

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, 2 December 2025, Busan, Republic of Korea

The meeting began at 9.00 a.m. GMT+9

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members and observers to Busan on the eve of the sixth World Conference on Doping in Sport. He was pleased that everybody had arrived on time and hoped that they had enjoyed the previous evening's dinner and the minister's hospitality. There were 13 Executive Committee members present in person, along with Mr Sergii Popyk, who was representing Minister Bidnyi from Ukraine as a deputy from Europe. The seat reserved for the new CADE representative from the Americas remained empty, as the nominee had not yet been submitted for the necessary Foundation Board approval. Additionally, a late apology had been received from Minister Wells, who was unfortunately unable to attend, leaving the Oceania seat empty.

Copies of all of the committee chairs' annual reports had been provided; but, due to limited meeting time, all chairs would not present verbally. The chairs would still be available to answer any questions. Members were reminded that the meeting was scheduled to end at 2 p.m., to be followed by the opening ceremony of the World Conference on Doping in Sport. The agenda had been streamlined, with only select items to be discussed. Members were referred to the distributed documentation for further information about the other topics and were assured that there would be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the meeting. If time allowed, the answers would be provided during the meeting. Otherwise, a written response would be provided as soon as possible. Lastly, there would be one break at around 11 a.m. and then the members would push through until 2 p.m. A lunch would be served at the end of the meeting before the members returned to the hotel prior to the conference opening ceremony. He was relying on everybody to be as efficient as possible that day because it was really necessary to finish on time. He urged the members, diplomatically, to focus on the timing and be very efficient.

He would circulate the physical roll call and asked the members to sign it and then pass it on to their neighbour.

The following members attended the meeting: Mr Witold Bańka, President and Chairman of WADA; Ms Yang Yang, Vice-President of WADA; Mr Jiří Kejval, President, National Olympic Committee, Czech Republic, IOC Member; Mr Nenad Lalovic, Executive Board Member, ASOIF, UWW President, IOC Member; Mr Ingmar De Vos, President, ASOIF, IOC Member, FEI President; Ms Dagmawit Girmay Berhane, Board Member, Ethiopian National Olympic Committee, IOC Member; Mr Humphrey Kayange Emonyi, IOC Member, IOC Athletes' Commission Member; Ms Amma Twum-Amoah, Commissioner for Health, Humanitarian Affairs and Social Development, African Union, Ghana; Dr Koji Murofushi, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Sergii Popyk, representing Mr Matvii Bidnyi, Minister of Youth and Sports, Ukraine; Ms Gabriella Battaini-Dracconi, Independent Member, Italy; Ms Venetia Bennett, Independent Member, Australia; Dr Patricia Sanguinis, Independent Member, Argentina; and Mr Ryan Pini, Athlete Council Chair, Papua New Guinea.

The following Permanent Special Committee and Standing Committee chairs attended the meeting: Mr Ryan Pini, Chair of the WADA Athlete Council (also a member of the Executive Committee); Mr Henry Gourdji, Chair of the WADA Compliance Review Committee; Ms Kady Kanouté Tounkara, Chair of the WADA Education Committee; Professor Pascal Borry, Chair of the Independent Ethics Board; and Ms Diane Smith-Gander, Chair of the WADA Nominations Committee.

The following WADA management representatives attended the meeting: Mr Olivier Niggli, Director General; Mr Pritpal Gill, Head of Internal Audit; Mr Sébastien Gillot, European Office and Sport Movement Relations Director; Mr Kevin Haynes, Compliance, Rules and Standards Director; Ms Karine Henrie, Athlete Engagement Director; Ms Amanda Hudson, Education Director; Mr Stuart Kemp, Chief Operating Officer; Ms Florence Lefebvre-Rangeon, Deputy Chief Operating Officer; Mr Francisco León, Latin America and Caribbean Office Director; Mr Marc-André Matton, Chief Technology Officer; Ms Catherine MacLean, Communications Director;

Mr Darren Mullaly, Government Relations Director; Ms Chaya Ndiaye, Digital Insights Director; Mr Rafał 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; Ms Mayumi Yaya Yamamoto, Asia/Oceania Office Director; Mr Rodney Swigelaar, Africa Office Director; Ms Audrey Taillefer, Finance and Strategy Acting Director; Mr Ross Wenzel, General Counsel; Ms Shannan Withers, Chief of Staff; and Mr Günter Younger, Intelligence and Investigations Director.

The following observers joined the meeting: Michael Cary, Chris Solly, Shin Asakawa, Keiko Momii, Yumiko Nakajima, Yuka Morokoshi, Hannah Grossenbacher, Jane Thornton, Gaby Ahrens, Nataliia Radchuk, Jamie Brown, Liene Kozlovska, Rich Young, Snežana Samardžić-Marković, Olle Dahlin, Devante Duncan, Lina Kessy, Samuel Olutimeyin Ogbondeminu, James Carr, Michael Vesper, Christian Thill, Natanya Potoi, Kerry Knowler, Luke McCann, Jane Mountfort and Peter Miskimmin.

