee and the colleagues from the Turkish Anti-Doping Commission for the very good collaboration for the good of sport. He also thanked the minister for finding the time to join the Executive Committee during that important event. He gave the floor to Professor Erdener.

PROFESSOR ERDENER thanked the Chairman and the minister. On behalf of the Turkish Anti-Doping Commission and the Turkish Olympic Committee, he wished to welcome the members of the Executive Committee to Belek. He believed that they would have a very productive meeting in that nice place and that everyone would leave there with some good memories. He requested the Chairman's permission to give the floor to the host, Ms Elif Özdemir, who was the Vice-Chairman of Özaltın Holding, which owned Gloria Hotels. She was also an executive board member of his NOC and the Turkish Archery Federation, as well as a board member of the Mediterranean Games organization.

MS ÖZDEMİR thanked Professor Erdener and greeted the esteemed guests, the minister, the Chairman and the distinguished Executive Committee members of the World Anti-Doping Agency. It was both an honour and a privilege to welcome them all to the Gloria Hotels and Resorts. As their host, she was truly delighted to have the distinguished WADA Executive Committee conduct its important meeting discussions there, and was proud to support its efforts in promoting clean sport worldwide. The hotel team was fully committed to ensuring the members' comfort during their stay. It took great pride in providing a space where meaningful conversations and decisions could take place, and hoped that the setting would inspire productive discussions for all. The work that WADA did was crucial not only in protecting athletes, but also in upholding the values of fairness, integrity and transparency in sport. She greatly admired the impact it continued to have on the global stage and was grateful to play a role, however small, in supporting the mission that day. As somebody who was passionate about sport, a member of the executive board of the Turkish Olympic Committee, Turkish Archery Federation and the Mediterranean Games, she wished to state that the occasion was extra special for her because it allowed her to combine hosting such a special occasion at her beloved family's heritage as a member of the Olympic family as well. She wished to thank Professor Erdener for giving her the opportunity to make a

difference in the world of Turkish sport since 2014. Once again, she welcomed the Executive Committee members to the Gloria Hotel and wished them a successful and impactful meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Özdemir very much. First of all, on behalf of WADA and all of the participants, he wished to thank her for her amazing hospitality. It was really a beautiful place and everybody was enjoying their stay there. He thanked her for everything that she had done to make sure that the meeting was organized so professionally and it was really exceptional. He reiterated his sincere thanks.

Returning to that day's meeting, 14 Executive Committee members were attending in person, which was extremely pleasing. There were two online participants, Dr Koji Murofushi from Japan and Dr Patricia Sangenis, who was one of the independent members. Two of the committee chairmen would be joining the meeting during the agenda, either in person or online, to provide some updates. Some other experts as well as WADA management team members would also be present at certain times. The meeting would be conducted with the support of Mr Pisani, the Events Manager, who would manage the members and speakers participating virtually.

He would proceed to circulate the physical roll call around the table and asked the members to sign it and pass it on to the next person. With regard to the meeting time, it would last for the full day. Looking at the agenda, the duration would be around eight hours. There would be a morning break, a lunch break and an afternoon break, with the meeting concluding as close to 5 p.m. as possible. Also, as mentioned in correspondence sent to the members on 27 August from the Independent Ethics Board (IEB), there would be some time dedicated in camera to address the matter from them. The IEB panel deliberation report required the Executive Committee's review and would be presented at that meeting, just before the first coffee break.

- **1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest**

THE CHAIRMAN asked if any members wished to disclose any conflict of interest. He knew there had been discussion about a conflict of interest for the representative of the Americas. There had been factual changes recently which had resolved the matter as far as WADA was concerned. He asked formally whether any members wished to disclose any conflicts of interest. He saw no requests for the floor.

2. Minutes of previous meetings

- **2.1 Executive Committee meeting on 11 March 2024 in Lausanne and extraordinary Executive Committee meeting on 25 April 2024**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the meeting minutes had already been approved via a circular vote and had been included in the document set for reference only.

- **2.2 Extraordinary Executive Committee meeting on 9 July 2024**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the draft minutes from the virtual meeting held on 9 July had been circulated among the members as part of the meeting materials shared on 21 August. No member comments had been received regarding those minutes in advance of the meeting and, if there were none that day, he would proceed to request approval of them. He asked if there were any comments or questions regarding the minutes of the July meeting. As there were no comments, the minutes from the July meeting were approved.

DECISION

Minutes of the virtual meeting on 9 July 2024
approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked the Chairman and greeted all the members. He firstly wanted to thank the Turkish hosts for their wonderful hospitality, and he thanked Professor Erdener in particular. As the Chairman had said, the agenda that day was very full, so he did not intend to go back over his comprehensive report that was in the members' binders. He would be happy to answer any questions. He did just want to highlight two points however. One was to confirm that the colleague from the Tunisian NADO, as the members

might have seen in the press release issued a few days previously, had been released from jail and was back home in good health. WADA was very pleased with that outcome. It appeared that legal proceedings were ongoing, so he would not make any further comments at that stage, other than to say that WADA remained very concerned about the incident and the situation there. The other point, which was more administrative, was just to remind members that applications for the standing committees closed on 18 September. There were only a few days left and he encouraged all of them to make sure that any good candidates for the standing committees applied within the deadline, in particular from the regions from which traditionally fewer applications were received.

Finally, he wanted to make it clear that he would not mention anything on the Chinese file at that stage. That would be dealt with under items 4.1 and 4.2 on the agenda, when all questions and discussion on that point could take place. He thanked the members very much and would be happy to take any questions.

PROFESSOR ERDENER spoke on behalf of the sport movement to thank the Director General for his very detailed and comprehensive report. Again, he wished to say something about UNESCO and its relationship with WADA. He welcomed the update on the relationship with UNESCO, and was wondering if he could have the opportunity to address something related to the two points with UNESCO. He would mention the first one forthwith. What concrete actions were UNESCO and the convention taking to support WADA and anti-doping efforts? The second was on whether there was any reflection between UNESCO and the convention to address the accountability of those governments that failed to uphold their commitments vis-à-vis the convention and the World Anti-Doping Code. The sport movement noted that, as part of the reflection established by the conference of parties, there had been a proposal to establish a mechanism for public authorities to dispute WADA's assessment of government legislation compliance. What was the risk for the global efforts to harmonize anti-doping globally should such mechanism be established? Was that something the public authorities on WADA were monitoring closely?

MS MARACINEANU wanted to take the opportunity to say that, as usual, it was regrettable that the documents had been received late. That had not enabled everybody to go through them in great depth. Also, she wished there to be an oral presentation by WADA at the CAHAMA meeting, which preceded the Executive Committee, of the ins and outs of the meetings to come. There had been an interruption in those relations, which was very regrettable when it came to Europe, and she wished there to be an oral presentation of the various points that would be upcoming in the meetings with the Executive Committee.

MS CESSOUMA wished to thank the Director General for his report. She was particularly pleased, as a representative of Africa, about the release of the director general of the Tunisian NADO. That would not have been possible without the wonderful work accomplished with a view to having him released from prison. She hoped that it would not occur again. Justice was under way and she hoped he would not be sentenced. She wished to draw the attention of African leaders to the fact that that was something that should not happen. It was not at all easy. Of course, she knew Tunisia well. There had been many difficulties in that case but she wished in any event to thank the Director General for his work.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL appreciated the questions. He would start by addressing the questions from Professor Erdener. He thought that some of them, in particular regarding the accountability of governments in relation to the convention, would be better addressed to the public authorities represented around the table than to him, to look at and discuss within the forum of UNESCO. Discussions would be held with the UNESCO bureau in the coming weeks (he did not remember exactly the dates), in particular regarding the last topic Professor Erdener had raised, which was the idea of potentially having mechanisms in relation to WADA monitoring compliance of legislation. On that topic, he thought a number of discussions had already been held, but perhaps it was important to remind everybody what the challenge was there. There was no obligation under the Code to implement the Code through legislation. Some governments had decided to do it or some governments had to do it because of their legislative system. However, that was not a Code requirement. When that was done, and when a portion of the Code, most of the time, was incorporated into legislation, it was key to make sure that there were no loopholes in the legislation that would actually create a free pass for dopers through legislation. Therefore, it had to be approached as one element and the Code and the legislation needed to be looked at together to make sure that there was no inaccuracy or loophole between the two documents. That was why WADA had to monitor that portion of legislation that concerned the implementation of the Code.

The rest, of course, was for governments to deal with. He envisaged that that would be part of the discussion in the future. But, of course, it would be problematic if there were different mechanisms for dealing with the legislation and the Code itself.

He thanked Ms Maracineanu for her comments. As far as documents were concerned, every September the Prohibited List (List) arrived a little later for logistical reasons. That was a recurrent subject that had been discussed before, as the List first had to be approved by the Health, Medical and Research Committee. He did take into account her comment about the CAHAMA meeting presentation and of course it would be discussed in the future.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

- 3.1 Hosting of WADA Africa office update

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would be extremely brief. As was set out in the paper, an agreement was in place with the South African authorities for the hosting of the WADA office. WADA had agreed to the terms of that agreement. At that time, it was only a matter of being able to sign the agreement for logistical reasons. That had not happened yet but would very soon. That was the update.

DECISION

Hosting of WADA Africa office update noted.

- 3.2 Proposal for a regional Arabic-speaking countries office

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that item 3.2, as communicated to members earlier that week, had been postponed to a future meeting and he would therefore move on to item 3.3.

DECISION

Proposal for a regional Arabic-speaking countries office to be dealt with at a future meeting.

- 3.3 Strategic plan 2025-2029 update

MS TAILLEFER said that she was pleased to provide an update on the draft strategic plan. She would summarize the key messages highlighted in the different sections of the document before giving the floor back to the Chairman, who would offer the Executive Committee members the opportunity to ask questions and make comments based on their reading of the document that had been shared as part of the Executive Committee reading material.

Before diving into the contents of the strategic plan, she wished to take a moment to thank the Executive Committee members for the involvement and engagement provided throughout the consultative process that had been ongoing for more than 12 months: two working sessions with the Executive Committee, more than 30 interviews and three feedback opportunities had led to the draft document being presented that day. As indicated at the beginning of the process, the 2025-2029 strategic plan would build upon the progress made since 2020. Perspectives shared during the consultation phase had been reflected on to establish guiding principles that would create consistency in the intentions conveyed across the following strategic plan. Notably, when guiding principles were referred to, they included the focus on implementing improvements to the global anti-doping system, seeing system partners as key allies to expand the impact, the importance of programme consolidation to simplify the system and increase efficiency, the focus on being innovative, strategic, proactive and targeted, and to communicate WADA's activity and impact in a language understandable by the different stakeholders. The following few pages showed consultation takeaways that had been captured from the work performed together which had been used to inform the sections of the strategic plan.

She would review the main sections of the strategic plan, starting with the introduction, followed by the strategic priorities, and finally looking at how to achieve the mission. For the first introduction section, as mentioned in the reading material, she wished to request the feedback of the Executive Committee on validating

the relevance of the trends and success stories highlighted in the document. Very briefly, the success stories selected from the 2020-2024 strategic plan cycle were those shown on the screen and in the document. One success story per strategic priority had been selected to keep it short but also comprehensive. Looking at the lead strategic priority, the members could see the benchmarking insights developed through the anti-doping organization benchmarking initiative; under 'grow impact', the members could see the European Union intelligence and investigation capability and capacity project; under 'be athlete-centred', the creation of the Athlete Council and the enhanced representation of athletes on governing bodies; under 'collaborate and unite', there was the completion of the governance reforms; and under 'perform', the delivery of the annual reports that included the performance indicators. When it came to ecosystem trends, the trends that had been selected to showcase how the system had evolved included the increasing cost of activities and the overall lack of resources, the pressure for better governance, the tangible anti-doping fatigue across the ecosystem, the fact that cybersecurity and data protection were increasingly complex fields while maintaining the importance of protecting the human rights of athletes, and the fact that opinions were increasingly polarized and publicized.

As she had mentioned earlier in the introduction, she would present all of the sections before taking comments and questions. With regard to the core section of the document with the strategic priorities, as the Executive Committee members had seen through previous working sessions together, five strategic priorities and 35 associated key initiatives had been developed. The new portion of that section comprised the flagship project examples that had been selected from the long list developed in previous versions, as well as strategic indicators to help measure progress for each of those strategic priorities. She would appreciate the members' feedback on the selection of those two sections. She would not go over each of the 14 flagship project examples and the 17 indicators, as the agenda that day was very full, but she would invite members to share feedback after reading the document.

Finally, with regard to the last section on achieving the mission, the feedback she wished to request in that section was to validate how WADA intended to achieve its mission under four areas. The first one was delivering together. Protecting clean sport could not be achieved by any single group or organization; it required global collaboration. WADA was committed to leading the conversation on anti-doping and community, communicating on salient issues, while relying on stakeholders to advocate for anti-doping in their own areas, deliver anti-doping programmes and support the education of the system. The second area was catalyzing innovation. In addition to serving as the trusted source of data in anti-doping, WADA aspired to convene diverse minds and resources to create a dynamic and responsive anti-doping ecosystem by facilitating the implementation of leading methods and technologies. The approach to innovation centred around protecting athletes, with a particular focus on improving athletes' experience, driving efficiency and providing equal access to the benefits of data analytics. The third area was incorporating sustainability in activities. Key initiatives of the strategic plan would be prioritized to maximize the positive impact related to the following United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including good health and wellbeing, quality education and partnership for the goals. Finally, the fourth area was fostering an agile and dynamic global anti-doping system. Some of the ways WADA intended to invest to achieve that included facilitating an accessible and navigable 2027 stakeholder update process for the Code and international standards, as well as rolling out a robust Code implementation support programme and working to simplify information and communications.

After that meeting and the feedback session that would soon begin, the next step would be to integrate the feedback of the Executive Committee and prepare a new version that would be submitted for approval to the Foundation Board at its meeting on 5 December 2024. In the meantime, the agency would ensure and validate that the 2025 operational plans and budget were well aligned with the strategic plan and assess the capacity required to deliver the strategic plan for 2026 to 2029. That concluded her presentation.

MS CESSOUMA wished to thank Ms Taillefer for the very complete report. She was sorry but she wished to return to the matter of the regional office. She wished to thank everyone who had found a solution because she had been very embarrassed that in Africa the situation had not been solved. She was very happy that there had been support. There were 55 member states, but the staff of that office and a solution should be found to that question so that the office could play its part at the level of the member states on the African continent.

MR KEJVAL thanked Ms Taillefer very much on behalf of the sport movement, especially for the procedure regarding the development of the 2025-2029 strategic plan, and welcomed the process very much. He also

supported the strategic plan and the strategic priorities. Five strategic priorities had been identified, supported by 35 key initiatives. The priorities of WADA included leading an anti-doping community, being athlete-centred, leveraging innovation and encouraging efficiency as well as building capacity. He reiterated the support of the sport movement.

MR PINI wished to commend WADA for continuing to prioritize and empower athletes within the 2025-2029 strategic plan. He particularly wanted to acknowledge the efforts of the Plan's drafting team for recognizing the critical need to put athletes at the heart of anti-doping efforts. Being athlete-centred was not just a strategic priority but represented a fundamental shift in how anti-doping policies should be crafted and implemented. Athletes were the primary stakeholders in that space, and their wellbeing, rights and perspectives must drive decisions made. That commitment had significantly influenced the Athlete Council's action plan, ensuring that the priority translated into tangible outcomes. The council was committed to fostering ongoing dialogue and feedback mechanisms that allowed athletes to actively contribute to anti-doping efforts. He was optimistic that the continued athlete-centred approach would enable WADA to build a more robust and fair anti-doping system that was transparent, inclusive and truly reflective of the needs of the experiences of the athletes. The Athlete Council looked forward to reviewing that.

MS MARACINEANU wished to congratulate Ms Taillefer on her presentation. She had had the pleasure of taking part in the setting up of that strategy and making contributions. On behalf of CAHAMA, she wished to congratulate WADA for having included human rights, and she was very happy that human rights could be spoken about openly. With regard to the Sustainable Development Goals, there were SDGs 3, 4 and 17, on health, education and partnerships. She wished to include gender equality, which was SDG 5, and 16, on responsible and inclusive institutions. Personally speaking, she wished to stress that, in order to realize those five targets, the financial means needed to be given to WADA to reach those objectives and items such as a meeting with UNESCO and discussions between states and governments in order to get to a stronger link between WADA and governments to ensure a financial contribution. She deemed that absolutely indispensable and believed it should really be in the strategic plan of WADA, given the financial context of the various governments that day.

MR MISKIMMIN greeted the Executive Committee. From an Oceania perspective, he wished to compliment the WADA management on the great work performed and on boiling everything down into a very coherent and logical plan. His comments were more about trying to add value to the process rather than any criticism, and he would draw attention to the ecosystem. The statement of tangible anti-doping fatigue across the system stood out quite strongly. Evidence or any examples would help. He would also, on behalf of Oceania, like to make reference to the importance of climate change and environmental sustainability in his region particularly. His region believed that there needed to be a response from WADA in that regard. In terms of the strategic priorities, he wondered if the Code review should be featured a little bit more strongly given the importance of it, given the importance of everyone working on it across the system, including the NADOs, which were putting a lot of work into that space as well. It had been emphasized in the flagship project, but he believed it might need a little bit more elevation than that. In terms of the other strategic priorities, he wondered whether there should be mention of the contamination situation cases that had occurred, and pursuit of mechanisms to ensure that that all NADOs and actors in the system were applying the Code correctly, with better guidance on managing contamination cases. That did seem to be the issue that everyone had been discussing prior to that meeting. Finally, with regard to achieving the mission, he would like to probably draw a little bit more attention to item one on delivering together. All the other items had some actions related to that. Delivering together did not, and yet it was probably one of the fundamental, critical, important issues at that time, with many of the issues ongoing that required a harmonized, collaborative community working together. Perhaps some thought could be put into particular actions that could strengthen that.

DR GUPTA appreciated the sharing of the latest draft of the strategic plan and the significant work that had already been done on that document. On behalf of the Americas, he appreciated the challenges outlined in the introduction under the ecosystem trends. Everybody had work to do in better supporting NADOs, improving governance, protecting the human rights of athletes and finding ways to work together more constructively. He wished to add that he would agree that the governance reforms accomplished to date included many important successes, as had been mentioned on page three of the draft. However, that effort to improve how work was

performed to fulfil WADA's vital mission must continue in earnest. The present era was one of rapid advancements in science and technology, which required flexibility to act quickly in addressing emerging threats, such as new methods of doping or complex conspiracies that threatened clean, fair sports, as his colleague had mentioned. The text should also indicate that WADA would continue to work with anti-doping stakeholders to do what was necessary to strengthen the organization. He also very much appreciated the commitment to leveraging anti-doping data to detect patterns of problem areas and solve issues in a targeted area under growing impact. That type of analysis, which was of course vital for WADA, was also important for NADOs and for WADA Foundation Board members to better understand the trends in their regions and countries and identify methods to address those challenges. He appreciated the reference in the collaborate and unite section on strengthening collaboration with law enforcement and investigative capabilities of the anti-doping organizations. That reference might be supplemented to reinforce the importance of WADA and Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs) utilizing intelligence investigations and confidential sources to uncover doping conspiracies. That was an important area that WADA had already been investing in. To the extent that rules for such operations needed to be refined, he advocated adding a reference in the strategy to accomplishing such reforms. He reiterated his appreciation to WADA for sharing the draft and providing opportunities to provide that input.

MS TAILLEFER thanked all of the members for the feedback and comments. She would proceed quickly to make sure that the feedback had been captured properly and she encouraged members to talk to her during the break if she had not captured everything properly. She thanked Ms Cessouma, Mr Kejval and Mr Pini for their support, which was much appreciated. She thanked Ms Maracineanu for providing the suggestion to look at adding, as, part of a recommendation from CAHAMA, SDGs 5 and 16. She also acknowledged the importance of the financial means to ensure delivery of the strategic plan. She thanked Mr Miskimmin for the feedback on the trends and ensuring consistency in the examples given to support the different trends, as well as ensuring that the Code update was featured more prominently and that NADOs felt they had visibility throughout the strategic plan, the mention of the contamination case as being a concrete issue to dive into, and adding some activities focused on delivering together. She appreciated all of the comments and the important emphasis placed on leveraging data and collaboration to have an impact on anti-doping. All of that feedback would be taken on board for the next iteration of the plan that would once again be shared with the Executive Committee at the December meeting before being submitted for approval to the Foundation Board.

DECISION

Strategic plan 2025-2029 update noted.