1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest

THE CHAIRMAN asked if any members wished to disclose any conflicts of interest. He gave the floor to Ms Bennett.

MS BENNETT declared a conflict of interest in relation to item 6.1.1. insofar as it related to her own reappointment as a member of the Executive Committee and the recommendation that the Executive Committee would make to the Foundation Board.

MR DE VOS added that, with regard to the recommendation of the Nominations Committee for the position in the ITA, he also, of course, declared a conflict of interest.

MS BERHANE said that the same applied to her regarding the nomination for the Risk and Audit Committee.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 11 September 2025

THE CHAIRMAN said that the draft minutes from the meeting held in September in Prague had been circulated as part of the meeting document set. No member comments had been received in relation to them. If there were no comments that day, the minutes would be approved. He saw no requests for the floor, so he declared the minutes from the September meeting approved.

DECISION

Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee meeting on 11 September 2025 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL welcomed the members to the World Conference on Doping in Sport and warmly thanked the Korean hosts for the week. That meeting would be a very condensed one. He would follow the orders from the President and get straight to the point. He had very few updates from his report that was in the members' binders, but there were two items that he wanted to draw their attention to.

He started with the Enhanced Games. He thought the members knew exactly what he was talking about; but, just to remind everybody, the event was scheduled to take place in May the following year in Las Vegas. It involved three sports: athletics, weightlifting and swimming. The event promoted the use of performance-enhancing drugs and prohibited substances. As it had done from the beginning, WADA condemned the event because of the risk it represented to the health of the athletes and to the value and integrity of sport. His point was related to the litigation that the Enhanced Games had filed against WADA, because he was sure every member was interested to know where the multi 100 million-dollar claim was. It had been filed in New York against World Aquatics, USA Swimming and WADA. It was an antitrust-related litigation primarily linked to one of the bylaws of World Aquatics. The bylaw stipulated that those who participated in the Enhanced Games might then be declared ineligible to participate in further World Aquatics events.

The lawsuit alleged that WADA had conspired with World Aquatics with respect to the bylaw as a means of blocking the Enhanced Games' entry to the market. That was the legal approach. That was, first of all, absolutely not true. The bylaw had been introduced by World Aquatics without any involvement from WADA. WADA had, of course, defended itself in the case. It had filed motions to object to the lawsuit; all of the defendants had. WADA had also filed an objection regarding personal jurisdiction on it from a New York judge. In a recent order, on 17 November, the judge had found that there was actually jurisdiction over WADA; he had said in his order that it was a borderline decision but had found that there was jurisdiction. However, he was pleased to say that the judge had actually accepted the motion to dismiss by all three defendants. That was good news and meant

that the case was over. As far as WADA was concerned, he had given very little credibility to the claim made against WADA. However, the judge had given the Enhanced Games a deadline of 30 days to amend their complaints to address the defects in their claim; and we were currently in that period, which was why he could not say it was completely over. It was positive. The deadline would expire on 17 December. WADA welcomed the dismissal of the lawsuit and hoped it would not be refiled. If it were to be refiled, which he thought would be relatively complicated, WADA would still defend its position. He thought, however, that WADA had a relatively strong position in that case. That was the current situation and he hoped to be able to update the members on where it was going.

The other item on which he wanted to give the members a quick update was regarding the Ombuds program. As the members knew, it had been confirmed the previous year that the program would be subject to regular review. A need had been identified for the program to evolve, and that was important to ensure that it maintained some level of continuity. After careful consideration, WADA had decided not to continue the contractual relationship with Ms Thorstenson, who had done the job since the program's inception. Her contract would be ending at the end of that year, and WADA would soon issue a call for proposals for a potential service provider, be it an individual or a company, to manage the Ombuds program. He thanked Ms Thorstenson for the work she had done and the help she had provided in establishing that important program. During the transition period, WADA had an interim solution in place. It had contracted an organization called Sports Law, which was a multidisciplinary sport management company focusing on governance and legal services. It would deal with the matter and there would be no discontinuity in the program. It would answer all calls or questions. And, of course, in March, WADA would provide an update on the situation and the following steps. WADA was looking also for potential separate funding for that project, as had already been mentioned in the past.

Those were the two main things he had wanted to raise. He reminded the Executive Committee members that they would be on stage the following day in the afternoon for sessions three and four at the World Conference on Doping in Sport from 2 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. He urged them not to be late or forget, or get lost at the lunch. If the members had questions on his report, he would try to answer them or pass them on to his colleagues.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Director General and asked the members if they had any comments or questions.

MR PINI expressed on behalf of the Athlete Council his gratitude and appreciation towards Ms Thorstenson, the former ombudsperson, for her outstanding contribution to the ombuds services that had been provided over the past year or so, and for establishing and shaping that service for the athletes. Her professionalism, integrity and genuine commitment to supporting athletes had set a very strong foundation. He was pleased to see that the Ombuds program continued to be strengthened and that the athletes had increasingly trusted, neutral and confidential resources to return to. That was a concrete example of how athlete-centred initiatives could make the system more supportive and fairer. He thanked Ms Thorstenson and thanked everybody for making sure that the service would be continued.

MR DE VOS thanked the Director General for that detailed report, which gave, in his view, a very good overview of the progress that had been made. Many topics were covered in that report. He saw the point regarding the Chinese swimmers case and agreed that, as mentioned in the report, there was a need to reinforce the independent testing. But it was also very important for the doping control officers to have free access to the countries where they had to implement independent testing. That was becoming more and more complicated in the world. It was also necessary to focus on that and get the full cooperation of the governments.

He welcomed the update regarding the situation of the USA and noted that the sport movement was deeply concerned about the fact that, basically, no progress had been made. He was quite disappointed about that, especially also in view of some very important international sporting events that were going to take place in the USA. For the sport movement, it was really important for that relationship to be restored as soon as possible and for the USA to get back on board and be fully integrated again in the system; and, as the honorary IOC president had said the previous day at the special dinner, for clean athletes in the USA also to be protected. He noted the willingness of WADA to enter into dialogue with the USA. He knew that it was sometimes difficult, also because it was necessary to wait for the appointment of some key people in the whole mechanism, such as the leadership of the ONDCP, which was basically the body that had to support the funding. Also, for the funding, it was really important to get them back on board because that was an important amount although, of course, it was the Olympic Movement that was the biggest contributor. But, in order to allow the IOC to match the US contribution, he referred to the really important amount that was important for the sustainability and the continuity of the work of WADA and to be able also to undertake the necessary initiatives in education, research, investigations, etc. It was therefore really important to get the USA back on board and he really would welcome initiatives by WADA to reach out to the USA and to see how that could be helped. The sport movement was

very supportive of that and, if necessary, would be willing to support any initiative that could re-start the dialogue and get the USA back on board.

With regard to communication, there were some nice initiatives mentioned in the report that were really good. Opening a dialogue with what were often referred to as WADA's 'critical friends' i.e. the media, was interesting, as was the feedback. He thought it was really important to focus on that, also to protect the reputation of the organization and to explain exactly what was being done. All in all, he thought that it was a very good report and he looked forward also to the update in March with regard to the communication strategy.

MS BERHANE followed on from what her colleague had said and would make two comments and ask some questions in relation to digital insights and education, which were mentioned in the report. She congratulated the Director General on the report. She had noted that WADA was continuing to work on the AI strategy to optimize its operations. She also appreciated how WADA was actually keeping the human element and also ethics at the centre of that exercise, which she believed was key. She wished to recognize that. Also, at future meetings, she would be interested in hearing more about the impact of AI and the use of data on the anti-doping community.

On another note, she had a quick question. She had noted that only ADOs had signed the API agreement. In terms of aligning with the new Code, might there be changes in terms of the support of the sharing of information relating to athletes? She sought more clarification on the onboarding of the other ADOs in terms of having more coming into the onboarding, and also, on ADAMS, she knew that there would be a lot of changes made to align with the new Code. Could changes also be expected to support the sharing of information relating to athletes and support personnel in and around the athletes? Still related to that topic, in terms of cyber security, was there any update in terms of any attacks that WADA was facing?

She wished to place on record her appreciation of the work that was being done by Japan to assist WADA in collaborating on the education aspect. That was very important given the fact that building capacity was very much supported by different partners, especially in the regional activities. Gaining more insight into how WADA was measuring the long-term impact of those programmes would be even more beneficial.

On behalf of Africa, MS TWUM-AMOA said that she also wanted to thank the Director General for his report. She wished to thank the Director General for the updates on all the issues raised. The African region remained deeply appreciative of WADA's continuous support to NADOs and RADOs. In recent weeks, she knew that the French-speaking NADOs had benefited from in-person Global Learning and Development Framework training in Algeria, made possible through the partnership with SuperSport. She again voiced her concern regarding the so-called Enhanced Games. She trusted that reason would prevail and that that event would be abandoned. In the meantime, it was necessary to remain vigilant and committed to guiding the athletes away from any involvement. That was very important. The members had to continue to stand together, unwavering in their resolve to protect the integrity of the games.

Regarding the private partnerships, she thanked WADA's management for the innovative activities under the SuperSport agreement, ranging from GLDF training to awareness projects across the member states.