- 3.4 Strategic key performance indicators update – final results

MS TAILLEFER said that she would be brief but would provide some context on the process leading to the final results that would be examined. As mentioned in the reading material, a longer timeline for the perception survey had taken the responses to a level that was comparable to but still lower than the 2023 response rate, validating the belief that the anti-doping community might be in a state of fatigue when it came to answering surveys for opinions or sharing perspectives in a broad way. That said, with a comparable response rate from the previous year, most of the results were consistent with the results that had been presented in a preliminary version in March 2024. She would not spend too much time reviewing the numbers, but would rather focus on a process that WADA wished to conduct in 2025, to act on the feedback that had been received to date on the process. Once again, she would go fairly quickly through the key takeaways. While recognizing the need to interpret perception data with caution, the strategic key performance indicators (KPIs) for 2024 highlighted the same strengths and areas for improvement as the analysis of the preliminary results. She would not go over them because the Executive Committee had seen them already in March. She wanted to say that, in terms of the highlights, they remained stable. When it came to the indicators that had changed since the preliminary version presented in March, the percentage of change was fairly small. The first three indicators could be seen projected on the screen. The perception of being a leader in the field, perception of athletes believing that WADA was concerned about their welfare, and perception that athletes believed the system enabled clean competition and fair play had decreased by 1%. However, the last four indicators set out on the page had actually increased between 1 and 4%. Those were whether the perception of collaboration within governance bodies or the level of collaboration WADA fostered within the anti-doping community were deemed appropriate, as well as key

indicators regarding diversity and representation on WADA's decision-making bodies. She would not spend too much time on them because, once again, the changes were rather small and she would rather spend more time on the approach that WADA wished to adopt for 2025. She welcomed the feedback received throughout the process over the past three years. The perceived limited value of most indicators from large-scale perception surveys required a rethinking of the approach. Therefore, for the upcoming year, the proposal was to capture the perception of distinct smaller groups of stakeholders on their experiences with WADA specific initiatives. The reason behind that was to ask fewer questions that would not require a large time investment from stakeholders but ensure that the questions were on matters of importance to them.

Some examples of those perception indicators would be athlete groups, such as athlete commissions or athlete councils, which would be surveyed on the athlete engagement initiatives; WADA governance body members being surveyed on governance engagement initiatives; anti-doping organizations on development activities in which they had participated; and the users of newly-developed ADAMS modules on current experience compared to previous experience. Once again, feedback was being taken on board to be specific and ensure better defined groups of stakeholders with very specific questions. As a complement to the perception indicators, additional interim indicators were proposed for 2025, such as the level of participation in the 2027 World Anti-Doping Code and international standard update process, and participation in the 2025 World Conference on Doping in Sport. Sustainability indicators would be added for environment, social and governance, private partnership and private funding updates, scientific and social research grant programme updates, anti-doping organization training updates and athlete and athlete support personnel education updates. That would be before the transition towards the impact intended to be measured during the next strategic plan cycle, which would be consistent with the indicators that had been identified in the earlier presentation. She recalled that a detailed update on ADAMS development would be provided as a separate agenda item for that meeting, as requested during the March 2024 Executive Committee meeting. That concluded her presentation.

MR KEJVAL spoke on behalf of the sport movement to thank WADA for that update and welcomed attention to diverse measurements of the KPIs to avoid the sole reliance on survey participation. In light of the 2025-2029 strategic plan, the sport movement encouraged WADA to set measurable targets with regard to fostering new partnerships.

MS MARACINEANU wished to congratulate WADA on the new KPIs, in particular those linked to sustainability, partnership and private finances.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI warmly congratulated Ms Taillefer and her colleagues on the work that had been developed. She very much liked the second part of the presentation and believed it gave a feeling of security regarding the work WADA was doing and the progress being made.

DECISION

Strategic key performance indicators
update noted.

- 3.5 Intelligence and investigations 2024 audit report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that Mr Younger, the head of the department, was online if there were any questions for him. He recalled that the Intelligence and Investigations Department was being audited separately from the organization by an independent auditor, Mr Emmanuel Leclerc from the French police force, who had been appointed the previous year. It had been his first audit that year. The report was in the files. He would not go into it in detail but would highlight that he had confirmed that the department was fully independent and there was no interference with its work. The independent auditor was making a number of recommendations that he was sure Mr Younger and his team would take into account. Some of them had already been implemented with some structural changes in the department. If there were specific questions on that, Mr Younger could answer them. That item was for decision because that report had to be formally approved by the Executive Committee prior to being made available publicly through a summary of the report conclusions.

MR LALOVIC stated that the sport movement supported the adoption of the intelligence and investigations audit report by Mr Leclerc, and welcomed the independent auditor's review, which reinforced confidence in the process.

DR GUPTA appreciated the presentation of the audit and in particular the careful review and helpful suggestions offered on the concluding page of the document. He wished to note how useful it was for institutions with significant responsibilities to go through an audit to ensure that they were appropriately and diligently following correct processes and procedures. The work of the Intelligence and Investigations Department was essential. Perhaps there was no other area of the work that was more deterring, detecting and understanding doping. Uncovering those conspiracies between two or more parties with an incentive not to be discovered was not easy. It required a lot of careful work and he appreciated all of that. Of course, his question was what was the plan for the Intelligence and Investigations Department to move forward to implement the five areas of improvement that had been highlighted on page 11 of the audit report?

MR YOUNGER sent greetings to Türkiye from where he was in Canada. He thanked Dr Gupta very much for his kind words. Scrolling to page 11 of the report, the audit had comprised an overall review after six years of the Intelligence and Investigations Department, looking at where it was possible to change some of the strategic objectives of the organization, in particular going more on compliance investigations. Therefore, it had sought to consider the strategic plan of WADA and implement it into the new structure of the Intelligence and Investigations Department, which included an intelligence unit, in order to proactively gather intelligence on hotspots, on areas of concern for WADA and for the anti-doping community. That was the plan for the following five years. Some of the changes had already been implemented, including some staff shifts within the organization. That was quite a lot of work to do but he was very comfortable that, in the following five years, the department would be fit for the future of intelligence and investigations, in particular for the intelligence section. He hoped that answered Dr Gupta's question.

On behalf of CAHAMA, MS MARACINEANU also expressed her approval of the audit report. As to the independence of the Intelligence and Investigations Department, she hoped that those recommendations would be implemented also with regard to independence, so that the Executive Committee would know exactly what the roadmap was for the implementation of those recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the Executive Committee members agreed to approve the report of the 2024 annual audit conducted on the WADA Intelligence and Investigations Department.

DECISION

Intelligence and investigations 2024 audit report approved.

As THE CHAIRMAN had said at the beginning of the meeting, an in-camera session would be held then to review the IEB panel deliberation report shared prior to the meeting. He therefore asked all the observers and staff to leave the room. Only the Executive Committee members and the Director General could stay in the room. The session was then conducted in camera.

4. Chinese swimmers contamination case

- 4.1 General update

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL had only one item he wished to clarify in relation to document 4.1, which referred to point 12 of attachment one. Since the report had been drafted, WADA's lawyers in the USA had been informed by the Department of Justice that the incident referred in the document had been linked with a mistake in identification. Note had been taken of that.

DECISION

General update noted.

- **4.2 Presentation of the final report by the independent prosecutor Eric Cottier**

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that Mr Cottier was the independent prosecutor who had been reviewing WADA's handling of the case and had presented his interim report in July 2024. That day he would present his final report, which had been shared with the Executive Committee members, who had no doubt read it with interest. He noted that once Mr Cottier had completed his presentation, he had been invited to remain to answer any questions members might have. He also noted that the WADA experts Mr Ross Wenzel, Professor Olivier Rabin and Mr Günter Younger were present at that meeting either in person or online in case there were any questions that might be better put to them.

MR COTTIER greeted the members of the Executive Committee and appreciated the honour they had bestowed on him by giving him the opportunity to present the answers to the questions in the final report that the Executive Committee had received. On 9 July, he had set out the facts and the conclusions drawn from them, and could confirm that those conclusions had not changed. In other words, firstly, nothing in the file, which was complete, suggested that WADA had shown any favouritism or deference or in any way favoured the 23 Chinese swimmers. He had found no evidence of any interference or meddling in the agency's review, either within the agency or externally from any entity or institution, including the Chinese Anti-Doping Agency (CHINADA) or the Chinese authorities. He had found no irregularities in the review of CHINADA's decision. That review had been detailed and covered all relevant issues. Secondly, all the elements that had been taken into consideration by WADA, whether from the file produced by CHINADA with its decision or from the investigation procedures carried out by the agency itself, showed the decision not to appeal to be indisputably reasonable, both in terms of the facts and the applicable rules. In other words, he wanted to confirm that WADA had done its work autonomously, independently and professionally. The information in the file confirmed that, and there was no evidence to the contrary. WADA had applied the rules to which its activity was subject. His full report went beyond the questions posed and allowed him to make a number of suggestions. Those suggestions were of two kinds. Firstly, clarification of certain rules that the group in charge of revising the Code should examine, in particular with regard to specific situations of group contamination. Secondly, the formalization of certain administrative processes within WADA within its limited resources. Finally, as far as the Chinese agency was concerned, it was clear that certain rules of the Code had not been applied. That was regrettable, but in the end it did not change the outcome of the case and the acceptance of the contamination hypothesis. He would conclude his brief introduction at that point and would be happy to provide any further information and answer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Cottier for his report and for his diligence and professionalism in conducting his review. He opened the floor for questions and comments for Mr Cottier.

DR GUPTA thanked Mr Cottier for the brief information provided. On behalf of the Americas region and the United States of America, he appreciated his work and presentation and, of course, some of the comments he had made. He was grateful to be there to participate in that. Before asking some questions, he wished to state clearly that it was his belief that, even with the addition of that useful report and conclusions, there was still much more work for WADA and its stakeholders to do to strengthen anti-doping efforts and to learn and adjust based on the handling of that incident. Mr Cottier had stated that the decision not to appeal was indisputably reasonable and had made statements regarding autonomous, independent and professional work. He wished to know at some point what his definition of the difference between autonomous and independent was, from a legal perspective. Why and how were those terms being used?

In terms of questions, he understood from the document the reasons for not providing recommendations. Nevertheless, that was a 180-degree turnaround because Mr Cottier had indicated in the interim report that he would be providing recommendations. Could he please provide help to understand the roundabout turn on that particular issue, not only why recommendations had not been provided but also what motivated the difference of his opinion between 9 July and that day? Could he please share his thinking on that? Or was he just surprised that there was too much, as he had stated in his rationale for not providing recommendations after 9 July? He would ask his remaining questions afterwards.

MR COTTIER appreciated the two questions. As to the first question on the difference between independence and autonomy, when he had emphasized independence, he wanted it to be quite clear that the

agency had worked without anyone trying to influence its work. That was what he considered to be the short definition of the independence of a given entity, such as the independence of a court or the independence of a public prosecutor. Those were examples he was familiar with. Then he had talked about autonomy, which meant that, within the agency itself, the work of the management and the various specialized services should be conducted without getting instructions from the agency or the board, which would influence the work in one direction or another. As to the remainder, apart from one expert task, which had been entrusted to a pharmaceutical company that was very familiar with the substance, TMZ, WADA had worked in an autonomous manner. In other words, it had used its own resources in terms of the vast skills and also in terms of means and time made available. As the members knew, the agency worked in an autonomous manner. That was the difference between those two words, which overlapped to a degree.

As to the second question, he had talked about recommendations at the beginning of July when he had drawn up the interim report. He had not issued any recommendations in the formal sense of the word at the end of his final report for two reasons. Firstly, after having drafted his full decision, he had considered that he had not acquired a sufficient general level of expert knowledge to talk about recommendations, which for him carried a greater weight than the remarks or comments he had made. Dr Gupta had noted that those comments set out a certain number of suggestions. That was a nuance. He had issued proposals. He had described certain paths that should be followed, but he did not consider that they carried the weight of an actual recommendation, which was far weightier. Secondly, given the time he had had available, he had wanted to be able to file that report sufficiently in advance of the session held at the beginning of August. He had not been able in the time available to issue recommendations. He hoped that answered the questions.

DR GUPTA thanked Mr Cottier for acknowledging that he had not had sufficient knowledge to create recommendations while conducting that investigation. His next questions were the following. Mr Cottier had had two terms of reference in terms of questions and had clearly done wonderful work in looking at a lot of things, which he really appreciated. He understood that it was a comprehensive report. However, with the knowledge that Mr Cottier currently had, did he still believe that the terms of reference for his work were appropriate or should they have been expanded? In addition, since Mr Cottier had received his terms of reference, had he received any new information from experts or officials based in China, or any other source or expert that had given him more insight on the possible source of TMZ that had not been included in his report?

MR COTTIER replied to the first question that, given the situation as it had been at the end of April and beginning of May 2024, he firmly believed that the questions put to him in terms of the activity of WADA on the matter of the 23 Chinese swimmers had been relevant and sufficient in view of the case. Had things evolved subsequently? One could imagine that perhaps the mandate should have evolved as well, but that was only a supposition. Nothing enabled him to say that he should have been asked different questions or additional questions. That was his answer to the first question. As to the second question on new information and truly new elements, which might have led him to think that other evidence could be found in terms of the thesis of contamination or other hypotheses, no, he had not learned of any further facts that would have enabled him to think that things could have been elucidated in a different way to the way they were in his review conducted in 2021.

DR GUPTA reiterated his thanks for the opportunity to ask further questions and thanked Mr Cottier for his response and the fact that he had done tremendous work in drafting a very comprehensive report. He found the fact that Mr Cottier, as an expert, would not have asked himself anything different quite interesting. Again, it was the view of Mr Cottier and he could choose to not respond or not directly provide the answer, but as he had done such extensive work and spent quite a lot of time on it, he felt compelled to ask why, in Mr Cottier's view, he thought that CHINADA had not notified the athletes of the positive drug test. That was a finding in the report that he obviously had not mentioned in his earlier brief comments. Similarly, why did he think that CHINADA had chosen not to provisionally suspend the athletes while an investigation was conducted into the possible contamination? Lastly, why did he think that WADA's investigative department had not carried out a more in-depth factual investigation when the case had come in, leading to Mr Cottier's engagement? He thanked Mr Cottier for answering those questions.

MR COTTIER responded that he found those questions very interesting. Dr Gupta was asking him to put himself in the minds of people in 2021. Putting oneself in the shoes of a different person was an exercise that

an investigator had to look upon with a number of reservations. It was perhaps not dangerous, but it was very ambitious. It was rather pretentious to think that the intentions of a person three or four years previously could be ascertained, and that was true in every aspect of life. CHINADA had explained in its decision of 15 June 2021, right at the end, and it had already explained in March and in April 2021 why it had considered the cases to be very special. According to the agency, the explanation of the way that CHINADA had acted, its decision not to apply the ordinary rules of the Code and the Chinese code, was, he thought, widely known. The various documents sent by CHINADA to WADA highlighted that stance sufficiently, and he did not believe that it was up to him to interpret or to look for any other intentions. In his view, things were clear and the matter had been sufficiently set out. As to why investigations had not been conducted by the WADA Intelligence and Investigations Department at the time, he thought that the facts had shown that, from the legal stance, medical stance, pharmacokinetic stance and pharmaceutical stance in general, WADA's activities had been quite sufficient. He believed that the assessment that had been made did not warrant the engagement of that WADA department.

DR GUPTA wished to conclude by saying that Mr Cottier had acknowledged that CHINADA had not applied the Code to those cases, and had considered them, in his words, very special. Yet, Mr Cottier believed that the decision not to appeal was indisputably correct. He also believed that, beyond those two questions, there had been no reason to ask more questions or go further, whereas he had clearly done good work to go beyond that. Some of those matters were conflicting and contradictory. He thanked Mr Cottier for respectfully answering his questions at that time, and thanked him for so much hard work with his investigators. He highly appreciated his genuine input into the report and the work that he had done.

MR COTTIER wished to respond to the last comment very briefly. He had been appointed as an investigator. He had been given a mandate limited to two questions, not to mention what he had seen, which was very close to the two questions that might have led people to think that he had not seen those elements of non-application by CHINADA of the rules in the Code. He could have been criticized had he not mentioned that for being blinkered and failing to see what was on the left or on the right. That was why, even if the questions that had been put to him did not refer to that specific matter, he had needed to say that he had understood all of that in his overall view of the situation, with a view to answering the questions.

MS CESSOUMA wished to congratulate Mr Cottier on his excellent work. She remembered when that matter had been discussed and believed that a degree of consensus had been reached. She noted, however, that that was not the case. Africa supported all efforts to ensure that sport was as clean as possible with transparent procedures. It was also necessary to keep in mind the priority of protecting athletes. At the time, she had thought that the report highlighted all those points and there was no more to say. It was necessary to find a definitive solution to that kind of problem. The work in question was perhaps a bit disappointing because the question kept cropping up. A real solution had not been found. She did not know what the conclusion would be after that day's debate. She had thought the matter had been closed and would be concluded that day. She wished to note that, whatever the decision was, she did not want the Executive Committee to dwell on the question. She did not want it to lead to a confrontation between WADA, which did excellent work, and the Executive Committee. She believed a solution could be found without conflict or confrontation. She advocated making proposals that would enable the matter to be concluded as quickly as possible. That was what Africa wanted. Much work was required for clean sport but would not be possible if all sessions were delayed. She stressed the importance of working towards a solution by listening to the proposals tabled. That problem was proving to be divisive, and the view of the African continent was that it was key to work together in order to be strong.

MS MARACINEANU wished to note that she was speaking on her own behalf. She had respected the request for confidentiality proposed by WADA and it had not been possible to circulate the report among all of the CAHAMA members. Her first request was that Mr Cottier's report be circulated at the end of that day. She thanked Mr Cottier warmly for the wonderful work he had done. She thought that he had gone beyond the two questions put to him and had shown the great relevance of his inquiry and the knowledge he had built up in a very short space of time. He had truly conducted a very robust inquiry. She believed that, although he had said he would not make recommendations, reference could be made to paragraph six, which set out eight 'suggestions', as he called them, on the basis of which future work should be conducted. The colleague representing Africa had advocated moving on to something else. She was not in agreement, but rather thought

it important to look very carefully and intelligently together at those eight proposals. They were quite clear and she deemed that work necessary. The method could be defined without being suspicious or trying to accuse anybody in particular. She proposed working together in order to move forward and improve the processes that had been highlighted in that report, to enable relations with the NADOs to be improved, because there had been a problem in 2021 on the part of CHINADA. And more than in the report, she had exercised her right the previous day to read the annexes and wished to ask that annex 8.13 (the questions put to Professor Xavier Decleves) and annex 8.14 (the report of the study undertaken by the legal firm, and in particular what Mr Pierre Ducret had said), also be made accessible. Even if the names were removed and the report was made anonymous, people should be able to read it. Although Mr Cottier had incorporated a lot of that report into his own, it was interesting and shed light on a different aspect, going beyond the questions and the involvement of CHINADA in that matter. She believed that a great deal could be learned from the report. She proposed deciding on a method of work that day to have a roadmap in terms of implementing what she called the recommendations, although apparently there was no consensus on the term, to be able to move forward. She believed the Executive Committee should be able to at least have a right of scrutiny, if not control, concerning the implementation of those recommendations in the operational functioning of the agency.

MR DE VOS wished, on behalf of the sport movement, to thank the independent prosecutor Mr Cottier for his excellent report and his 'suggestions', not to use the term 'recommendations'. Although it might be semantic, the conclusions remained unchanged, which was very important for the sport movement and reassuring that nothing had been done wrongly. He thanked Mr Cottier for his clear answers. He had no further questions or suggestions but fully agreed that the most important work to be done at that time was looking at how those suggestions were dealt with and how solutions could be found to improve the system where necessary. He believed it was important to decide at that meeting the way forward to address those issues in order to, as suggested by the colleague from Africa, turn the page and move on at the end of that process. He believed it was also important to make some general comments. He had no specific questions for Mr Cottier and the sport movement fully respected the work that he had done. However, he had some general comments regarding the process and asked the Chairman if he should make those at that time or at a later stage.

THE CHAIRMAN proposed first asking questions and then making general comments about the next steps.

MR DE VOS wished firstly to also mention that, further to the eight comments, from what he had understood and also from what had already been discussed earlier that day in the meeting, some of those points were already in the process of being dealt with. He also considered that to be positive. He could imagine that it had been very surprising to receive the file that was a bulk of documents that were not structured. However, he understood that that was the situation in 2020 and 2021 but, in the meantime, with the introduction in 2023 of the result management centre (RMC), that problem had been or should be resolved. He wished to know if Mr Cottier had had any experience with documentation after 2023 and if he felt that the way the documents had been provided was better. Also, the lack of coordination between the departments had already been addressed under the Intelligence and Investigation Department audit report, but he thought that there was still a need for more guidelines. His last point was with regard to the athletes and communication, that it was important, also from a legal perspective, that the athletes be informed prior, during and also certainly when a case was closed so that they could remain in their comfort zone. He would make some more general comments after that round.

MR COTTIER replied that he had not seen or received any files post-dating the time when the case had taken place. However, in the exchanges that he had had with the Director General and Mr Wenzel, and given what he had found on the WADA website, he had seen that work had already been under way on various aspects, on which he had made some remarks. He had also understood that the management of the file and its legibility had already been an issue discussed prior to him joining the meeting. The same went for coordination. It had not been his role to look into whether coordination had changed or evolved since the period that he had been supposed to investigate. From the discussions he had had with the management of the agency, he had been fully satisfied that the problem had been identified and, once a problem had been identified, not even taking into account his investigation, it was being dealt with. In response to the comment made by the representative from Africa, those were questions that would always come up. It did not mean that

they had not been resolved. Society changed, the situation changed, and for many things it was simply not possible to obtain a final response. One just had to be as up-to-date as one could.

MR WENZEL said that he would comment on two points. The first was in response to the request made by the CAHAMA representative, Ms Maracineanu, that annexes 8.13 and 8.14, the report of the scientific expert and the report of the legal expert, if he had understood correctly, be made public. As was mentioned in the cover paper, advice had been received that it would certainly be problematic from a data perspective to publish all of the annexes. Very simply, the reason was that, in order to publish personal, sensitive information, there needed to be a legal basis to do so. The legal basis in that instance would not be consent. It would be a form of public interest, a compelling justification. The view of the counsel consulted was that that compelling justification or that public interest would extend to the publication of the report itself, which described and quoted, in some instances, the various annexes, but it would not extend to at least the globality of the annexes. If it was the view of the Executive Committee that, with respect to those specific annexes, it should be considered to what extent they could be published with data protection counsel redacted as necessary, that was certainly something that could be done. The question had been asked with respect to the body of the annexes and an opinion received on that question.

With regard to Mr De Vos's comments on the files, he thought it was necessary to distinguish between the files that would have been kept in 2021 by the various people involved in that process. That would have been the Science Department, of course, the Legal Department and others. Each of those individuals, including Professor Rabin to his right, would no doubt have had their own individual files. Rightly or wrongly, he took responsibility for that. If one set of one person's files or even everybody's files had been provided, it might not have covered all of the documents, including messages and everything that related to that process. When the Executive Committee had endorsed the appointment of Mr Cottier, he had wanted to make sure that Mr Cottier received absolutely everything and in such a way that would not in any way lead him. Therefore, everything that could possibly relate to that file had simply been extracted from the IT systems with the help of the IT Department and provided in chronological order. He accepted that that had not been the most efficient way for Mr Cottier to familiarize himself with the file, but the view had been that it was the safest way from a transparency perspective to provide the files. With respect to the files that WADA kept on individual cases, it was true that, since the introduction of the RMC, there had been a more harmonized and structured approach. There was a screenshot of what that filing structure looked like in the cover paper that had been provided to members. Since and even before the story had broken at the end of April of that year, WADA's Legal Department, specifically the result management division of that department, had worked on and continued to update certain internal protocols, including a step-by-step approach to how decisions were reviewed, including, if a decision was taken to refer a case to external counsel, how that referral e-mail should be drafted. That work before 2024 had already been done, which addressed some of the concerns Mr Cottier had raised.

DR MUROFUSHI thanked Mr Cottier for his comprehensive review and hard work in a limited period of time. He had one question. In his opinion, Mr Cottier had perfectly provided all the documentation, which he highly appreciated. Some people had proposed going back and doing the research again, but that would not be possible for scientific reasons because it was called recall bias and would be scientifically wrong. All of the resources were at that time available and it was time to look to the future. He asked why, as the independent prosecutor, Mr Cottier had chosen a scientific advisor or specialist in pharmacokinetics and another who focused on therapeutic uses. Had he considered experts from the field of sport science or anti-doping science?

MR COTTIER replied that the expertise he had required from scientific experts was in the field of pharmacokinetics. His understanding was of the scenario going from the ingestion of a substance in any which way to the excretion or elimination of the substance in any which way, though in that case it had been through urine. It concerned what happened in the body from consumption and what would have had to be done prior to ingestion in order to reach the result after excretion. He had believed it necessary to find an expert who could explain that to him. He had not gone beyond that. The questions that he had put to the scientific expert had required him to give a view on hypotheses in view of his scientific knowledge and with regard to the questions that he had needed to answer. He had not believed it necessary to consult other experts given the questions that had been put to him.

MS MARACINEANU wished to return to the question of the publication of the annexes after Mr Cottier's answer. The previous day, members had been provided an opportunity to examine the report in person and read the annexes, which included some private data that could be excluded or deleted in order to be able to publish those annexes. She did not know whether other members of the Executive Committee had consulted those annexes but she thought it would be very interesting to read them and to see the comparison between the various versions of the Code and the standards by way of information. She thought it would be very interesting for the Executive Committee members to see what was contained in the annexes.

MR DE VOS noted that, for some people, it had been impossible to consult the annexes the previous day as many meetings had been held. However, he supported the request for the annexes to remain available for the members of the Executive Committee after that meeting, because he thought the need for further follow-up should be agreed upon and those annexes would still be relevant for the future process. The Olympic Movement would support a process whereby those annexes remained available for consultation by the Executive Committee members.

DR GUPTA supported the request made by the colleague from the Council of Europe and the sport movement colleague to make the annexes available to the Executive Committee and endeavour to make the information publicly available with the necessary data protection. He believed that it would help build public trust. He advocated providing the full annexes to the Executive Committee as it moved forward in a collaborative way to find good recommendations.

MS BENNETT thanked Mr Cottier for his detailed analysis, thorough report and suggestions for WADA to improve systems. She also appreciated his willingness to answer questions at the Executive Committee meeting that day and the forthright nature with which he had done that. Personally, she was grateful for the fact that he had expanded his report into details that went beyond the questions put to him and informed his decisions on those two matters, even though they might not have been directly the matters put to him. She thought that provided a basis for the Executive Committee's informed discussions on that matter. She echoed comments from colleagues about reflecting on his suggestions or recommendations as a way to move forward, and particularly to ensure that athletes and NADOs were provided with a copy of his report to restore trust in WADA and in the anti-doping framework. She had no specific questions but wanted to take the opportunity to thank Mr Cottier for the way that he had gone about undertaking that analysis and investigation and the very thorough report that he had provided, which she thought would form a strong basis for restoring that trust that she had just mentioned.

MR MISKIMMIN wished to record his thanks to Mr Cottier for his complete and thorough report. He was very satisfied with the work and congratulated and thanked him for that. It was very reassuring to hear his conclusion of no bias and that the decision not to appeal had been a reasonable one. He thought that provided a unique opportunity to look forward rather than look back, with the mandate and opportunity to look at where further improvements could be made to strengthen WADA and also to strengthen the Executive Committee's processes. He welcomed Mr Cottier's suggestion on those internal processes but agreed with Europe that others needed to look at it and take some consideration. There might be other things that were raised that should be considered. However, he wished to state for the record that he believed there should be an examination of the appropriate role that the Executive Committee played in that situation, particularly in such sensitive cases and cases where there was such a high risk profile, in a situation where ultimately the Executive Committee was accountable for a decision or an action that it had not agreed on at the outset. There were aspects related to that that he thought needed to be reviewed and he would welcome any process to do so. He would contribute insofar as possible. He would also recommend publishing the annexes, which he deemed would be very helpful for the NADOs.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL wished to respond to Mr De Vos to say that the annexes would be made available to the Executive Committee members. An electronically secure means of sending them would be found.

MR DE VOS said that he was happy with that answer but reiterated that he also had some general comments. He thought it was important to make some more general comments on behalf of the sport movement. The decision of WADA not to appeal the decision of CHINADA had had a very important impact on the

organization and, in the view of the sport movement, had unnecessarily undermined the reputation of WADA and the broader international anti-doping system. Many references had been made to governance, and he wished to reiterate that a governance review had already been performed twice and that, in the view of the sport movement, the processes and the system and governance reforms that had been introduced and implemented very recently were good and should have made the organization more solid. Of course, there were always areas for improvement but, for the sport movement, some points were important and needed to be addressed. First of all, it believed that the dialogue between WADA and the US partners needed to be restored or improved. There was serious friction and it was good to see that some first steps had already been taken. It was a very fragile relationship but the sport movement called for further improvements to be made in that direction and communication to be improved.

It was also necessary to consider how WADA and the whole anti-doping system could be better protected from politicization in a world where polarization and disinformation campaigns were growing and fake news was even becoming the norm. It was necessary to see how WADA could better protect its system and organization against that. He also believed that WADA needed to strengthen its crisis management response and look at opportunities to further strengthen trust in the system and further improve communication with the athlete community and anti-doping organizations. The sport movement believed that it was necessary to take the suggestions or remarks of Mr Cottier very seriously, and to take an appropriate initiative that day to follow up in an efficient and timely way where improvements needed to be included in the Code review, as also suggested by Mr Cottier. That could be done in a timely way and in order not to lose any time. Another point that he believed needed to be addressed was that the number of contamination cases was increasing all the time, and that was probably due to improved technology, which allowed for much lower levels or thresholds to be detected. Therefore, the sport movement urgently called upon WADA to look into that and to find ways to avoid unnecessary clear contamination cases without, of course, endangering the integrity of the whole system. It was necessary to get rid of the overload of cases that in the end were considered contamination. He urged them to do that and acknowledged that there was already an initiative in that sense, but believed it was necessary to move on because all of those cases, like the one that had just occurred, absorbed a lot of the resources and means of those organizations that should be used to fight doping. Too much bureaucracy should be avoided. It was important to address that contamination subject and to try to remove contamination from procedures by establishing certain thresholds or limits, again always very carefully (that was why it was a scientific project), without endangering the integrity of the whole system. The sport movement looked forward to those potential measures and was of course open to further ideas on that subject.

DR SANGENIS first of all wished to thank Mr Cottier for his hard work and the comprehensive report that she had read carefully. She had also read all the proposals and suggestions, and wished to say that contamination at that point had reached the general public, the population at large, because it was through the media that the general population took notice or found out about such matters, and everybody had an opinion. She believed that with all the experience acquired from those contamination cases and the different scenarios, scientific, legal, technical, appeal or challenge the contamination decision, different steps of the evaluation should be an important part of the education programme of WADA and be included, for example, in the annual symposium. Cases could be part of courses, lectures and working groups. Even the word contamination, in her view, should be part of the regular conversation, like steroids, stimulants, modulators and other substances or methods. Contamination was a well-known scenario for WADA. Everybody knew all the expertise. As Mr De Vos had said, contamination was happening on a large scale. That was known to the Executive Committee from the number of cases that WADA had dealt with, but it was a new topic for the general population and for many athletes also. In her view, WADA should share its broad experience with stakeholders, athletes and NADOs, and enrich public information with true and scientific information. Public trust was important.

DR GUPTA started by saying that he completely agreed with the colleagues from the sport movement on the need to work together for a stronger WADA and a stronger anti-doping system. As several others had mentioned, it was necessary to work on the science development and research regarding contamination cases. It was also necessary to make sure that WADA did not learn about such cases via reports that appeared in the media, but the Executive Committee should learn about them right there in that room. On the point about partners, as a strong democracy and with the independence of all partners, he would continue to encourage WADA's leadership to engage with those partners separately, independently and autonomously, to use the

terms that had been used, so that ties could be strengthened with those partners separately. He was happy to facilitate that because he believed communication, relationship-building and trust to be a very important component of harmonization, collaboration and cooperation, which was the mission. It was necessary to work to protect against disinformation and fake news in all campaigns; that was often true outside those walls, but it was sometimes true inside those walls. Therefore, he advocated also working collaboratively to make sure that all of the members were educated, whether that be regarding the legal changes that were happening in the USA or the ability to make sure that people felt comfortable going to the USA as a welcoming nation, which would be hosting many sporting activities in the future. The USA had a deep vested interest, not only for the Americas, but also for the world, in working in partnership to strengthen the anti-doping system and hoped that all would continue to work together towards that.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Gupta and asked if there were any other comments or questions. He then gave the floor to Mr Cottier to offer final conclusions and final comments.

MR COTTIER noted that he had to be very careful about making further comments since he did not want to start participating in a debate, which on one hand was very interesting – he trusted that the Executive Committee understood that the mission with which he had been tasked was very interesting – but on the other hand was not his to deal with. He had issued his report and given his opinion, and was very happy that what he had called ‘suggestions’ had raised interest. He did not feel the need to say any more, as all of those themes were being addressed and were in good hands, which he was very happy about.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Cottier again for the very comprehensive, robust report, which he was sure would help WADA to strengthen the anti-doping system.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he did not wish to pre-empt any further discussion on the way forward but wished to respond to the remarks made by Dr Sangenis and Mr De Vos that contamination was the crux of the matter. Whether it be individual or group contamination, the reality was that such cases would increase in the future and there was no satisfactory answer to that at that time. That was clear. There was probably no easy answer either. That would need to be addressed both scientifically and legally and was a challenge for the entire system.

THE CHAIRMAN opened the floor for general comments as there were no more questions.

DR GUPTA noted that there had been really good discussions and conversations amongst all of the colleagues, mostly around that table, in the previous day-and-a-half following discussions amongst governments and colleagues in the sport movement and with WADA. He recommended that a sub-committee of the Executive Committee be established to turn the findings from the two Cottier reports, as well as the findings of the World Aquatics report on that matter, into specific recommendations for approval by the Executive Committee. He proposed on behalf of One Voice that such sub-committee consist of a member from the public authorities, a member from the sport movement, a representative from the Athlete Council, with an independent member, namely Ms Battaini-Dragoni, serving as chairperson, if she was willing to accept that responsibility. He also wished to thank the public authorities, the sport movement and the WADA management for assistance in discussing that. The purpose of that group was to find consensus on the way forward. He would very much welcome all colleagues’ comments and support for that proposal and looked forward to returning in December 2024 with some initial recommendations.

MR PINI stated that he did not have any comments or questions for Mr Cottier but did appreciate and acknowledge his report, the transparency and the thorough review of that case. He would withhold from making a statement on behalf of the Athlete Council until a later time, as those documents had not been reviewed. However, he did want to offer some initial comments, particularly regarding the sentiments expressed by the athlete community. It was his role as the voice of the athletes to relay those from the anti-doping community. Those views largely centred around trust in the anti-doping system, a system which was designed to protect athletes’ rights and integrity in sport, while deviating from the established procedures as accounted for and accepted in the report, there was a need to respect fundamental legal principles and human rights, and it was essential to consider the potential impact on the broader system. The Code was not built for athletes to understand. It was complex. Athletes rather abided by and understood the general principle and relied on the trust that the system was working for them and to protect them. In any case, the Code was highly complex.

Athletes relied on consistent and transparent processes to ensure fairness. Any deviation, even in unique cases, risked creating a perception of arbitrariness, and athletes needed to have confidence that the same standards applied universally, regardless of the circumstances. Moving forward, it was critical to focus on constructive measures and lessons, particularly in the Code, and the suggestions by Mr Cottier that built confidence among athletes and that ensured that they felt secure in a system that constantly upheld the same principles for all.

In addition to the discussion of contamination cases, he wished to highlight the importance of the Athlete Council collaborating with any of the related working groups on contamination or inadvertent doping. The rise in contamination cases was concerning, driven largely by advancements in detection, and it was crucial that the Athlete Council was actively involved in those discussions to ensure that athletes' voices were heard and considered. By working together, it would be possible to develop fair, effective solutions that protected clean athletes, while maintaining trust in the integrity of the system. Finally, on further feedback from the athletes, he wished to address the narrative that unintentionally targeted clean athletes and that cast a shadow on their efforts as clean ambassadors for sport. It was crucial to recognize the dedication and integrity of those athletes, who constantly upheld the values of fair competition. In striving to protect the integrity of the sport, it was vital to ensure that efforts did not inadvertently harm those who were committed to competing cleanly, but rather supported and elevated their role as ambassadors of fair play. Lastly, in response to Dr Gupta, the Athlete Council would gladly put forward an athlete representative if that working group were to exist.

MR DE VOS noted on behalf of the sport movement that he supported the initiative, as he believed it was the appropriate way to work and also that it was the responsibility of the Executive Committee to do whatever necessary and take some personal responsibility, rather than commissioning it out. As Dr Gupta had mentioned, the terms of reference had to be clear and refer only to the eight suggestions from Mr Cottier relating, of course, to the entirety of the report and its annexes. The sport movement thought it was also an excellent idea to include the World Aquatics recommendations and suggestions, because that body had experienced the same case from another angle, and it was important to include all angles. He would perhaps suggest, but would leave that up to the sub-committee to consider, involving an expert with regard to the 2027 Code review process because it was necessary to move quickly and to make sure that, if the sub-committee issued conclusions (which would of course need to be endorsed by the Executive Committee), there was a very smooth integration of the items that needed to be adapted in the Code, through the Code review, and a good connection and bridge between the Executive Committee and the sub-committee and the Code review organization. He sincerely hoped that Ms Battaini-Dragoni would accept that mission, especially given her expertise and lengthy experience with the organization. That could certainly help to move things forward in a timely way, because it was also necessary to be clear that the process should start that day or the next, at the latest. He supported the initiative.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI responded to the request. She was aware of the importance of the decision to create a group that was limited in its composition, but which could work effectively in order to see what could continue to be done all together in order to reinforce WADA for all of the athletes in particular. She felt a bit emotional because she had not expected to be asked to chair that small group but would take the matter very seriously and as soon as possible would start to see what could continue to be done together.

MS MARACINEANU spoke on behalf of Europe to thank Ms Battaini-Dragoni for accepting that role on behalf of the Executive Committee. She thought it was important to follow up on the excellent work done by Mr Cottier and to take into account the eight suggestions to make priorities or perhaps develop a roadmap in order to implement those eight suggestions. She wished to broach two points. Perhaps the members would agree with her. The first was the surprise that had been felt when that case had been publicized, and that one item had not been mentioned in the eight suggestions, which concerned information for the members of the Executive Committee about the decision not to appeal. She understood that there had been some difficulties informing the members but, if such a case were to happen again (and it would), perhaps in the future WADA would decide not to appeal again, but that information needed to be provided in some way to the Executive Committee. Secondly, she thought that the crux of the matter was contamination. As the Chairman had already said and everybody had agreed, it was the most topical subject. She was not sure what had been suggested with regard to contamination cases but thought that there was already a working group between NADOs and WADA on the subject of contamination and thought that the Executive Committee did not necessarily have the expertise to take a decision on the matter, but one suggestion might be to look at the subject of contamination

in a broader fashion in all of the countries of the world, because not all had the same rules in terms of agriculture and there were different forms of contamination from meat or medicines and different rules. She thought that, apart from doping from contamination, there were other things that needed to be done. In terms of detection thresholds, she did not necessarily think that they should be put up because that might cause problems in countries that did not have the same risk of contamination through meat or medicines as other countries. She also wanted to suggest that all the members of the Executive Committee be informed regularly so as to be able to make contributions. There should be a report at the next meeting of the Executive Committee so that the members could put forward a roadmap to the Director General of WADA and then follow the implementation of the suggested roadmap. She agreed that the working group should talk only about the report.

MS CESSOUMA stated that all human endeavours could be perfected. It was very clear that the system and procedures required improvement. She fully supported the establishment of the group that would work on the suggestions in the report. She stressed that it should limit its work to Mr Cottier's report and that there be a limited timeframe. Recommendations from that group should be put forward at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. She wished to thank Ms Battaini-Dragoni, who had accepted that responsibility, and wished to congratulate her on her work. She encouraged everybody to work in a spirit of collaboration and under the leadership of WADA in the hope that, in December 2024, that subject could be concluded.

MR DE VOS responded to the question put forward by Europe. He completely agreed. Contamination was the theme for the future and was increasingly relevant because science developed in a way that made it possible to detect traces of prohibited substances. Contamination was not a form of doping and did not have an impact on athletes' performance. He understood that initiatives had been taken in that direction, but it was necessary to move forward and make progress, and to deal with the matter seriously. Resources were required for all such cases and it was necessary to avoid cases of that type in the future, and bureaucracy should not hamper that. He wished to know what sort of initiative could be taken by WADA in order to make progress in that regard so that, in the future, useless cases did not have to be dealt with.

MR MUROFUSHI wanted to support the proposal on the working group and thank its future chairperson. He thought that the working group would work well. The number of non-intentional contamination cases was increasing and there was a financial burden in appealing to the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS). He wondered if that could be addressed by the working group or perhaps another instance, as it was necessary to consider that for the future of WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN gave the floor to the Director General for his concluding comments on the matter.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to Mr De Vos that the idea was to discuss the item in the framework of the sub-committee. There was already a Contaminants Working Group in WADA. Its terms of reference were different, being to determine what substances were deemed to be contaminating. Of course, whether the terms of reference of that group be extended or whether another group specific to contamination was required would be examined. Contamination was the central subject and raised many questions from the legal and scientific point of view, as had been mentioned. He supposed that the WADA management would support the Executive Committee sub-group. He requested confirmation because it had not been said when talking about the composition of the group.

MR DE VOS noted that he could speak on behalf of the Olympic Movement. He did not completely agree with the fact that the issue of contamination from the scientific and legal point of view should be part of the terms of reference of that sub-committee. He thought the sub-committee should examine what could be improved in the procedures of WADA, in the Code and the standards. However, the problem of contamination was a scientific issue and had to be looked at by experts, because he did not believe that the members of the Executive Committee had the experience and the knowledge to be able to contribute to that. Nevertheless, it was obviously necessary to look at all that from the more generic point of view. Meanwhile, it was very important that WADA continue to work on the issue in order to find solutions that would be acceptable from the scientific and legal point of view. He hoped that he had clarified his position.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL clarified that he was not suggesting in any way that the ad-hoc group deal with technical questions. The report would be given to the Contaminants Working Group as well as the working group dealing with the Code Update, upstream of the work that would be done by the group that was just

constituted, and he thought that the roadmap that would be developed would entail looking into contamination more broadly.

MS CESSOUMA stated that the group would require the support of the WADA management but she had understood that its work would be limited to the suggestions made in Mr Cottier's report. Perhaps she was wrong and it needed to be extended. If that was the case, it would not be possible to submit that report in December 2024.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked all of the participants for the interesting and robust discussion. He was glad that Mr Cottier's final report had confirmed the following: he had had unrestricted access to all relevant materials; WADA's review of the case had been thorough and professional; there had been no bias, interference or any other form of impropriety; and the decision not to appeal or challenge the contamination scenario had been indisputably reasonable. He hoped that that chapter could be closed to make it possible to focus on the way forward and on how the anti-doping system could really be strengthened. Of course, WADA welcomed the initiative of the public authorities and sport movement to create a working group to address the recommendations and suggestions of Mr Cottier and would engage in that process. He also welcomed that initiative because some of the suggestions applied to WADA's internal procedures, so he thought it was very important for WADA to be part of that group. In addition, it was a very good sign of collaboration to look together at what could be changed in the regulations. WADA would humbly accept the suggestions and recommendations on its internal processes and regulations. Positive lessons could be learned from that report with full acceptance of the suggestions to strengthen the system. He reiterated his appreciation of the very collaborative, comprehensive discussion and thanked Mr Cottier for his work. As discussed at the previous meeting, he hoped all of the members agreed on publishing the report on the WADA website. He thanked the members of the Executive Committee.

DECISION

Final report by the independent prosecutor to be published on the WADA website, and Executive Committee Working Group on the implementation of the Cottier report to be created.

5. Governance

- 5.1 International Testing Agency foundation board member appointment

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL stated that item 5.1 required a decision from the Executive Committee on the appointment to the International Testing Agency (ITA) board of Mrs Dagmawit Girmay Berhane. That was the process that had been agreed upon the creation of the ITA, where proposed candidates were reviewed by the Nominations Committee prior to formal approval of the appointment by the Executive Committee. She had been approved and recommended by the Nominations Committee and the Executive Committee was asked to approve her nomination to the board of the ITA.

DR GUPTA unanimously supported the nomination of Mrs Berhane on behalf of the One Voice members and thanked his dear colleague, Professor Erdener, for his service on the ITA board.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for the record if the Executive Committee agreed to approve the International Olympic Committee representative, Mrs Dagmawit Girmay Berhane of Ethiopia, to the International Testing Agency foundation board.

DECISION

ITA foundation board member appointment approved.

- 5.2 Risk and Audit Committee – Executive Committee member appointment

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that that was a formality because the Executive Committee members had been consulted already on Mr Kejval being reappointed to the Risk and Audit Committee after one year.

Given that support had been received from both the sport movement and the public authorities, it was a formality.

DR GUPTA expressed unanimous support on behalf of the public authorities for the reappointment of Mr Kejval to the Risk and Audit Committee. He thanked him for his past service on that important committee and his agreement to continue to serve for the following year.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for the record if there were any objections to reappointing Mr Kejval as the Executive Committee member on the WADA Risk and Audit Committee for a second term starting on 22 September 2024.

DECISION

Proposal to reappoint Mr Kejval as the Executive Committee member of the WADA Risk and Audit Committee approved.

- 5.3 Executive Committee and Foundation Board memberships 2025

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL recalled that the deadline for nominations for both the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board was 1 November 2024. He called upon regions where there was an upcoming vacant seat to submit nominations.

MS CESSOUMA noted that, for 2025, the African Union would remain a member. In November, the African Union would submit the name of the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo who would be replacing Ghana. In December, the African Union would also probably be able to submit the decision about representation from the African Union.

MS MARACINEANU wished to inform the Executive Committee that the European representatives for the Foundation Board and Executive Committee had been recommended by CAHAMA at its previous meeting. They included a representative from Armenia for the Foundation Board and a representative from Ukraine for the Executive Committee. Consultations were still ongoing but the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe would be meeting before the end of October 2024 to decide. The names would be communicated to WADA as soon as the formal decision had been taken.

DECISION

Executive Committee and Foundation Board memberships 2025 noted.

6. World Anti-Doping Programme

- 6.1 2027 Code and international standards update

MR HAYNES greeted the Executive Committee members and said that he would provide a brief update on the 2027 Code and international standards since the previous Executive Committee meeting in March. The end of the stakeholder consultation phase was approaching. It had been launched in May and would conclude on 11 October. Stakeholders had had the opportunity to review proposals made by the relevant drafting teams, and were guided by a summary of major modifications for each document. In order to increase the reach of stakeholder input and accessibility, all of those documents had also been added to the WADA website. At that time, fewer than 50 comments had been received on the WADA Connect platform, but a flurry of comments was expected in the following weeks. For the concept phase, over a thousand comments had been received and so a large number of comments were expected in the following two weeks. After the conclusion of the consultation phase, the drafting teams would reconvene and review the feedback received. That phase would run until the following February before launching a further stakeholder consultation window. Because the original plan had been for that project to be initially an update rather than a full review, it had been identified in the plan that the consultation phase the following year might be reduced in scope or might focus on certain documents and not others. However, it was anticipated at that time, following many of the comments received, that the majority, if not all, of the documents would require further consultation. The following year's consultation phase

would of course include the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories. A few minor adjustments to the plan included in the paper provided to the Executive Committee had been made. He wanted to touch on one important development that had evolved over the summer, which was the need to ensure that the athletes' voice was heard in that project. There had been limited athlete input during the concept phase. Therefore, together with the Athlete Engagement Impact Area, he had been looking at other opportunities to engage athletes in order for them to provide their invaluable input. That included issuing tailored postcards during the recent Olympic and Paralympic Games to athletes. Finally, as proposals became more concrete, the Executive Committee would be given the opportunity to discuss emerging issues at its meeting in December and of course the following year as the documents evolved. That concluded his presentation.

MR PINI thanked Mr Haynes. It was reassuring to hear that the optional consultation would be enforced. He wished to reiterate his thanks for the support in hearing the athletes' voice in that consultation review. He wanted there to be as much athlete input as possible. It had emerged from the consultations with the athletes that it was a rather complex process and, while the athletes had good intentions to put forward suggestions, it was very difficult for them to be able to do so. He was therefore looking forward to the inclusion of a very niche space for athletes to be able to input their comments. He thanked Mr Haynes and his team for allowing the Athlete Council to step into that Code review process.

MS MARACINEANU said that she was glad to hear that the consultation phase was going to continue. That was what Europe had proposed, and it welcomed the continuation of that third consultation phase for the Code and the standards. She reiterated the request that WADA provide an impact assessment of those new requirements, particularly regarding the human and financial resources of WADA and the NADOs (it was also a way for them to negotiate a larger budget) if substantial amendments had to be made to the Code, it was necessary to be aware of those, also for WADA, as well as an impact assessment on legislation.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL stated on the impact assessments on NADOs that, as noted in the past, WADA could not do that alone. NADOs differed greatly depending on their individual situations, and it was therefore up to the NADOs to carry out such impact assessments with regard to the proposals and then share the results with the Code group if they wished. WADA simply did not have the possibility to carry out such impact assessments.

DECISION

2027 Code and international standards update noted.

7. Legal

- 7.1 Voluntary withholding of contributions to WADA's budget by governments

MR WENZEL stated that the process had been a long one to date. It had accompanied him pretty much through his entire journey at WADA thus far. The discussion group to advance that project had been agreed at least as a principle in Cairo in May 2022. By the time of the previous ordinary Executive Committee meeting in March of that year, the discussion group had produced a paper considered to be a basis to move forward to drafting and further consultation, and that had been approved by the Executive Committee at the meeting in March before the symposium. One issue that had been raised specifically at that Executive Committee meeting was the legality or otherwise of a penalty or fine as one of the consequences for voluntary withdrawal of funding. After consultation with the Swiss counsel, who was available that day during that meeting, if necessary, to answer questions on that point, it had been considered more robust legally to require the payment of interest as opposed to a penalty or a fine. A fine as such or a penalty had been taken off the table. As set out in the proposals, the regulation currently referred to interest for late payment, with differing percentages depending on whether they were low, moderate or high consequences. From the outset, he thought that it was fair to say that both the European representatives had argued at most of the meetings that interest should be preferred to a fine or a penalty. That was the upshot after consultation with the external counsel. Subject to that one change from fine to interest, the documents that had been drafted contained no material changes to the paper that had been submitted in March. Indeed, very often the wording was verbatim, the same. The drafting had been done by the external counsel who, again, was available if there were questions. The bulk of that drafting was set out

in a specific regulations on the withdrawal of funding that would be, if adopted, part of the governance regulations, but there were also certain consequential changes or changes to anchor that mechanism in the WADA statutes which had also been provided in the papers in red-line. There were also minimal changes to the World Anti-Doping Code with respect to the consequences that were required to be implemented through signatories. Those were in particular the consequences relating to bidding for events, the consequence relating to the relevant government representatives attending certain events and also sitting on signatory boards. Those had to be anchored in the Code. The members might have seen that there were some proposed changes to the Code or additions to the Code. He thought it was important to stress that those changes would not need to be implemented by the signatories into their own rules. It was a matter of contract between WADA and the signatories.

Because there were changes to the Code, it was necessary under the terms of the Code to submit those changes, even if they were not implementable by signatories in their own rules, to reasonable consultation. As stated in the paper, a consultation period was proposed from late September until mid-October, of three weeks. After that consultation process had taken place, and if any changes came out of that consultation process, the discussion group could meet in order to discuss the documents again. However, the plan from the WADA management was very much to submit those documents for adoption by the Foundation Board in Saudi Arabia in early December 2024. Of course, if there were changes made to the documents prior to that, they would be submitted back to that Executive Committee at its meeting the day prior to the meeting of the Foundation Board in Saudi Arabia. That concluded his presentation.

MR EMONYI observed that WADA's funding model needed to be secure, as that had an impact on the fight for clean sport. Governments and other stakeholders needed to maintain cooperation and commitment in order to ensure the integrity of sport and the protection of clean athletes worldwide. He believed failure to pay contributions had a significant impact on the athletes and the anti-doping ecosystem, as activities and programmes would be affected. Consequences were there to deter and encourage timely contributions. The process was graded and several measures would be in place to understand the different scenarios before a high-level consequence decision was reached. The proposed changes to the WADA statutes, the regulations, the Code and the consequences of voluntary withdrawal to contributions to the WADA budget were fully supported.

DR GUPTA spoke on behalf of all of the public authorities, which agreed that the measure should not be approved. If a formal vote was called, the public authorities would vote unanimously against it. However, each of those representing governments had somewhat different views on that topic, and anyone who wished to speak would do so of their own accord. Firstly, on behalf of the Americas region, he wanted to share some brief remarks. First and foremost, he did not see any legal analysis in the documentation that had been submitted. He thought it was important, again, to not be surprised, but rather to have something in writing. If he had missed it, he certainly wished to know that he had missed documents that had been submitted. He understood that any organization must be concerned about the maintenance of its budget, and that that issue had been a priority for the past five years at WADA. Nonetheless, as a representative of a democratic country, he also had a responsibility to listen to and respond to the concerns of the United States members of Congress to garner their support regarding the appropriate fulfilment of dues. The US Congress had very clearly asked him to assure it that WADA was taking the necessary steps to further improve its effectiveness and transparency, and he wanted to be in a position to do that. For the USA to continue, as it had since WADA's founding a quarter of a century previously, to remain each year, year after year, the largest funder of the organization from a public authority standpoint, it had to do that. At that point, increasing sanctions on sovereign nations, threatening to deny countries the ability to host games and imposing additional financial penalties, whether they be dues, interest, penalties or fines at that time would severely undermine the ability of the USA to support WADA. He wished to make it clear that he understood that the intent of those sanctions was to protect WADA's budget, which he was very sensitive to and which was the responsibility of any organization and that Executive Committee. However, the results of imposing new sanctions at that time would be exactly the opposite, and perhaps irreversibly so. He therefore urged all of the colleagues there not to approve those sanctions, because he was certain that they would weaken and not strengthen WADA and would undermine the shared goal of strengthening anti-doping efforts. It would be improper for a vote that imposed a mandate on public authorities when the public authorities

opposed that. That was not the type of collaborative and cooperative spirit sought. He respectfully asked his colleagues to carefully reconsider that counterproductive and ill-timed approach.

MR PINI echoed Mr Emonyi in emphasizing the critical importance of consistent funding to WADA's operations, especially to outline the principle of equal funding enshrined in the UNESCO International Convention against Doping in Sport. Any disruption to the balance, such as withholding contributions, posed a real threat to the stability of the anti-doping system. It was essential to recognize that withholding contributions did not just affect the overall budget, but directly impacted meaningful athlete programmes, such as the work of the Athlete Council. Those programmes were vital for education, supporting and protecting athletes in the ongoing fight against doping. Athlete-centred initiatives relied heavily on stable and consistent funding to be effective and, without delay or reduction, could significantly hinder the ability to promote clean sport. He urged governments and all stakeholders to consider the broader consequences of withholding contributions. It was about ensuring athletes had the tools and knowledge and resources to compete fairly and cleanly. Maintaining reliable funding was essential to safeguarding those critical programmes, and he believed it was a shared responsibility to ensure their continued success.

MS CESSOUMA noted that Africa was of the opinion that the commitments made must be honoured and upheld by paying contributions to promote clean sports and, above all, implement WADA's activities. However, Africa noted the difficulties that some member states might have. In Africa in particular, currently, there were economic difficulties in addition to the harmful effects of climate change. In most African countries, there were floods leading to deaths, houses that were destroyed, crops swept away, and almost all countries were concerned with hundreds of deaths. In Kenya and Ethiopia, in the Sahel region, where it normally did not rain enough, recent rains had washed everything away. Therefore, it was necessary to have not a gradual approach, but rather an approach that took account of all of those difficulties, and countries should not be sanctioned. It was not because those countries did not want to pay but because those countries had difficulties honouring their contributions. She advocated a gradual approach that took account of the difficulties being encountered in the African continent. All member states were encouraged to pay on time, obviously, but often there were many conflicts and great economic difficulties owing, inter alia, to climate change.

MR MISKIMMIN conveyed the strong support of Oceania for the general proposal being reflected there. He recognized that WADA absolutely needed confidence and assurance of funding supply to do its job efficiently. However, from the perspective of Oceania, at the March 2024 Executive Committee meeting, there had been an undertaking to obtain a legal opinion that was to be shared. At that stage, he had not seen that legal opinion, if one had been obtained. Secondly, also at the March meeting, there had been an agreement that the proposal would be up for further consultation. He had not seen any of that consultation process at all. He questioned some of the decisions relating to the penalties imposed of 15%, 20%, etc., and a number of other things. He wished to understand the reasoning behind that. Like the other public authorities, he did not support that. He supported it in principle but needed more information before being satisfied.

MS MARACINEANU stated that, as mentioned by Mr Wenzel in his explanation, she had been asked by CAHAMA to request a presentation of the legal analysis, which had already been requested. She understood what was being proposed and that it stemmed from the legal analysis already carried out, but she wished to know what that legal analysis was. As said by Dr Gupta, above and beyond the position not to submit the point to the Foundation Board which she supported, personally speaking, she had a clear position on the matter which she had raised earlier when talking about the strategic plan. She thought it was high time to take the necessary time to look at how states could be linked to an organization like WADA through UNESCO or outside UNESCO. She thought that the commitment of each state should be set out in a common document and called for a discussion of the distribution of that participation among states. It was easy to express a position in favour or against, but when it was written into a bill that enabled withdrawing financing from an organization like WADA, then the law could perhaps also include a certain amount for a contribution to such an institution, which was beneficial for all. It was necessary to think about how to do that. That discussion had occurred time and again. The WADA management had told the governments to discuss the matter with UNESCO. UNESCO met twice a year, so she was not sure when exactly such discussion could take place. She thought that it would be more productive to try to look at the matter amongst the member states and WADA. That was her personal point of view, not Europe's position.

They were playing ping pong there. The matter was not being addressed as it should. That was why she suggested including that in the strategic plan, to ensure the financing of the parties and governments. The governments had not signed the Code like the sport movement had, and it was very important to have a binding document that was also flexible and could be adapted, setting out the joint undertaking. She understood that a lot of work had been done, but, personally speaking, she thought it necessary to go further in order to ensure that that financing was secure, because it was absolutely indispensable. She belonged to the part of the world that contributed the most to the WADA budget so she thought that that discussion must take place.

DR MUROFOSHI stated that Asia supported the principle of the overall concept of the consequences of the voluntary withdrawal of funding. That being said, he wished to propose postponing the discussion and decision to a later time when sufficient information clarifying that interest payment, and a legal interpretation had been received. He echoed what Oceania had said.

MR WENZEL thanked the representatives of the sport movement and the representatives of the Athlete Council for the support expressed and the need to take measures to protect WADA's budget, and also to those representatives of the public authorities who had expressed support in principle for the need for a mechanism of that nature. With respect to the question of legality, as he recalled it, the issue had been raised at the March meeting and had also been raised, to be fair, by the representative or representatives of the public authorities on the working group in the past, regarding the legality of a fine or a financial penalty. He believed that the Chairman of WADA had made a proposal. As that was the controversial issue, he had proposed taking that off the table and removing that consequence. He believed that Mr De Vos for the sport movement had advocated not throwing the baby out with the bathwater, although not in those words. His proposal had been to obtain an opinion on the legality of the financial penalty. Counsel had been consulted on that issue, as he had mentioned, and rather than force through a financial penalty, which might not necessarily be illegal but would certainly be more controversial than an interest payment, the view had been taken with the external counsel to take the financial penalty off the table and to revert to interest payments. He was certainly very happy to hold a discussion on what the level of those interest payments should or could be, but that was why there was no legal opinion, because the only specific objection that had been raised from a legal perspective, as he recalled, was the question of a financial penalty, and that had been taken off the table. The documents had, of course, been drafted by the external counsel and it could therefore be understood that the external counsel did not consider there was anything illegal from a Swiss law perspective in what had been proposed. But, again, from the beginning of the process to the end, as he recalled it, the only specific legal issue that had been raised by anybody was with respect to the financial penalty, and that had been taken off the table, which was why there was no specific legal opinion on that issue. It seemed from the public authority interventions, and he thought on that that Dr Gupta was speaking on behalf of the USA rather than the region and certainly not of all public authorities, that the objection, if he had understood it, seemed to be much more fundamental. He would not go further than that and, with respect, that was surprising given that he did not recall those fundamental objections to the whole model or the proposal being raised at the Executive Committee meeting in March 2024. He understood that Dr Gupta might have consulted further with US Congress and other stakeholders, but that was his immediate feedback to those comments.

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that the initiative to have some regulations in place which could address that issue, including even some sanctioning mechanism, had come at the beginning of 2020 from the CADE Americas representative. It was the Americas representative who had started that discussion process on having special regulations that could address that issue. Those matters had been under discussion since 2020, which was quite a long time. He believed that it was time to move forward. Concrete tools had to be available to defend WADA against any attempts to pressure it to take certain actions or adopt certain behaviours. He understood there being additional questions regarding that document, so he proposed that, as consultations would be held from late September to mid-October, the documents would then be submitted again in advance of the December meeting in Saudi Arabia to the Executive Committee and Foundation Board with a view to recommending that the Foundation Board adopt them. Were the members happy with that?

DECISION

Voluntary withholding of contributions to WADA's budget by governments update noted. Documents to be submitted to members in advance of the December meeting to be recommended to the Foundation Board for adoption.

8. Information technology

- 8.1 ADAMS improvement progress update

MR MATTON explained that, as had been requested in March 2024, an annex had been prepared in the report that provided a detailed overview of the ADAMS development, alongside a presentation outlining ongoing and future projects. He wished to take a few moments to highlight some key items. A few years previously, ADAMS had struggled significantly with performance issues. At that time, the service level objective had been 99.95%, which was a remarkable improvement. Additionally, the infrastructure had undergone a complete transformation. Previously reliant on a physical server, it had successfully been transitioned to a 100% cloud base, not just for ADAMS, but for all the solutions used. ADEL was another example. That shift demonstrated flexibility, scalability and security. In terms of security, significant strides had been made. Two-factor authentication had been implemented across the entire ADAMS account, significantly enhancing security. The development process had also evolved. By adopting a local platform, it was possible to develop applications and modules more rapidly and adapt quickly to changing needs. Moreover, the focus of the development architecture was on being athlete-centred. That meant that the system built was more aligned with the requirements and experience of athletes, as well as the operational needs of Anti-Doping Organizations (ADOs). A major initiative under that approach was to improve the Athlete Central application (app). That app would streamline the athlete experience, making it easier for athletes to interact with ADAMS and manage the anti-doping journey. Additionally, work was under way to improve the identity access management or the different user right authorization within ADAMS. The role and responsibility of each user would be made more transparent, ensuring better clarity and control over access to sensitive information. That would ultimately enhance both security and usability across the platforms. Five years previously, ADAMS had been updated maybe once or twice a year. At this time, the development cycle had accelerated to either biweekly or monthly, depending on the roadmap and progress, allowing for continuous improvements to the system.

A major focus had been on developing WADA's own Application Programming Interfaces (APIs). He would take a moment to explain why that was important and its benefit. The quick definition of an API was a set of rules that allowed different software systems to communicate with each other. It could be thought of as a bridge between systems, enabling them to share information efficiently and securely. For instance, when ADAMS was integrated with an external system, APIs allowed data to be exchanged seamlessly without compromising security or usability. By developing WADA's own APIs, it gave more control over data flows in ADAMS, allowing for it to be integrated with other systems while maintaining strict security standards. That had become crucial, as ADAMS would interact with more external systems, and having robust APIs in place ensured that those connections were reliable and secure.

One key advantage of using APIs was that they helped eliminate human error. When data needed to be manually transferred between systems, there was always a risk of transcription mistakes. APIs automated that process, ensuring the accurate transfer of data without the need for manual intervention. That not only improved efficiency, but also enhanced the overall integrity of the data handled. Regarding WADA's APIs, it was important to note that external exposure required additional layers of effort for the team, security and support. For that reason, a usage fee structure had been established. That fee was designed to cover the costs associated with support, usage and development while ensuring that the ecosystem and data of athletes remained secure. There had been recent examples of organizations being targeted by attacks resulting in their data being published by malicious actors. He took the security of ADAMS and athlete data very seriously. He was committed to ensuring that the method of information transfer via APIs was secure and minimizing the risk of

attack by an organized network. He understood that the fees seemed high to some organizations, but wished to emphasize that, for every API offered, there was also a solution available via the ADAMS interface at no cost. That concluded his intervention.

MR LALOVIC said that the sport movement wished to thank Mr Matton for the detailed update and welcomed WADA's efforts to improve the tool. ADAMS was the face of WADA for athletes and ADOs. The sport movement wished to understand WADA's strategy to ensure ADAMS was continuously up-to-date and leveraged the latest technologies in a rapidly changing environment. The sport movement also requested that the solution be found rapidly to ensure that the ITA could be provided with an ADAMS account. The current status quo was affecting the operational efficiencies of the ITA with a direct impact and wastage of Olympic Movement resources. He called for more tests that were cheaper. It was very simple.

DR GUPTA also really appreciated the important work that was undertaken regarding the system and deemed it critical. He agreed with the colleagues in the sport movement about that. He had heard some concerns about the cost to access some of those improvements. He wondered if it had been considered whether that would impede access to the updated system.

MR MATTON replied regarding the WADA strategy and the development of ADAMS that the process was under way. There had been different groups established to discuss the different requirements they might have. There was an ADAMS testing group that focused on that. Regarding the collaboration with the ITA, discussions were held with the agency on a weekly or daily basis. The ITA had access to the ADAMS teams if needed. Efforts were continuously made to improve the solution, communication and the ITA's ability to perform tests. In response to Dr Gupta, there was always the possibility to access the ADAMS interface at no cost, as he had mentioned earlier. He understood that the fee might be high for some organizations but, at the same time, it was also necessary to make sure everyone was aware that there was a system, namely ADAMS, that was available for the full anti-doping community free of charge. Some organizations might not have the same budget as the biggest organizations that had their own system, which was why WADA also needed to improve their ability to develop their own apps.

MR DE VOS noted on the subject of giving access to the International Testing Agency that the request had been made as early as 2020. The problem was that many international federations had given the anti-doping mandate to the ITA to follow up on the procedures. The problem was that the ITA always needed to go through the individual access codes of all those international federations. The only request being made was to give access to the ITA for the ADAMS system, for all of the files of the federations that had given a delegation to the ITA. It could not be that complicated. He fully respected that there was a dialogue and an interaction, but wanted to know why it was such a technical issue to grant that access. If something had to be done from the side of the international federations to provide the legal or administrative support, he would be happy to do that. That would very much facilitate the work of the ITA because the ITA was paid by the hour and continuously logging in and logging out made the cost of the testing system more expensive.

MR MATTON stated that discussions were being held with the ITA on the API side. The ITA was one of the biggest users of APIs. He understood that, regarding the access, the ITA needed to have multiple accounts, and that would be addressed with the new IAM or Identity Access Management platform that was planned to be in place by the end of the year.

MS MARACINEANU wanted to draw the attention of the working group of the Executive Committee to the comments made by Mr Cottier, who had said that ADAMS must be improved so WADA's attention could be drawn to any critical situation. That was something that should be built into ADAMS. Was that also something that was being examined by the working groups that were dealing with improving ADAMS?

MR MATTON replied that the requests and requirements or proposals from Mr Cottier's report would be taken into consideration.

DECISION

ADAMS improvement progress update noted.

9. Testing

- 9.1 Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis – Amendments

MR RICKETTS stated that the Executive Committee had before it a paper that outlined proposed amendments to the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis, which he would refer to as the TDSSA. The TDSSA was a mandatory document for signatories to implement, and focused on the minimum levels of analysis that anti-doping organizations must conduct for certain prohibited substances based on each sport and discipline. To ensure that the document remained fit for purpose, the WADA Strategic Testing Expert Advisory Group conducted an annual review of the document and proposed the following amendments to the Executive Committee that day. The first was the addition of a new appendix four to the document, which contained those signatories who were outside the Olympic and Paralympic Movement, who would have minimum levels of analysis for their sport and disciplines formally recognized. The international sport federations responsible for those sports had agreed to the minimum levels of analysis as referenced in the document. The second was a reduction of the minimum levels of analysis relating to the sport of aikido due to the exhibition nature of that sport, and the final amendment was to recognize the implementation of the new endocrine module of the Athlete Biological Passport, and that all samples collected and analysed as part of the endocrine module would count towards meeting the minimum levels of analysis for growth hormone. That was aimed at encouraging anti-doping organizations to greater utilize that new module. That concluded his summary of the main amendments proposed within the document that, once approved, would come into effect on 1 January 2025.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for the record if the Executive Committee approved version 10.0 of the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis.

DECISION

Version 10.0 of the TDSSA approved.

10. Finance and Administration

MS CHUNG conveyed apologies on behalf of Mr Ng for not being able to attend that meeting due to prior commitments. The Finance and Administration Committee had held its annual meeting on 26 June 2024 in Lausanne. The full details of the minutes and summary notes of the meetings were included in the Executive Committee papers.

- 10.1 Government/IOC contributions

THE CHAIRMAN noted that an updated document on contributions had been issued to the Executive Committee members on 10 September given there had been new contributions received since 21 August.

MS CHUNG confirmed that an update had been sent out in the previous days with updated amounts, as of 9 September 2024. WADA had received from the public authorities 70.4% of a budget income of 25 million US dollars compared to 89.5% the same time the previous year. Therefore, some 7.4 million had yet to be received from the public authorities, with the pending contributions from the USA of 3.6 million dollars. Russia's 2023 contributions had also been absent the previous year. With regard to the remittance per region compared to the budget, Africa was at 34%, the Americas at 43%, Asia at 87%, Europe at 79% and Oceania was fully remitted at 100%. To date, 106,000 US dollars had been received for additional contributions. 83,000 US dollars had come from Japan for programme development in Asia and 23,000 dollars from the City of Lausanne.

The brief update on Russia with regard to their outstanding 2023 payment was that, as mentioned at the previous Executive Committee meeting, the Russian Government had made several attempts to remit the payments but had had very little success due to strict and complicated banking and other sanctions. It was not unusual with the Swiss authorities. WADA was entitled to that money or that transfer. However, from the bank's perspective, that did not permit WADA to automatically take receipt. At the end of June 2024, however, WADA had received 50,000 euros from Russia (from a total of almost 1.3 million dollars) by way of money transfer to WADA's Absa Bank in Cape Town. The remaining amount had yet to be received. WADA continued to monitor that and would provide updates in due course. The June deadline had already passed. She encouraged all

parties to settle outstanding contribution payments. WADA was very grateful for the contributions received from stakeholders.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

- 10.2 2024 quarterly accounts (quarters 1 and 2)

MS CHUNG recalled that the responsibility of the Risk and Audit Committee (RAC) was to monitor the quarterly financials, and it had reviewed the year-to-date financials at its virtual meeting on 9 August 2024. For the first six months of the year, the total income had been recorded at 34.1 million US dollars, or 62% of the budgeted income, from all funding sources and operating expenses had reached 23.7 million US dollars, which was approximately 47% of the revised budget. Activities, of course, were all back to normal. Most meetings and events had taken place in person, notably the WADA Annual Symposium and the Executive Committee meeting in Lausanne in March. The Global Education Conference had also occurred in France on 24 February. Other planned activities and meetings with stakeholders had also been carried out in person or in hybrid mode. Litigation was on the high side due to the higher volume of cases and complex cases, notably the Chinese swimmers' contamination case, which required additional external expert resources and other legal fees. Interest income, net of bank fees, amounted to 465,000 US dollars. As for the investment portfolio, WADA had opted for a shorter duration for bond investments to keep cash available should it be needed in coming months.

DECISION

2024 quarterly accounts noted.

- 10.3 Revised 2024 budget

MS CHUNG reported that, as part of the annual process around May and June, WADA management teams were asked to consider if the budget for the remainder of the year still held and if the budget lines were accurate. Income levels were reassessed and adjustments were then made to the budget and presented to the Finance and Administration Committee to review and discuss at its meeting. The Finance and Administration Committee had endorsed the changes to the revised 2024 budget. She would provide a recap of the discussions and highlights of the 2024 revised budget. The total income had been revised, leading to an increase of over 800,000 US dollars. That was mainly due to contribution payments from previous years that had been paid that year, notably by Venezuela and some other countries. The total operating expenses had been revised to 50.9 million US dollars, representing an increase of about 2% on the budget. The budgeted increase was mainly due, as mentioned in the quarterly accounts, to legal fees for the growing number of complex cases. The higher volume of users in e-learning on WADA's ADEL platform also demanded additional expenses for the platform. The cost for compliance audits had increased, as an audit had had to be factored in for China which had not been previously planned. The budget was cyclical. In addition to WADA's regular mandatory meetings such as the Executive Committee, the Annual Symposium and Foundation Board, 2024 was also an Olympic and Paralympic year, which entailed increased activities in some areas, notably independent observers, compliance, athlete engagement and executive presence at the Paris Games.

Meetings had also continued to be held in hybrid mode and the net surplus had improved from the budget from 23,000 to 44,000 US dollars. Capital expenditure stood at 4.3 million dollars, which was a decrease on the budget. Cash depletion was under the 500,000 US-dollar threshold approved by the Finance and Administration Committee. With the excess of surplus from previous years, the Finance and Administration Committee had also approved an increase in the operating reserve, from three months to six months of operations, which comprised an increase of 9.6 million US dollars based on the current level of operations and activities. The litigation reserve would also be increased by 500,000 to 2.5 million US dollars using the monies from the cash award from the RUSADA case. Due to the possibility of not receiving the full level of contributions as mentioned earlier during the contributions update, it had been deemed necessary to re-examine expenses, and expenses had yet to be committed, and to find ways to reduce costs and gain operational efficiencies until the year end and potentially also for the following year. WADA's management had therefore prepared a high-level view of cost reductions plan, which had also been presented to the Finance and Administration Committee, and an

initial discussion on such measures had also been held with the RAC on 9 August. That concluded the 2024 revised budget and she would be happy to answer any questions.

DECISION

Revised 2024 budget noted.

- 10.4 2025 draft budget

THE CHAIRMAN recalled that the item was for recommendation to the Foundation Board, which would discuss it and make a decision at its December 2024 meeting.

MS CHUNG said that WADA had presented the 2025 draft budget to the Finance and Administration Committee at its June meeting under the assumption that the Russian and US contributions would be received by the end of the year. In discussions with the Finance and Administration Committee, the WADA management had however identified some possible cost-cutting measures that could be implemented under a scenario whereby the USA did not remit its contributions. To date, WADA had not been informed formally of the intentions of the USA however and she invited the Executive Committee to still consider endorsing the recommendations of the Finance and Administration Committee to the Foundation Board with a full budget.

She would present some of the key highlights for the 2025 draft budget. To provide some background, in May 2022, the Foundation Board had approved annual contribution increases of 8% for 2023 and 6% for the following two years, 2024 and 2025. The 6% increase had been applied to the annual contributions for 2025. The total income from all sources was budgeted at 57.5 million US dollars, of which the IOC and public authorities owed 26.5 million US dollars each. The remainder was from the Montreal International partnership, funding from Sword and the usual grants and income from compliance monitoring and laboratory accreditation. Operating expenses were budgeted at 52.8 million US dollars, a net increase of 4% on the 2024 revised budget. Scientific research was budgeted at 4.8 million US dollars, representing about 6% of the annual increase. The key event in 2025 was the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Busan, Republic of Korea, where the updated World Anti-Doping Code and international standards would be presented and approved. It was currently forecast that there would be an annual salary increase of 3% for Montreal staff. The regional offices were subject to the country inflation and local regulations. The operating surplus was budgeted at 3.7 million US dollars. Taking into account the non-cash items such as depreciation, the net surplus was budgeted at a little over 200,000 US dollars, which was an improvement on the 2024 revised budget. The cash depletion from operations situated at close to 700,000 US dollars, which was higher than the threshold, but still manageable. Should there be a need, WADA would look into using unallocated funds to bring the cash depletion down to the desired threshold. Considering the uncertainty around contributions for the following year, a high-level preliminary view of the 2025 draft budget without the US contribution had also been presented to the Finance and Administration Committee. The total income would decrease to 49.8 million US dollars. With the increase of 6% in annual contributions, the US contribution would reach 3.8 million USD. She also recalled the matching with the IOC, which meant that the potential shortfall would amount to 7.7 million US dollars. Therefore, the WADA management had started to consider some principles and cost reduction measures for the above scenario, which included seeking out additional contributions from other stakeholders, limiting travel to critical travel, reducing in-person meetings and, of course, considering delaying new hires and looking for more partnerships and sponsorship. Also, considering that several measures would inevitably require the use of some unallocated existing funds, a review and reassessment had been made of some of the projects and initiatives to be funded by the unallocated funds. Those projects were to be scaled down in scope and size until further notice. The Finance and Administration Committee had reviewed and approved the 2025 draft budget with the US contribution, of course, and agreed to recommend it to the Executive Committee for further recommendation to the Foundation Board in December 2024.

MR KEJVAL conveyed the support of the sport movement for that budget. However, regarding point 10.1, as had been discussed already at the previous Executive Committee meeting regarding the contribution for Russia for 2023, he thought that no money was expected for that year. It would therefore be wise not to count on that money in the budget for the following year, particularly given that it was 1.3 million multiplied by two, because of the contribution from the sport side. He therefore proposed revising the income less by about 2.6

million US dollars. He also hoped that the USA would make its contributions the following year so no other steps would be required.

MS CESSOUMA conveyed Africa's support for those proposals but reiterated that the regional office in South Africa needed support and help in terms of staff. She would, of course, insist that member countries in Africa paid their contributions, although she had already underlined that they had financial difficulties. Africa of course wanted to work in favour of the cleanest possible sport and appealed to others to make their contributions as soon as possible.

MS MARACINEANU stated that Europe was also in favour of the adoption of the draft budget 2025 by the Foundation Board in December with the modification that had been mentioned. She was very happy to note that plans were actually respected in terms of the increase of 8% and 6% and 6%. She felt it was a very good solution to plan that in such a way, and hoped that WADA could also start planning its multiannual budget after 2025, to ascertain the extent of budgetary reductions that would have to be made. She hoped, of course, that the USA would stay on board and would not withdraw, in order to continue the joint fight against doping that sport needed.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL agreed with Mr Kejval on presenting a budget for 2025 that would prudently not account for Russia. However, the situation was not exactly the same as it had been the previous time, which was a good thing. The problem was the transfer of money. It was not the principle of Russia paying, but rather the difficulty in finding banks that would transfer Russian money because of the sanction. WADA had received 50,000 euros in South Africa, which meant a channel did seem to exist, and was at that time waiting to see if further transfers would follow. That was the situation at that time, but he reiterated his agreement that a plan should be drawn up excluding Russian funds.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the Executive Committee if it agreed to recommend the 2025 draft budget to the WADA Foundation Board for its approval in December.

MS BENNETT asked if that included the modification that had been proposed by Mr Kejval.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that it did.

DECISION

2025 draft budget (including proposed reduced Russia income amendment) to be recommended to the Foundation Board for approval.

11. Athletes

MR PINI would assume that the report had been read but thanked the Executive Committee for the opportunity to speak and would add a few comments on key initiatives and activities. As part of its mandate, the Athlete Council remained deeply committed to advocating for athletes and ensuring their voices were central to anti-doping efforts. Its initiatives were rooted in engaging athletes directly in key processes, such as the Code and international standards update, to foster greater transparency and inclusivity. The council also prioritized governance as seen through the review and updating of its terms of reference, ensuring its operations were aligned with the evolving landscape of anti-doping. Additionally, the development of the Athlete Council action plan underscored its dedication to delivering WADA's strategic plan with actionable goals that served the athlete community. The ongoing support for the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds and the human rights impact assessment also reflected its broader focus on safeguarding athletes' rights and wellbeing. Through active participation across WADA governance bodies, independent observer teams and various working groups, the Athlete Council continued to play a crucial role in shaping policies and programmes that strengthened clean sport. Its members' direct involvement in advocacy and athlete engagement, particularly during global events like the Paris 2024 Olympic Games, further highlighted its collective efforts to uphold and promote the values of fairness, integrity and transparency in sport. He wished to thank each council member for their active involvement. He also thanked the IOC and IPC for collaborating with those initiatives and actions, in particular the recent athlete engagement booth in Paris during the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, including the clean sport athlete ambassadors.

DR GUPTA thanked Mr Pini for the wonderful report and update. He really appreciated it. The public authorities were very pleased to see that the Athlete Council was continuing to expand its activities. He asked whether there was any updated information on the website.

MR PINI responded that he understood from the previous year's meeting that the website was a question that had been put forward, and a good question at that. Through the action plan, which was at that time in a draft stage, there was a place for that, mostly regarding communications and that strategy and how the athlete-centred approach could be supported. It was a fantastic idea and was being considered through the draft action plan. He hoped to be able to announce something at the next meeting, but it was necessary to look at the challenges involved in that and whether it would be independently run by the athletes, undoubtedly with room for assistance through WADA support as well. He hoped to see that action through the action plan.

- 11.1 Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds project continuation

THE CHAIRMAN wished to say, before he gave the floor to the Athletes' Ombuds to present the initiative, that he strongly supported it and it was a very important athlete-focused project and a long-awaited one. He hoped the Executive Committee could support the decision requested of it that day. He would give the floor firstly to Ms Thorstenson to present the status of the pilot project, followed by Ms Henrie who would address the long-term request for the project.

MS THORSTENSON thanked the esteemed members of the Executive Committee. It was a pleasure to be there and a great opportunity to present a brief update on the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds pilot project. She wanted to give a brief update on progress and then describe some conclusions that had been drawn throughout that year. In short, the ombuds office had been set up and services rolled out. The ombuds provided information, guidance, independence and confidential advice and assistance at no cost to athletes by assisting them with their concerns and disputes through reviewing the individual situation on a case-by-case basis, and gave recommendations on best practice, or by connecting athletes to the relevant information, services or organizations. The terms of reference, internal procedures, scope and authority had been finalized, while work was continuously ongoing on the plan, impact sought and the budget. The ombuds advocated fair, transparent and timely processes within anti-doping and also assessed and advocated for improved athletes' rights through interacting at conferences and reporting on non-compliance. In addition, the ombuds had promoted and raised awareness among athletes, anti-doping organizations and the anti-doping community. Of course, there was room for improvement, especially in raising athlete awareness and athlete uptake. Further, the ombuds had created important cooperation and working relationships with other ombuds athletes' representatives and maintained a close working relationship with the WADA Athlete Council and the Ombuds Advisory Committee.

However, creating trust and the recognition of the ombuds as an important part of the anti-doping system must be acknowledged as the great success, and it also showed the community's important perception of trust in the role by being a confidential and independent resource for athletes. A website had been launched one year previously, on 5 September 2023. Athletes could at that time reach out through e-mail, a secure inbox, or by telephone. She knew the Executive Committee was of course very interested in statistics. It was a key to success to have many athletes contacting the ombuds, but the enquiries varied significantly. Some were very complex and some were very simple. She noted that an enquiry might start about a substance or a 2.1 violation, meaning presence, and might end up with a breach of athletes' rights and concerns about compliance. Throughout that year, 115 athletes had reached out to her, which meant about 10 a month, from 42 countries and 35 sports. Many athletes asked questions such as what to do after receiving a notification letter, in other words, about the process itself. They asked questions about prohibited substances or use whereabouts and Therapeutic Use Exemptions, and more and more asked about procedural steps. Athletes who had received a first instance decision asked what to do next. Should they appeal it to the second instance? Could they appeal to the CAS? What was the deadline? And so on and so forth.

However, what was more concerning was that she saw increasing questions about athletes' rights from athletes who were concerned about breaches or violations of their individual rights in the process, and who were also concerned about the cost of an appeal. For example, the athlete really wanted to appeal the decision but could not afford it and wanted to know if there was any kind of legal aid programme that could help them on that journey. She noted that all of the values in the database could not be extracted for every picture shown on

the screen, which meant there might be a slight difference in numbers. The figures showed numbers of level of athletes, with the majority being international-level athletes. But there were also recreational, amateurs and so forth. She highlighted that only two minors had contacted her. Some had been in contact through their parents and were therefore registered as adults. She therefore thought that there were more minors. She thought that it was interesting for the Executive Committee to see the variety, with 42 countries. She noted that Canada had been a default country at the start of the web launch, which meant that the number was probably incorrect, in addition to Afghanistan. She did not believe there had been that many cases from Afghanistan. She thought it was just because it was the first country that popped up in the list of countries. She also drew the members' attention to the 35 different sports, of which athletics was the largest. There was a global distribution of incoming enquiries, confirming the real need for a global ombuds office.

Turning to the very important matter of athlete feedback, athletes who ended up contacting the ombuds were of course not very happy to be in that situation in the first place. However, the athletes had stated that they were happy to have someone neutral to talk to who could at least guide them with information and best practices, and who was cost-free. It was important for her to hear such feedback as athletes saying they had felt helpless in the process and she had supported them at that difficult time, or that her input had changed the outcome of an athlete's case because they had been able to find the source. Of course, she also had no real impact on the situation. Athletes realized that, even if the outcome of the case did not change, it was helpful to have her to talk to. Of course, there were always people who were not happy, and stated that the service was absolutely useless and a waste of their time as she had not given them any helpful answers. She had tried to convince the person in question that that sport was not under WADA rules at all, so she could not help him with his anti-doping enquiry.

In terms of awareness and athlete engagement, engaging with athletes was key for the success of the ombuds office, so she had been endeavouring to do so. Initially, there had been a referral from stakeholders on the websites, but she thought relations were more important, such as interactions and invitations to speak with athletes at various opportunities. She had done that, for example, at the IOC's international athlete forum and latterly in Paris at both the Paralympic and Olympic Games, which had been a great experience. She also thought it very important to maintain a working relationship with the Athlete Council. Two in-person meetings had already been held and hopefully one more would follow in the subsequent six months. According to the terms of reference, there would be an Ombuds Advisory Committee. It had been reconstituted in spring of that year, comprising one representative of the WADA management, one from the Athlete Council, and one with experience in ombuds services. Two meetings had been held since then. She clarified that the mission of that group was to provide support and guidance for the office itself and to help in developing plans and strategies for the future. In order to do so, terms of reference had been developed for that group in particular. As its name indicated, it was an advisory committee, so had no decision-making power.

Promotion was of course important. The budget had been limited for that project so she had done her best in building relationships and cooperation with differing stakeholders, starting with the ITA and including the contact details of the ombuds in their notification letters and in their information for the Paris programme. Other NADOs and International Federations (IFs) had asked for similar inclusions in their notification letters, and some were promoting the ombuds on their website. Another great opportunity had come through the IOC, which had promoted the ombuds role through NOC newsletters and the Athlete365 platform, and also in its quiz for the Paris Olympic Games. Cooperation with other ombudspersons was, of course, very important. To that end, the Alliance of Sport Ombuds had been created which was open to any other ombuds in the world working on anti-doping. The first webinar had also been held that spring and she was very glad that over 500 participants, athletes, NADO representatives and support personnel had taken part, which was great. In the future, she hoped to hold more of those webinars in regions and target regions in cooperation with WADA regional offices. She had also featured in videos on social media and websites and YouTube lately. In the previous two weeks, promotional videos of the ombuds role and its different angles had been released.

It was also important to understand the global ombuds landscape. Therefore, information had been collected on other ombuds functions through the IOC, NOCs, the Athlete Council, Ombuds Advisory Group and iNADO. Also, together with iNADO, a survey had been sent out in June 2024 on athlete representation in anti-doping organizations. It had not yet been finalized but, with about 40 replies, in answer to the question on whether the

athlete had access to an ombuds function within their country, 18 had said yes and 24 had said no. She noted that those ombuds services did not necessarily always handle anti-doping issues. In answer to the following question on whether the ADO had an ombuds function for athletes, two had replied yes and 26 had replied no. However, nine had stated an interest in initiating such a function. That showed there were not many organizations that provided that service. Looking to the future, the goal was to send out surveys to other entities in the anti-doping community and to compile that information and really map out ombuds globally to obtain a global network of ombuds services in the long term to consolidate expertise and to develop resources together.

Last but not least, she wished to mention three important achievements. The first was recognition. She was taking every opportunity to be included in important discussions and had been invited to many conferences to present and sit on panels to talk about the ombuds services, and to talk about athletes' rights. That was important because it showed that the ombuds was recognized as an important part of the anti-doping community and had become a unique, recognized global resource for both athletes and the anti-doping community at large. That confirmed the need for such a global ombuds service. The second was credibility. There had been much discussion of that at the meeting that day and it was stated in various UN and international law documents that an ombuds service could create credibility for an organization. The mission was obviously to create synergies and unite the anti-doping community by collaborating to deliver a coherent and global anti-doping experience. An ombuds function was unique as an independent and neutral, cost-free, confidential resource allowing an individual not to be afraid of retaliation. The ombuds played a significant role and created the trust needed in the system between the athlete and the anti-doping organization, so it affirmed the ombuds' credibility.

Lastly, regarding the impact on the anti-doping community, stakeholders had been interested in hearing the ombuds' position and experience. When she shared athletes' perspectives on improvements of rules, procedures and athletes' rights, that asserted a raised voice for athletes. It gave athletes an impact and empowered them. It built trust and again created credibility in the anti-doping system, which she thought was key.

To summarize what she believed was the biggest success and achievements, achieving the mission and accomplishing duties had created a unique and recognized resource for athletes. The number of athletes was, she would say, in line with other similar resources as, after one year of running, athletes were happy to at least have someone neutral to speak to who was also cost-free. Athletes' rights were her biggest concern throughout her experience, and she thought it was important to raise the athletes' voice and impact in the totality of the anti-doping system and by driving fairness and creating trust, building bridges and uniting, collaborating and creating working relationships. That was key. Impact and integrity could be strengthened globally with a permanent global ombuds office. Lastly, she wished to mention a few recommendations, which were described in greater detail in the report. She should perhaps call them suggestions, but would leave it up to the Executive Committee to decide. They were: assure a permanent global ombuds office; put athletes at the heart of anti-doping activities; advance athletes' rights and access to justice; collaborate and unite by building bridges; and grow impact and strengthen integrity. She invited the members to visit the website if they had not done so already by scanning the QR code shown on screen.

DR GUPTA congratulated Ms Thorstenson on her presentation. The Americas region very much appreciated the work of the ombuds. In reading the report, the feedback from the athletes clearly demonstrated that the project was making a real difference in athletes' lives. It was helping to make the whole anti-doping system more effective and highlighting areas for potential improvement. The USA was very pleased to hear about the productive relationship forged with the athletes' ombuds from the United States Olympic & Paralympic Committee (USOPC), and the creation of an Alliance of Sports Ombuds to advance sports ombuds programmes across the globe, which Ms Thorstenson had mentioned as a recommendation or a suggestion. He thought the proposal to produce guidelines or best practices to help expand the number of ombuds was also very positive. The ombuds had already accomplished great things by supporting athletes, educating them, and helping to protect their rights. On behalf of CADE, he also noted that it would be beneficial if some of the ombuds services could be available in Spanish so that more countries could access that important and valuable service. The public authorities appreciated the work done to date and he was looking forward to more over the following year.

MS BENNETT thanked Ms Thorstenson for her report and presentation that day, and more particularly for successfully setting up the ombuds office in such a short period of time. Taking into account its short history, the engagement seemed to be extraordinary. It was proving to be a successful project and was clearly a worthy one, and she did not want to jump across what she was sure her colleague would say but, having read the report, WADA had certainly provided value to the athlete community through the presence of Ms Thorstenson and the establishment of the ombuds office. She wished to make two comments. The first was that engagement showed a need in the athlete community. That need might arise in part as a result of the complexity of the Code, and she noted that the current Code review was limited or fairly limited in scope, given that the Code was in a stage of maturity. She encouraged WADA, and perhaps it was something that would arise in five years' time and not that day, to consider a more detailed Code review to reduce the overall complexity of the Code and the accessibility for athletes in understanding what they were subject to, the next time a Code review was undertaken. The second comment was from a different perspective: it was a key strategic priority in WADA's current and proposed strategic plan that the organization be athlete-centred. The ombuds office was a project that was directed entirely at that strategic priority. Taking into account the draft budget and the revisions to the 2024 budget that had just been discussed, it was of significant concern that there was financial pressure on the organization. She had been pleased to hear Ms Chung explain the measures that WADA was considering taking to address the potential shortfall in income to expenses were not intended to affect athlete projects. The draft budget contained the provision for the ombuds office to continue. She thought that was a nice reminder to the public authorities and countries that had not remitted their voluntary contributions that WADA was performing such important work in the athlete community. She wished to see that there was no risk to projects such as that, which were directly achieving athlete-centred objectives in ongoing budgets that were presented to the Executive Committee and Foundation Board. She welcomed any comments Ms Thorstenson had on either of those two points, particularly the first if she had a view on it. They were comments that had arisen from reading her very thorough report.

MR KEJVAL congratulated Ms Thorstenson on her impressive achievements in only a year. He requested clarification on several points. The goals of the programme were the following: a) to have a permanent and global ombuds available to all athletes in order to provide athletes with cost-free, confidential, neutral, independent and fair advice in assistance and assistance in relation to the World Anti-Doping Programme and the anti-doping entities that operated within the anti-doping system, and, b) to strengthen the ombuds community and to improve athletes' anti-doping experience by accelerating opportunities for improvements and the systematic change with an exchange of information between WADA and the ombuds. He also had some comments in terms of the NOCs and IFs that had ombudspersons, and it would be good to ensure contact. The IOC was very active in terms of the safeguarding officers and wellbeing officers and other such persons. They performed similar activities and it would be very good to coordinate that at the level of the IOC or IFs or NOCs. Athletes needed to understand who was who, and what were the responsibilities of each. The second question concerned budgetary difficulties. At the last meeting, a proposal had been made to look at the possibility of sponsorship. Was there a timeline for that or had there been any developments in that regard?

MR PINI thanked Ms Thorstenson for her great presentation. It was humbling to see that project in its fruition and beyond. He strongly supported the continuation of the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds project, which had already proven its value during its trial phase. Given its success in offering athletes a crucial layer of support, extending that project beyond the trial phase would help maintain transparency and protect athletes' rights. It reflected WADA's commitment to being athlete-centred and reinforced the importance of safeguarding athletes' interests throughout the anti-doping process. In line with that, the Athlete Council fully supported the continuation of the ombuds project, recognizing it as a key initiative that empowered athletes and ensured their voices were heard. That initiative also played a role in shaping the Athlete Council action plan by offering direct insights into the challenges and concerns athletes faced in the anti-doping system. The ombuds project helped the Athlete Council better understand and address those issues. The continuation of the ombuds would provide a valuable feedback mechanism, allowing the Athlete Council to refine its priorities and actions to more effectively advocate for athletes' rights and wellbeing. He thanked WADA and all the stakeholders for prioritizing the ongoing support and development of both the ombuds project and the Athlete Council.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI stated that, for a number of years, the question of the ombuds had been a dream, but it was no longer the case. She welcomed the successful development of that programme. There were many

things that she had read in the documents that had been presented by WADA to indicate as many activities as Ms Thorstenson was doing. She would not repeat what other colleagues had said but noted that she was very impressed.

MR MISKIMMIN also wanted to complement Ms Thorstenson on her report and the work she was doing. He got a sense of her passion hearing her talk about that. His concern in supporting that was how it would be scaled over time. It could be a matter of catching a tiger by the tail. The more people and athletes were educated, the more opportunity there would be, which would mean her workload getting bigger and bigger. There were resource considerations there. He would like to hear from Ms Thorstenson and the Executive Committee on how that would be scaled in an appropriate way over time, in order not to affect the quality of the ombuds' work or to leave some athletes frustrated that they had no access because of resource constraints. He asked Ms Thorstenson if she saw that as a challenge, given that she was only one person and there was a limited budget.

MS MARACINEANU appreciated the report. Europe fully approved the plan that had just been presented. She underlined the essential role that the ombuds was playing and, she hoped, would continue to play. It was coming to the end of that first mandate of the implementation of the plan. She hoped that, on 1 January 2025, there would be a continuation and that WADA would be able to allocate sufficient resources to enable her to continue to operate completely independently, as had been the case to date.

Ms Thorstenson had mentioned the ITA notification containing her details. She did not understand who had been notified. Was the ITA notifying the IFs or the athletes themselves, when they were notified about a doping case? She thought it was important and that it would be useful to propose it to the NADOs so that they could do the same thing and provide Ms Thorstenson's details where necessary.

She also supported the suggestion that had been made by Mr Kejval to work with the safeguarding people who had played an essential role for the first time during the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games in Paris. Perhaps it would be possible to work with those people in order to prevent violence in the framework of competitions. She thought that all of those people together with Ms Thorstenson would be really a good source of support for the athletes and would help to contribute to the fight against doping, and that a form of upstream risk assessment would be extremely important in the framework of doping prevention.

THE CHAIRMAN gave the floor to Ms Henrie, who had a presentation to show the future vision of that project which he believed would address many of those questions.

MS HENRIE welcomed the positive feedback and comments. It was her pleasure to be there to present the proposal for the continuation of the ombuds programme, based on the great success and achievements that Ms Thorstenson, as the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds, had been able to achieve thus far. She recalled that the decision requested from the Executive Committee was to confirm the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds programme as an ongoing WADA programme. She would briefly outline the approach. The aim was for the programme to be ongoing, subject to regular assessment against set objectives. The programme would be guided by three pillars, used to make sure that the development of the ombuds programme was conducted in a progressive manner that would maximize and leverage the use of existing WADA resources, and would be subject as it grew to WADA's capacity to leverage private funding. Hence, since the ombuds could also make important contributions to improving athletes' experiences within the anti-doping system, an important aspect in developing and proposing that approach was to make sure that work would be performed in collaboration with the ombuds, so that WADA and the ombuds could exchange and learn from the recommendations or suggestions stemming from the ombuds. That would be utilized to inform the rules and processes, as well as any current and new athlete initiatives.

Mr Kejval had already summarized the vision, goals and commitments for that programme but she wished to highlight the fact that the vision was that the programme be an effective agent of positive change. That would be achieved by having in place and making available a global ombudsperson to serve all athletes fairly and equitably, regardless of position or interest. The aim was to enhance the quality of the anti-doping system and create an optimal anti-doping experience. In addition, the programme should be able to strengthen the ombuds community, to create networks or work with existing safeguarding officers within NOCs already working in that space; the goal being to share knowledge, learn, leverage and increase all those great resources available to athletes and/or to make them available to athletes.

She presented a visual description, which had also been included in the paper, of the three key pillars to make sure that that vision could be achieved. The first pillar was to secure the success of the ombuds programme through effective planning and targeted promotion. The second pillar was to deliver ombuds service excellence and value for all athletes, and the third pillar was to strengthen the anti-doping ombuds community and to create meaningful change in the anti-doping system. For each pillar, it had been identified whether the activities would be undertaken in a collaborative manner or completely independently, as shown in the different colours. The two green pillars on the left and right were what had been called the collaborative pillars. They denoted activities that could be done in collaboration with the ombuds. The second pillar was the independent pillar, in which the ombuds delivered services independently of WADA or any stakeholders. An additional objective of those three pillars was to be able to identify short-, medium- and long-term goals where appropriate. The middle pillar comprised all of the services being delivered by the ombuds and that could be used to build the programme progressively. The short-, medium- and long-term goals were to achieve that. It was also important to be mindful that the ombuds, as had already been mentioned, was currently one person operating on a part-time basis. The plan was for that to continue in 2025. Therefore, it was necessary to identify activities to really support the ombuds given that timing. Again, the intention behind the three pillars was to make sure there was a clear delineation of responsibilities and clarity on who was accountable for deliverables and, where appropriate, it was important to maximize and leverage existing WADA resources and expertise to support the work of the ombuds. While there were several areas where collaboration was beneficial, if not crucial, it was also necessary to protect the independence of the ombuds in the delivery of those services. That was what guided those three pillars. The operating model proposed to support the delivery of the activities outlined in the three pillars was that it be an ongoing WADA programme, subject to yearly planning, review and budgeting, and operating similarly to other WADA programmes and projects.

The Ombuds Advisory Committee would also be a key player in that operating model, as Ms Thorstenson had already mentioned. The advisory committee had been reconstituted following the March 2024 Executive Committee meeting and was in place to provide advice, guidance and support, with the goal of all working together. Terms of reference had been drafted to make sure that the functioning of the advisory committee was clear. At that stage, that committee was more of an informal committee consisting of three members who would meet virtually on a quarterly basis. Specific topics would be identified for those meetings, such as helping to develop operational plans, reviewing progress and helping to promote the ombuds and the ombuds services. In line with the WADA planning and budgeting cycle, yearly operational plans with specific activities, key performance indicators and budgets would be developed. The development of that plan would be led by WADA's Athlete Engagement Impact Area and the Strategic Management Office, in collaboration with the Ombuds and the advisory committee. As part of that exercise, the specific objectives, KPIs and budget related to the ombuds services, pillar two, would also be identified. Once identified, the ombuds would be solely responsible for implementation and reporting. That was very important and the purpose was to make sure that the nature and importance of the ombuds services in terms of independence and confidentiality were never compromised. With regard to the plan for the following year, a draft operational plan had been developed. Activities had been identified and that had been used to make sure that a budget for 2025 could be proposed, which had been included in the draft 2025 budget. Finally, from a reporting perspective, in addition to the quarterly meetings of the Ombuds Advisory Committee and WADA's regular assessment of the programme, the ombuds would provide yearly reports to the Executive Committee and to the Athlete Council.

Naturally, she saw several benefits of that programme, some of which the Executive Committee members had already mentioned in their comments. She had been happy to hear that. She certainly believed that the proposed approach and operating model offered several benefits. One, it ensured a clear delineation of responsibility and focused on accountability and success. The proposed operating model aimed to ensure that, as WADA was supporting the ombuds programme financially, it could actively contribute to its evolution and ensure its growth was progressive and prudent, in line with the WADA strategic plan. The proposed operating model also recognized that the ombuds could not accomplish everything on a part-time basis. Hence, the proposal focused on collaboration while protecting the independence of the ombuds service. By serving as a source of information and advice for policies, procedures and rules, lessons could certainly be learned from the ombuds, so it was necessary to identify opportunities to improve the anti-doping system, as well as athletes' experiences within the system. Again, she believed that to be a very important aspect that focused on athlete-

centric outcomes. The proposed collaborative model also ensured that efficiencies could be capitalized on by using existing WADA resources where appropriate. For example, when Ms Thorstenson had mentioned the promotional webinar, she had been fortunate to work with the WADA communications team and leverage their expertise to help with the development of a promotional plan and the implementation of such a plan, in addition to leveraging IT expertise. In the future, the goal was to work with the regional offices so that they could help to promote those services, as well as the mapping exercise that Ms Thorstenson had alluded to and that had started with the iNADO survey.

Finally, she believed that the operating model addressed initial questions that had been posed in March, namely, that the model ensured there were proper controls in place to manage the evolution of the ombuds programme and the budget, that collaboratively private funding opportunities could be explored, that the ombuds operated independently, that the delineation of responsibilities was clear, and that the success of both the ombuds and the ombuds programme in general could be measured, which would be possible with the deliverables and KPIs identified in the draft operational plan.

To conclude, she strongly believed that the ombuds programme should continue. It was truly a programme for athletes and had been requested by athletes to help them navigate the complex world of anti-doping. The ombuds programme was also directly in line with WADA's strategic priority. As one member had specifically mentioned, it was truly in line with the be athlete-centred initiative and one of the key initiatives to promote neutral and confidential resources for athletes. While there was certainly a need to provide ombuds services within the realm of anti-doping, the United Nations had also stressed the importance of such a role. The importance and needs of ombuds services or related programmes within anti-doping had been expressed in different ways and by different entities, such as WADA's Athlete Council. The principles outlined in the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act and the preliminary findings of the initial human rights impact assessment all highlighted the importance of protecting athletes' rights, promoting athletes' access to justice and providing guidance to athletes to ensure they really understood the anti-doping programme. She certainly believed that the ombuds programme did that. She hoped the Executive Committee would agree and trust that, as an organization whose strategic priority was to be athlete-centred and athlete-focused, the members would support the continuation of the ombuds programme, since she believed it offered a very meaningful, athlete-centred initiative for a relatively modest investment. She would be happy to take questions or comments.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the Executive Committee for the record if it agreed to confirm the Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds programme as an ongoing WADA programme.

DECISION

Proposal to confirm the continuation of the WADA Athletes' Anti-Doping Ombuds programme approved.

- 11.2 Initial human rights impact assessment – update and early findings

MS SAMARDŽIĆ-MARKOVIĆ wanted to use the opportunity to thank WADA, the Executive Committee and also the observers for helping to keep the focus on human rights. She understood it was not always easy, but she highly appreciated that there was still an ongoing focus. Together with the colleagues from WADA, she had distributed a document attached to the agenda item which consisted of a number of elements and an analysis of the most important documents and practice. She also drew the members' attention to strict liability principles, to which she would return when discussing conclusions and next steps. She would go through the document as quickly as possible. When it came to analysis of the most important WADA documents and practice, she recalled that the Executive Committee members had given her a mandate. Part of that mandate was evaluating and balancing the human rights of athletes with the rights of athletes to fair competition. Athletes must be carefully considered in that process. Therefore, she had done an analysis of existing WADA documents and practice. Over time, the Code had evolved from the 2003 version to the current version, with numerous examples of an evolving attachment and attention to the human rights of athletes. Some of those examples were greater flexibility in sanctioning, longer periods for those who really were cheats, better incorporating specific circumstances to accommodate those who could prove their innocence and timely hearings with panels that were fair and impartial. There was also institutional independence of the panels and the right to legal

representation. None of that had existed in 2003 and was currently increasing. The latest version of the Code had also recognized para athletes, which she thought from a human rights perspective as protected persons was also very important. She had analysed the examples of good practice, as set out in the document. The takeaway was that she had better confidence and thought that WADA should also have confidence that the human rights of individual athletes were not in conflict with the rights of athletes. The answer to the question of whether they were in balance was yes, they were. They were not in conflict. However, one should not become complacent but think of the future. She thought a fortified dedication to fundamental rights in the future would not weaken the system, but would strengthen the anti-doping system, especially in promoting fair play. She had set out the analysis of the documents.

The issue of strict liability and burden of proof and human rights had been analysed in the document, but she wished to explain why she thought it important to revisit it, because, in her consultations with athletes, that issue was still present. It was perhaps possible to understand why athletes had the impression that there was no presumption of innocence in anti-doping proceedings. She thought that it needed to be understood from a human rights perspective, to see whether the strict liability principle was in accordance with human rights. There were three reasons why one could say that could be seen as in accordance with human rights. One was the issue of consent. It would come as no surprise that the athletes did not always feel that their consent was free or informed. At least that was what they had told her. However, by becoming a member of a private association such as a sport club, a federation or a book club, every individual automatically subjected themselves to the association statutes and governing texts and values. Therefore, members either implicitly or explicitly committed to adhering to the prescribed standards and, according to that, they adhered to potential sanctions. That meant that athletes gave their consent, but she thought it needed to be better explained when talking to them. Many did understand, but many did not. More efforts needed to be put into that understanding.

On the second issue, human rights and strict liability, or rather presumption of innocence as defined in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, was a guarantee *par excellence* or *stricto sensu* in criminal matters. However, as emphasized by Judge Costa in his opinion for the 2021 Code, athletes retained their rights to present evidence and explanations, asserting unintentional violations. It was crucial to note that anti-doping procedures were not criminal procedures but rather civil procedures. That was how she thought it should stay, because athletes were not criminals and should not be treated as such. Therefore, from a civil proceeding perspective, strict liability was also acceptable.

Finally, on the importance of procedures, it was vital to act in accordance with human rights by having procedures that were a guarantee of athletes' access to justice. She would be happy to discuss that in detail if there were any questions but wanted to say that strict liability was compatible with human rights. She did not think that principle should or could be changed. However, there was something that could be changed and that was practice. For example, that was something she would give as part of her recommendations, and she stood by them as recommendations, not as proposals. That was her mandate. WADA should encourage not necessarily legal but more structural and policy changes among signatories to incentivize the efficiency of justice and in particular timeliness at the first level of dispute resolution. How could that be done? She thought public authorities on the national level could create that wherever it did not exist. Such bodies could create legally and financially sustainable frameworks for legal aid for accused athletes or establish a *pro bono* legal counsel list. There could also be a list of human rights experts who could be ready to engage with athletes on a national level, or maybe with a panel of arbitrators before or during the proceedings. Secondly, WADA could encourage peer reviews among ADOs in different tiers, especially focusing on the efficiency of and access to justice and peer reviews. That was not just to have peer reviews, but it could focus on rigorous selection criteria for arbitrators and the development of procedures with timeliness and a central objective. The third thing that WADA could do without changing the Code was, for example, to encourage and promote the use of technology, including video conferencing options to enhance efficiency, particularly during proceedings. She had read research that had found that, in some parts of the world, video conferencing was not very widely used to accelerate anti-doping proceedings. She had endeavoured to make recommendations that required changes to the Code, but the above examples did not require changing the Code or international standards. Issuing guidelines, such as on video conferencing, could inspire stakeholders in many places where that did not exist. That was just one example.

Turning to the conclusions, that section of the document set down what could be expected from her recommendations. Before she made recommendations, the risk or challenges would be delineated through the narratives of athletes, highlighting the potential adverse impact on their human rights across the entire spectrum of the anti-doping process, from sample collection to result management. She would give one example from the athletes' perspective: awaiting results. Once the athletes had passed a sample for testing, it became the ownership of the ADO, the result management authority, and athletes could only await the outcome. In the event that the test was positive, there was one clear line of action. She had also looked from the athletes' perspective at cases when the sample had tested negative. She would present two perspectives. One was the ADO perspective, the other was the athlete perspective. If the sample was negative, the ADO could do three things. One was to decide to use the sample for scientific purposes. In that particular case, athletes needed to be informed because ADOs had to ask for consent from athletes to use the sample for scientific reasons. The ADO might also decide to destroy the sample, and the third possibility was to keep the sample for retesting and store it for a maximum period of 10 years. In both of the latter cases, the ADO was not obliged to notify the athletes of its decision. Only 0.77% of tested samples turned out to be positive, so what happened to the 99.23% of clean athletes' samples? How were they informed about the destiny of their sample? While awaiting, athletes might be anxious, and to date the practice had been one of 'no news, good news'. Thus, after a certain period of time, if not notified, the athlete might consider that they could continue competing, but they did not know with certainty for how long they would wait and with what outcome, or whether something or nothing would be found within six months, 10 years, at the next games or never. Fear did not have to be acute fear; it could be a latent fear, but that very much affected athletes' wellbeing and mental health or could affect performance. What was said to the 99.23% of athletes whose samples were clean? Was the system about them? All those present that day would say yes, it was about them. Perhaps there was a technical solution to that problem. Maybe there was a way to inform the athletes using a very simple technical measure of sample tracking. When one made an order from Amazon, information was sent out that it had been packed and was in transit, etc. Why could the athletes not be transparently informed using such technical means?

Another recommendation was that a strategic approach could be taken in relation to inadvertent doping or contamination. However, when she spoke about that, she did so from a human rights perspective, regarding the human rights of athletes. WADA could consider adopting a strategy that proactively addressed inadvertent doping issues and, hearing the discussion that day, that could be done from a scientific perspective, a legal perspective and an educational perspective, but she would insist it should also be from the athletes' perspective. She advocated a communication expert being involved in the group, not in the Executive Committee sub-committee, but perhaps a working group. She believed the Director General had mentioned that there was a working group already established within WADA to work on inadvertent doping. That was a medium-term recommendation.

There was a long-term recommendation for actions such as professionalization or the use of artificial intelligence, or the establishment of non-judicial operational grievance mechanisms, etc. There was also one example that she would mention of a recommendation for immediate action: to articulate and publish a public policy statement on the human rights commitment. She thought that could be done as soon as possible and transparently.

Regarding next steps, the initial plan had been to present the report to the Foundation Board in Riyadh in December 2024. She thought that was still feasible if there was a feeling in the Executive Committee that it should be done as soon as possible, but she believed that WADA could be given more time to give the feedback to her report and recommendations. For example, it had been announced that day that work on inadvertent doping was to be carried out. There was also the strategic plan. Dr Gupta and Ms Maracineanu had mentioned the presence of human rights in the strategic plan. That was a kind of feedback from WADA on what her recommendations were. Perhaps space could and should be given to that. She could also participate more in the Code update process. Her idea was to present her report recommendations and what had been done at the World Conference on Doping in Sport, because it was also a broader arena for transparent communication about human rights, possibilities, what needed to be done, etc. She would be very happy to continue updating the Executive Committee and of course the Athlete Council, with which she also worked very closely. She would be happy to answer any questions.

MS MARACINEANU welcomed the report, which she had not yet read in detail, but would. She had learned that, under the Code, there were no obligations to notify athletes that a sample would be kept and stored for ten years and could be tested subsequently. She had not realized that and appreciated that information. It was very interesting to hear about that at the Executive Committee meeting. She welcomed the proposal of a tracking system for samples so that athletes knew what became of their tests.

MR PINI appreciated the report. The Athlete Council fully supported the work of the human rights assessment and it was indeed a pleasure to work with Ms Samardžić-Marković on that programme. It was a fundamental programme that he knew would have lasting impact for the athletes and the anti-doping system, and he looked forward to the outcomes in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Samardžić-Marković for her very comprehensive report, excellent work and all of the recommendations and proposals. It was certainly necessary to consider how all those proposals could be implemented.

MR DE VOS wished to know, as there was a clear recommendation for the way forward, if the Executive Committee had to take a position with regard to the recommendation. That would mean a change in the initial mandate. It was basically a prolongation of the mandate with further work to be done, which he thought might have some consequences. Should the members simply take note of the recommendations or did they have to agree to what had been proposed?

MS SAMARDŽIĆ-MARKOVIĆ noted that the recommendations were a work in progress, but when it came to the idea of prolonging the work for all of the reasons that she had listed, it was up to the WADA leadership to say what procedure was required. However, with regard to her recommendations on what to do individually in the medium term, long term, etc., it was too early to express a view because she had not shared the full report with the Executive Committee.

MR DE VOS fully understood that, but noted that the reporting would be done one year later and in the framework of another activity of WADA, and that was his specific request.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he was not sure he had understood. He thought that it had been agreed that the timeline would be leading up to the World Conference on Doping in Sport, and that the work would progress until the publication of the final report, which would then be approved at the conference.

MR DE VOS thanked the Director General for that clarification. From the presentation, it had appeared as though there was a change in the timeline. If there was not, there was no problem.

DECISION

Initial human rights impact assessment update and early findings noted.

12. Compliance

- 12.1 Non-compliance cases

THE CHAIRMAN noted that an updated compliance paper had been circulated on 10 September 2024 following the ongoing work on the Compliance Taskforce and the Compliance Review Committee.

MR GOURDJI informed the members that he would provide a summary of the main activities undertaken by the Compliance Review Committee since the March 2024 Executive Committee meeting as reflected in item 12.0, before continuing with item 12.1 on the non-compliance cases for decision. The Compliance Review Committee continued to be quite busy in its interactions with WADA, providing independent advice and guidance on compliance matters. Since the previous March, it had continuously kept abreast of WADA's monitoring activities and support provided to signatories. During that period, the Compliance Review Committee had recommended the reinstatement of the following non-compliant signatories following referral from the WADA management based on the completion of outstanding non-conformities: the Angola National Olympic Committee, acting as a NADO, and the Tunisian NADO. In both cases, a recommendation had been put to the Executive Committee which had been agreed upon and the signatories had since been reinstated. Additionally,

the Compliance Review Committee had closed two further cases: Philippines and Cambodia NADOs and five watch list cases: the Vietnam, Bahamas, Peru and Sri Lanka NADOs, as well as the Wheelchair Rugby International Federation. The Compliance Review Committee had held two meetings since its last report to the Executive Committee. It had held an on-site meeting the previous May and a virtual meeting the previous August. At both meetings, the Compliance Review Committee had received updates on the watch list cases, the non-compliance cases and the cases before the Court of Arbitration for Sport, and had focused on guidance and oversight for the WADA compliance programme. Specifically, it had reviewed and provided input to the compliance section of the draft WADA annual report and the draft compliance annual plan. The Compliance Review Committee had brainstormed and coordinated with the 2027 International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories (ISCCS) Update Drafting Team on the potential improvements to the standard. It had carefully reviewed WADA's compliance risk register, reviewing the identified risks and WADA's mitigating measures put in place. It did the same with the Compliance Review Committee's own risk register, which was also shared with WADA compliance, to make sure that all known risks that related to compliance were identified, assessed and mitigated as appropriate.

At the virtual meeting on 8 August, new cases of non-compliance had been discussed which were detailed in agenda item 12.1 on non-compliance cases and which he would introduce next. With regard to the non-compliance cases referred to in agenda item 12.1, which was for the decision of the Executive Committee, he noted that the report in the documentation provided had been revised and the latest version was dated 10 September. The update to the document was for the purpose of closing a couple of compliance procedures: for the Montenegro NADO and the Mozambique NOC acting as NADO. Some NADOs had also been updated following recommendations of non-compliance with immediate effect to a recommendation of watch list, namely for the Senegal NADO, the Uganda NOC acting as NADO and the Uruguay NADO. That was always good to see. It showed that the mechanism that WADA had put in place to actively engage and work with the signatories continued to work well. It showed that signatories had been really active up to the point of that meeting.

He had prepared a one-page slide to guide the Executive Committee through cases. With regard to the new non-compliance cases, they could be categorized into three groups. There was the anti-doping rules case. The Compliance Review Committee would be recommending the Panama NADO for the watch list and an automatic non-compliance after four months if the non-conformity had not been resolved. There were the Code compliance questionnaire (CCQ) cases, with immediate effect, the International Federation of Basque Pelota (FIPV), and five cases for the watch list and automatic non-compliance after four months if the non-conformity had not been resolved. Those were for the Namibia NOC acting as a NADO, the Pakistan NADO, the Samoa NADO, the Senegal NADO and the Uruguay NADO. The third group comprised the anti-doping rules and a compliance questionnaire case. The Compliance Review Committee would be recommending the Uganda NOC acting as NADO for the watch list and automatic non-compliance after four months if the non-conformity had not been resolved.

He would start with the rules-related case. Section A, which was on pages five and six of the document, addressed the new case related to the implementation of the Code in the legal system of the Panama NADO. The detail of that case was found in A1. Essentially, that NADO had made good progress, and draft amendments had been presented to WADA in line with the Code, in addition to a calendar for adoption within the four months from the Executive Committee meeting. Therefore, the Compliance Review Committee recommended to the Executive Committee to watchlist the Panama NADO with consequences and conditions of reinstatement as reflected in section A, which was on page seven, which could be applied at the expiration of the four-month deadline if the non-conformity was still pending. Additional consequences would also be applied if, for any reason, the non-conformity was still not resolved 12 months after the signatory consequences set out above had been imposed.

He would next summarize the Code compliance questionnaire cases. The details of those cases were found in section B and started on page 10 of the report, B1 page 10 for the FIPV. By the time that case had come before the Compliance Review Committee, the FIPV had not implemented one remaining critical corrective action in the area of testing. For B2, which was on page 11, that was for the Namibia NOC acting as NADO at the time of the Compliance Review Committee meeting the previous August and to date, the Namibia NOC acting as a NADO had not yet implemented two critical corrective actions in the area of testing and resources.

For B3, which was on pages 11 and 12, and which referred to the Pakistan NADO, the Pakistan NADO had not yet implemented three critical corrective actions in the areas of Test Distribution Plan (TDP), TDSSA and timeliness of result management procedures. B4 was on pages 12 and 13 and referred to the Samoa NADO. The Samoa NADO had not yet implemented two critical corrective actions in the area of testing and resources. For B5, which was on pages 13 and 14, with regard to the Senegal NADO, it had been discussed at the meeting the previous August, and at that time there had been five critical corrective actions. However, the NADO had made some good progress recently. The Compliance Review Committee had reviewed that case just a few days previously. That progress had been included in the revised recommendation. For B6 on page 14, the Uruguay NADO had been discussed at the meeting in August and at that time the NADO had had seven critical corrective actions. However, it had also made some good progress since August so the Compliance Review Committee had reviewed that case again recently and revised its recommendations. The Compliance Review Committee had discussed the five cases: the Namibia NOC acting as NADO, and Pakistan, Samoa, Senegal and Uruguay NADOs, and decided to recommend to the Executive Committee to watchlist all four NADOs and the Namibia NOC acting as a NADO with consequences and conditions of reinstatement, as reflected on pages 15 to 19, to be applied at the expiration of the four-month deadline if the non-conformities were still pending. In all those cases that he had just mentioned, he noted that additional consequences were being proposed after 12 months if the reinstatement conditions had not been met. For those cases, the additional consequences would be that the state flag would not be flown at specific events. For the Senegal NADO, if the signatory had not satisfied the conditions of reinstatement six months after the signatory consequences were imposed, then some of Senegal's national testing activities would be subject to supervision by an approved third party. For the FIPV, the Compliance Review Committee had discussed that case and decided to recommend to the Executive Committee that it approve sending a notice to the FIPV, alleging that it was non-compliant with the Code and proposing the consequences and conditions of reinstatement as listed on pages 21 and 22 of the document under discussion.

Section C of that report on pages 23 to 26 set out one case of non-compliance related to anti-doping rules and compliance questionnaire, which was the Uganda NOC acting as a NADO. At the time of the Compliance Review Committee meeting the previous August, the Uganda NOC, acting as NADO, had had three critical corrective actions that had not been implemented related to resources, testing and entering Doping Control forms (DCFs) into ADAMS. With regard to the rules, they had not been in line with the Code at that time. However, a few weeks previously, the NOC had managed to make some progress by drafting the required amendments in line with the Code and providing a calendar for adoption within four months of the meeting that day, as well as making good progress on the CCQ critical corrective actions. Therefore, the Compliance Review Committee recommended that the Executive Committee watchlist the Uganda NOC acting as NADO with consequences and conditions of reinstatement, as reflected on pages 24 to 26, to be applied at the expiration of the four-month deadline if the non-conformity was still pending. Additional consequences would also be applied if, for any reason, the non-conformity had still not been resolved 12 months after the signatory consequences set out above had been imposed.

To recapitulate, the decisions for the Executive Committee were summarized in paragraphs A, B, and C of the paper which were all set out on pages two and three and summarized in the one-page slide he had displayed. That concluded the Compliance Review Committee presentation to that committee and he would be pleased to answer any questions the members might have.

DR GUPTA thanked Mr Gourdji for the excellent report. He wished to reiterate, as the Americas had been mentioned a couple of times, that everybody understood WADA's responsibility to review instances where Code signatories had not appropriately updated their regulations or laws, but he believed that it was nonetheless not appropriate to hold NADOs accountable for the inaction of governments. With regard to the Panama case, he had been informed that conversations were under way for the legislature to move forward with a needed update. He knew that WADA was in receipt of a letter from Panama's NADO articulating some of its concerns about how the issue was being addressed. He noted that the Americas region appreciated the hard work of Francisco León, the new head of the Latin American and Caribbean office, and would continue to work with him in a constructive, transparent manner. There also remained some sensitivities in the region regarding the lack of consultation on the decision to replace the former occupant of that position, Maria José Pesce Cutri. He hoped that the WADA leadership would keep those concerns in mind, as that would be highly appreciated.

MS CESSOUMA wished to congratulate Mr Gourdji on his report. She added that unfortunately the African region had had cases of non-compliance but that excellent work had been done and the situation was being rectified with the NADOs in the various countries concerned. Some non-compliance remained, and further work was being done so those countries could come off the watch list and, above all, so those countries could be subjected only to monitoring. In Mozambique, Senegal and even Uganda, work was under way and the Africa office, together with the NADOs and the other institutions in charge of sport, were working together to ensure those NADOs would be taken off the watch list. She hoped the countries in her region would simply be subjected to monitoring and would work with the NADOs to rectify the situation as quickly as possible. That work was being done in conjunction with the Africa office, which helped them and supported them, together with the African Union, with a view to rectifying the situation.

MR DE VOS thanked the Compliance Review Committee on behalf of the sport movement for the good work performed. The fact that an updated document had been circulated showed how quickly it was reacting to developing situations. He congratulated the Compliance Review Committee and supported the proposed measures.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members very much for their comments. For the record, he wished to do it case by case and he would try to be as fast as possible if the members agreed. In relation to the implementation of the Code into the legal system, were the members agreeable with the following decisions: to instruct the WADA management to provide four-month watch lists, starting from 12 September 2024, to correct the outstanding non-conformities, failing which WADA would automatically send the following signatory formal notice alleging non-compliance and proposing the consequences and reinstatement conditions recommended by the Compliance Review Committee: Panama NADO? He thanked the members.

In relation to the implementation of anti-doping programmes monitored through the CCQ, were the members agreeable with the following decisions: to instruct the WADA management to provide four-month watch lists, starting from 12 September 2024, to correct the outstanding non-conformities, failing which WADA would automatically send the following signatories a formal notice alleging non-compliance and proposing the consequences and reinstatement conditions recommended by the Compliance Review Committee: Namibia NOC acting as NADO, Pakistan NADO, Samoa NADO, Senegal NADO and Uruguay NADO? He thanked the members.

He also asked the members if they would approve the WADA management sending a formal notice alleging non-compliance with the Code and/or the international standards to the following signatory and imposing the consequences and conditions of reinstatement detailed in the Executive Committee paper: International Federation of Basque Pelota. He thanked the members.

In relation to the implementation of the Code into the legal system and the anti-doping programme monitored through the CCQ, were the members agreeable with the following decision: to instruct the WADA management to provide four-month watch lists, starting from 12 September 2024, to correct the outstanding non-conformities, failing which WADA would automatically send the following signatory a formal notice alleging non-compliance and proposing the consequences and reinstatement conditions recommended by the Compliance Review Committee: Uganda NOC acting as NADO? He thanked the members very much.

DECISION

Proposed non-compliance cases and related measures approved.

- 12.2 Legislation-related compliance cases update

MR HAYNES informed the members that he would briefly go through the paper submitted, which had been requested at the March 2024 Executive Committee meeting by a number of members. Firstly, he would touch on WADA's approach to dealing with legislation. Then he would follow up with some measures that had already been taken by the Compliance Review Committee, as had just been explained, and some possible updates to the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories to ensure that compliance procedures remained effective and proportional. The Code was a starting point for confirming the need for WADA to ensure that the signatories' legal framework was in line with the Code. It had been said already that day. As mentioned a

number of times at previous Executive Committee meetings as well, if anti-doping legislation was in place, it had to be assessed to ensure harmonization with the Code. Without that, there was a risk of resource management procedures being affected, as well as the creation of a two-tiered system: one for those with legislation and one for those without legislation, which of course would be contrary to WADA's role and mandate. The approach to assessing legislation had been consistent for many years. Firstly, WADA did not encourage or advocate for countries to adopt legislation, but of course, understood that some had chosen that route in the past and continued to explore the opportunities even in the present. WADA also provided a lot of support to the drafters of legislation to ensure it was kept general and to a high level, and therefore was not subject to constant updates, for example, when the Code was reviewed periodically. As there was still no 'one size fits all' approach taken by countries, tailored support was provided to each country at every step to ensure that good practices were implemented and the process could be completed as efficiently and as quickly as possible. Also, at the start of the process, the aim was to engage all of the relevant stakeholders within the country, as well as other key influencers such as the IOC, to ensure that everybody was aware of the requirements. But one of the key challenges was if, during the review of the legislation, non-conformities were identified and the legislation was already in force. In those circumstances, complete compliance procedures were required to ensure a speedy resolution to the non-conformity. If the legislation was still in draft format and compliance procedures were not required, WADA could work alongside the country to ensure legislation could be adopted that had been assessed as in line with the Code by WADA. The report stated that, since May 2023, WADA had helped 22 countries that had adopted legislation, and the vast majority had done so without the need for a compliance procedure. However, when a compliance procedure was opened, it was opened against the NADO as the signatory, and the ISCCS confirmed that it was not an excuse that the issue had been caused by another entity, such as a public authority. The Compliance Review Committee and the Executive Committee had confirmed that approach in a number of cases over the years.

With regard to timings and proportionality, from the moment a non-conformity was discovered to the end of a watch list period, if the criteria were met and sufficient time was available, WADA committed to review and support signatories as a priority when compliance procedures were running. Concerning the consequences of non-compliance, the Compliance Review Committee had recently offered more proportionality by introducing certain consequences, such as the national flag after one year of non-compliance, and in the same spirit, the ISCCS drafting team, as Mr Gourdji had mentioned, was also looking at proposing some additional time within that watch list window to afford signatories extra time, especially when they had complicated adoption processes. He reiterated the ongoing desire for non-compliance to be a last resort. The timing of that discussion and the paper provided were important to confirm WADA's role as, in 2026, once the Code and international standards had been approved, all signatories would be required to update their anti-doping rules, and those that had legislation might have to update it if there were significant changes. Those requirements would need to be adopted by 1 January 2027. On that matter, he would urge the public authority members to play a leading role in passing the message to those countries that did have legislation to adopt only a version that had been assessed by WADA as being in line. A number of cases that had been submitted to the Executive Committee in the recent past had been the result of last-minute, non-compliant changes made to legislation that had subsequently been adopted and come into force, despite WADA having approved a previous version. That scenario must be avoided where possible. It took a long time to undo and fix, and usually led to non-compliance, but most importantly wasted considerable resources both within the country and also at WADA. That concluded his brief presentation of the paper and he would be happy to answer any questions.

MR DE VOS thanked Mr Haynes on behalf of the sport movement for the detailed report on that very important topic of legislation-related compliance cases and the proposed considerations in relation to the ISCCS. He welcomed the decision to apply consequences on flags if non-compliance remained after one year and not as an immediate sanction. He also recommended that the practice should be clarified in the standard. He was grateful for the attention paid to the comments made by the sport movement in the past and its concern about an increased number of cases referred to the CAS and the solutions considered, which were mainly from a financial perspective. He supported the proposal in the documents to increase the flexibility around the watch list allowing for a range from four to nine months, which was very helpful. He appreciated that the ISCCS had to strike the right balance between achieving more flexibility on the one hand but, on the other hand, maintaining pressure on the relevant parties. The sport movement believed that the sanctions under the ISCCS must strictly

meet the principle of proportionality with the most severe consequences applied only as a very last resort. Sanctions must first and foremost affect the institution that was responsible for the non-compliance and not other groups, especially not the athletes. The sport movement also recommended the inclusion of a mechanism allowing sanctions to be gradually reduced when the party made improvements, which provided a kind of motivation. He looked forward to seeing some of those actions implemented in the Code review.

MR HAYNES appreciated the feedback, which would be taken into consideration as part of the drafting team work as well as the Code review.

DECISION

Legislation-related compliance cases update noted.

13. Health, Medical and Research

- 13.1 2025 Prohibited List and Monitoring Programme

PROFESSOR ENGBRETSSEN informed the members that Professor Rabin would be talking about the research projects and he would be talking about the Prohibited List and the monitoring programme. It would be brief because he thought that the athletes and the team doctors would be very happy for so few changes to the 2025 list. He wished to highlight a couple of the issues on the list document that was in the members' folder. The first was about a new practice of manipulation of blood and blood components. The document stated that donation of blood or blood components, which comprised plasma, red blood cells, white cells, platelets and peripheral blood stem cells, including by apheresis, was not prohibited when performed in a collection centre accredited by a relevant regulatory authority in the country in which it operated. That last sentence was a change to the formal rules in that it was no longer prohibited for an athlete to donate blood or blood components to friends or family, or in a catastrophic situation such as Covid, for example, when many athletes had donated blood to friends and family. That was number one, and was probably the most significant change in the list at that time, if the Executive Committee approved it. The second one was about beta-blockers. Some athletes used beta-blockers to reduce their pulses, typically in shooting, archery and similar sports. However, based on information provided by the International Ski and Snowboard Federation, the disciplines of ski jumping, freestyle aerials, half pipe and snowboard half pipe/big air were removed from the ban on using beta-blockers. Those were the two changes that would be found if the 2025 list was approved.

The second document was the monitoring programme for 2025. He wanted to alert the Executive Committee to just one change, which might be very interesting: the new medication on weight control. He was sure everyone was aware that there was currently medication for overweight which worked very well. It had been designed to be used by patients with type-two diabetes and had helped a lot of them. The question was whether athletes were starting to use it to stabilize their weight if they were competing in, for example, boxing, wrestling and other sports with weight categories. That medication had been placed on the watch list to look at the epidemiology of it and how many athletes were actually using it. Also, it was not currently known whether it was helping athletes' performance. Within a year or so, there would be much more information about that. Those were the main issues about the Prohibited List and the monitoring programme and he would be happy to answer any questions.

Professor Rabin would then talk about the new way of dealing with the research projects that had just started that year. He would update the Executive Committee on the numbers, which showed WADA's great success in attracting many more research projects than previously.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for the record if the Executive Committee approved the 2025 WADA International Standard for the Prohibited List, including the monitoring programme for 2025.

DECISION

Proposed 2025 Prohibited List and monitoring programme approved.

- **13.2 2024 scientific research projects (cycle 1)**

PROFESSOR RABIN said that he would try to entertain the Executive Committee with a little bit of scientific research at the end of that long day. He would provide some metrics on the 2024 research projects, in particular the first cycle. Seventy expressions of interest had been received and that was a new way to apply for research projects to WADA. Efforts had been made to make the procedure simpler. As had been stated at previous Executive Committee meetings, the aim was also to be more efficient in attracting and reviewing research projects. Any research team could currently apply to WADA at any time of the year. One of the main objectives was to increase the attractiveness of the programme and receive more projects. That had been achieved immediately. In 2024, a record number of grant applications or expressions of interest had been received. That was very good news, because it was exactly what WADA had tried to achieve. He thought that trend would continue. The other good news was that more projects were coming from Asia, which was a good thing because in the past not so many projects had come from that region of the world. One of the other indicators that WADA wanted to increase was the number of investigators not related to WADA-accredited laboratories. There was a duty of research in the anti-doping laboratories, so it was normal to receive projects from the laboratories. Nonetheless, WADA wanted to make sure that the programme was universal enough to attract people from outside the anti-doping laboratories and outside the usual anti-doping community. That seemed to have been achieved, because 67% of the expressions of interest received had come from principal investigators from outside the anti-doping laboratories. That was good news.

The process, as had been mentioned, had been changed in 2024. Expressions of interest were received and they were reviewed by two external experts and one member of the WADA management. That was a little bit new. It was also to ensure that expressions of interest that were not in the areas of research priorities for WADA or were redundant, or research that had already been conducted, could be ruled out. That was why the WADA management component was useful. If successful, the expression of interest was turned into a full application and reviewed by three independent reviewers. That year, a pool had been used to give an order of magnitude of 27 external independent reviewers for the projects that had been received. Finally, as in the past, the Health, Medical and Research Committee members were part of the process and had reviewed the applications before making a recommendation to the WADA Executive Committee that day. The role of the Health, Medical and Research Committee was even more important at that time because the project was reviewed in depth and discussed at the very end of the process, which was rather useful. Over the past few months, a lot of positive comments had been received on that process for the flexibility, efficiency and mainly the possibility for investigators to apply to WADA at any time during the year.

With regard to what had been seen that year, of the 32 full applications that had been received which were worth slightly more than five million US dollars, 14 projects had been recommended, representing about 27% of the total requested. That concerned the financial aspect.

It was quite interesting to look at where that money was going to be invested or proposed to be invested. As usual, the anabolic agent section was quite important. Many projects had been received on that. It was well known that the vast majority of adverse analytical findings still related to the anabolic agent section. With regard to the five projects, they accounted for about one-third of the projects in that section. Some of them touched upon the isotope ratio mass spectrometry analysis, because that isotopic method was used more and more and relied on more and more on to determine substances of exogenous origin. There were two projects in that area. There were also new substances regularly coming into the field. YK11 was one of them that had been identified. WADA was constantly improving and reviewing its approach to those new substances, looking at how to better detect them and how to make sure that the analytical aspects could be converted into very strong and robust adverse analytical findings. Of course, there were also the long-term metabolites. It had been said that day that analytical methods were more and more sensitive, which was true. Those methods made it possible to detect anabolic steroids much longer in the biological samples.

The following section had also been growing over the years, and was the section on peptide and protein hormones. Three projects had been selected there. He had just talked about new substances, and kisspeptin under project one was a new peptide that had been identified as having doping potential. Again, it was necessary to investigate many aspects of the metabolism of that new peptide.

Lastly, there was the area of GLP-1 receptor agonists. Those so-called incretins were at that time widely available, not only for medical practice, but also largely publicized in society in general, including on social media. They were increasingly present in the sporting environment, and it was therefore necessary to improve detection. The aim was to test the possibility of detecting those substances in dried blood spot, which was a method of great interest to WADA, and to look more into the metabolism, including of some substances, such as SR9011, which was not a substance that was available and could be administered to humans. However, there was certainly a desire to explore the metabolism in cell culture, or in vitro.

There were two projects related to the Athlete Biological Passport, mainly to what was known as confounding factors, whether glucocorticosteroids had an effect on the Athlete Biological Passport. Some preliminary research had concluded that they did not, but WADA wanted to go into a final level of analysis of the potential impact of glucocorticoids on the Athlete Biological Passport, as well as the intake of ethanol, alcohol and food intake in general, to refine the ability to analyse some complex passports or profiles in the Athlete Biological Passport.

Finally, there was also one project in the area of narcotics. The previous year, he had talked about tramadol. Tramadol was at that time prohibited, but there had been a shift from tramadol to other narcotics, opioids such as tapentadol or codeine. WADA sought to better monitor that in terms of the ability of those two substances to enhance performance, as it had done for tramadol, leading to the inclusion of tramadol on the Prohibited List.

There was also one project related to looking into rycals, which were substances that were not entirely new but where the mechanism was relatively new, related to the stability or stabilization of calcium metabolism.

To conclude, there were two very interesting projects in completely different areas, but certainly very much related to WADA's work. One was on gene doping to increase the capability to detect the enzymes used for gene edition. Some of the members might have heard in the past, including from him, about CRISPR-Cas9, which was about gene editing and how that kind of scissors could be used to break the DNA and make some very fine modifications to it. It was possible to detect the enzyme, but the aim was to prolong the window of detection of the enzyme in case it was being used by athletes.

There was also a rather innovative project using artificial intelligence to try to pick up the very small signals that were conducted during mass spectrometric analysis to see if artificial intelligence could be used to better identify the substances that would not normally be seen but that artificial intelligence could help identify, in particular some new substances that were not necessarily known. That was more of a prospective but quite intellectually interesting project.

Of that cycle, 14 projects had been recommended for funding for a total of just over 1.4 million US dollars. One project had been submitted to WADA and the Partnership for Clean Competition, which was also interested in it. He hoped that that project could be co-funded. He stressed that some research projects could be recommended by the expert groups when there was a particular interest in improving certain methods or addressing some very specific questions related to the work of those expert groups. As he had said in the past, one of the aims was to use research to answer some very practical questions that those expert groups might face in their practice. That was why there were four projects that had been selected in 2024 related to the better analysis of erythropoietin, for example. There were two projects in that field. There was one related to a new variety of growth hormone called somatotropin, to make sure it could be analysed with sufficient sensitivity and specificity. Finally, some good progress had been made on detecting gene doping, in particular the viruses that were used as 'cargoes' to bring DNA or RNA into the body. There was a very interesting project and the aim was to bridge from the end of the research into implementation in the anti-doping laboratory. Those were the four targeted projects accepted in 2024.

He would conclude on the current situation. WADA was already preparing for the next cycle, which was cycle two, of 2024 grant applications. It had received 52 projects for that cycle, which was very good. The recommendations would be seen at the meeting in December for approval. He certainly wanted to continue making sure that applied research was continued in support of the work of the expert groups. It was extremely useful to be able to answer some of the questions practically and pragmatically that the expert groups faced with WADA's anti-doping research capability. It was necessary to continue projects that delivered good results, and to make sure that such work would continue from the end of the research into implementation in anti-doping

laboratories. That occasionally meant bridging some studies that required attention and interest. Of course, it was necessary to cover what was extremely important from that budget, in addition to ethical reviews of those projects and the ability to provide support for the time, energy and expertise that the external experts dedicated to the review of those projects. With regard to 2024, there should be no problem. However, there was very substantial concern for 2025, because in 2025 there would not be only two cycles but three cycles. If the money earmarked for 2025 was spent, there might be a budget deficit to support all the good projects received in 2025. Therefore, he might in the future request not more money, but perhaps a little more consideration for more resources if needed for research in 2025. That concluded his presentation on research projects.

MS MARACINEANU appreciated the extremely interesting report. She did not know how long those research projects lasted, but Europe would very much like to receive a summary, if possible, of the results once the projects had ended and to know how the information was communicated to the NADOs, for example, or to the Executive Committee. Once research had been concluded, was it possible to obtain access to how that project had been managed and how it could contribute?

PROFESSOR ENGBRETSSEN replied that, at the August 2024 meeting in Montreal, a discussion was always held on the previous projects that had been funded and the current status thereof, and they had resulted in not only papers, book chapters and the like, but also new methods to detect doping in the laboratories and so forth. That was done every year. It gave a good overview of how the money had been spent and what it had resulted in. He thought the proposal was a good one and that it might be possible to collate all of the projects from the previous five years, for example, to present to the Executive Committee.

PROFESSOR RABIN noted that all of that information could be found on the WADA website, including everything that WADA had financed since 2001 and what the impact had been through the results. The results were made visible, and also gave satisfaction to those who had helped finance those projects by showing the positive impact of such research projects.

MS MARACINEANU said that it would also be in the interest of the Executive Committee to disseminate the information in such a way that was more understandable for the general public to see what WADA actually did, scientifically speaking, in the fight against doping in sport.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the Executive Committee if it approved the funding recommendations for the first cycle of research proposals for 2024.

DECISION

Proposed 2024 scientific research projects (cycle 1)
approved.

- 13.3 Approval of Athlete Biological Passport laboratory status – Shanghai, China

PROFESSOR RABIN noted that he would continue that very entertaining discussion on science and refer to the laboratory status. Two decisions had to be taken that day by the Executive Committee. One related to the Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory. In the past, the Shanghai laboratory had applied for full accreditation, and then it had wanted to come to WADA more specifically for the Athlete Biological Passport, which was the blood laboratory approval. WADA had realized that its rules, even if access or accreditation were granted, did not specifically entail access to Athlete Biological Passport approval. Therefore, it had been necessary to go through that process again. The laboratory had gone through that process and had confirmed over more than a year that its results were in conformity with the quality expected. The reporting of results was within the specificities and specifications required and in full conformity with what was expected from an Athlete Biological Passport laboratory. Hence, the Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory was being presented for Athlete Biological Passport approval to the Executive Committee that day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked, for the record, based on the recommendation of the WADA Laboratory Expert Advisory Group and WADA Science Department, if the Executive Committee agreed to grant Athlete Biological Passport laboratory status to the Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory.

DECISION

Athlete Biological Passport laboratory status for Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory approved.

- 13.4 Candidate for Athlete Biological Passport laboratory status – Casablanca, Morocco

PROFESSOR RABIN noted that the item also referred to laboratories in support of the Athlete Biological Passport, or what were informally known as 'blood laboratories'. He was very pleased to see that a candidate from the African region had applied to become a blood laboratory, namely the Laboratoire Mohammed VI Antidopage in Casablanca, Morocco. The application had been reviewed very carefully, and he was very pleased to say that all the requirements established under the International Standard for Laboratories had been met. Therefore, the Laboratory Expert Advisory Group and the WADA management recommended the aforementioned laboratory in Morocco for approval as a candidate laboratory.

THE CHAIRMAN asked, for the record, if the Executive Committee approved the laboratory in Casablanca as an Athlete Biological Passport candidate laboratory.

DECISION

Laboratoire Mohammed VI Antidopage in Casablanca, Morocco approved as an Athlete Biological Passport candidate laboratory.

14. Other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN noted that there were no other issues to be raised. With regard to the following Executive Committee meeting, it would be held on 4 December in Riyadh, followed by the meeting of the Foundation Board on 5 December. The March 2025 meeting would be changed in light of the recent announcement of and schedule conflict with an IOC session. It might need to be held virtually. In any event, the date would change and the details would be confirmed as soon as possible. The same applied to the Executive Committee meeting in September 2025. Members would be informed as soon as possible about the structure of that meeting, the time and whether it was going to be in person or online.

MR DE VOS asked with regard to the March 2025 meeting if the Annual Symposium would be maintained on the same date or would also change.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL replied that the Annual Symposium would be maintained. The date could not be changed given the congress venue availabilities.

THE CHAIRMAN concluded by thanking the interpreters, WADA staff and all those involved in the excellent organization of the meeting. He thanked the exceptional host, Professor Erdener, and his team, for their outstanding hospitality and perfect organization.

DECISION

Executive Committee – 4 December 2024, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;
Foundation Board – 5 December 2024, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;
Executive Committee – March 2025, location TBC;
Annual Symposium – 18 and 19 March 2025;
Executive Committee – first half of September 2025, location TBC;
World Conference on Doping in Sport, 1-5 December 2025, Busan, Republic of Korea;
Executive Committee – date TBC, Busan, Republic of Korea;
Foundation Board – date TBC, Busan, Republic of Korea.

The meeting adjourned at 5.15 p.m. GMT+3.

FOR APPROVAL

MR WITOLD BAŃKA
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA

MR OLIVIER NIGGLI
DIRECTOR GENERAL AND RECORDING SECRETARY