DR MUROFUSHI welcomed the comprehensive report. On behalf of OneVoice, he wished to share two points from the governments, also echoing Mr De Vos. First, the USA remained a vital partner in the global anti-doping movement. The current situation affected the collective efforts, particularly in the lead-up to the 2028 Summer Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles. He strongly encouraged WADA to continue its efforts to resume constructive dialogue and work towards resolving that issue. Among the five seats allocated to government representatives on the Executive Committee, the Americas seat was currently vacant. The absence of a representative from the Americas region had created challenges in information sharing, which could potentially affect the governance of the WADA Executive Committee. He believed that that issue should be addressed promptly, and invited all of the members on the committee to acknowledge its importance and to cooperate in prompt dialogue and find a timely solution.

MR KEJVAL said that he had one issue related to the Enhanced Games. The sport movement welcomed the update on the recent decision. He was very pleased about that. He had just one question. Based on the previous experience with legal trials in the USA, what was the expected cost? The previous one had been very serious.

MR PINI thanked the Chairman for allowing him to take the floor again. He just wanted to follow on from the comments on the USADA certification program. That had actually been discussed the previous day at the Athlete Council meeting. There had been some concern regarding that and how that program might unintentionally limit independent testing by other signatories. In light of transparency issues highlighted through the Chinese swimming cases, he was aware of how essential operational independence was to maintaining

trust in the system. Anything that restricted who could make or made testing more predictable raised questions. With the upcoming Code changes aiming to strengthen independent testing globally, the Athlete Council felt that it was important to understand the intention and rationale behind that programme and how it aligned with the broader objectives within that. He welcomed the report.

MS BENNETT thanked the Director General for his, as usual, very extensive report. She congratulated WADA and its internal and external legal counsel for what was a very positive outcome in the legal action commenced by the Enhanced Games. She hoped that 17 December would come and go without incident.

As others had done, she wished to note her concern in relation to the prospect of certification by USADA for doping controls by other signatories within the territory of the USA. She imagined, or at least she hoped, that all stakeholders in the anti-doping ecosystem would share the common goal of strengthening that system for the benefit of athletes and clean sport. Independence in testing was one way in which to do that. She did not intend to foreshadow any outcomes or recommendations of the Working Group on the Operational Independence of National Anti-Doping Organizations, but it was possible that its recommendations might extend to processes that were aimed at ensuring independence in testing, and of course there were recent changes proposed to the Code to that end as well. She did not profess to be across the detail of the proposed certification process that USADA had put forward, but it seemed that placing restrictions on the testing of athletes in any particular geographic region was an unnecessary impediment that might undermine the integrity of the testing framework in that country.

MR POPYK spoke on behalf of the European countries to thank the Director General for his report. At the same time, Europe wished to refer to the case currently before the Court of Justice of the European Union as mentioned in that report, and invited WADA to continue to follow it closely.

MR LALOVIC thanked the Director General for his very precise and extensive report. He wished to say that the international federations were very attentive and were very interested in the certification of ADOs in the USA. While the sport movement lacked full visibility and understanding of the certification, the principles published on USADA's website raised concerns, in particular regarding the ADOs' capacity to run their anti-doping programs independently. Did WADA have any clarity on the impact for international federations and others of such a program? Understanding that, on average, 8% of international athletes covering all nationalities were residing in the USA within the few months leading up to games, did WADA see any risk for pre-games testing, also bearing in mind that there would be many test events a year before or qualifying events? And the last question was, did WADA have any direct dialogue with USADA to seek clarification?

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed all of the comments and questions. After so many comments, he was happy that he was not the Director General, to whom he gave the floor.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked the members very much for their comments. Luckily, he could respond collectively to some of them. He would start with the remarks on the USA. He thought that they had come from Mr De Vos, but they had been repeated by OneVoice and others. The members would have seen from his report that WADA had made contact on several occasions with the US administration during the course of the summer. As mentioned by Mr De Vos, the head of the ONDCP had not yet been confirmed. Also, the people working in that department had all left. There were new people who had just started. They had not been in the office for a number of weeks, given the government shutdown, which had also complicated things. Mr Mullaly was regularly in contact with the administration and WADA would continue to try to establish and re-establish that dialogue with the new people who had arrived and the new director, when confirmed. WADA would see where it went and would continue its efforts on that. But, as the members could see from the report, there had actually been a number of exchanges of letters and even a call during the summer, but that team had since disappeared, and WADA would have to start again from scratch. That was of course different from USADA, with which WADA had less contact for obvious reasons. WADA also had regular contact with the NOC and would continue to have that permanent open dialogue with it.

In response to the remark on communication that Mr De Vos had made, he wished to highlight the fact that WADA had actually had meetings with a group of journalists both in London and in Warsaw, and they had been very good. The goal had not been to generate an article, but rather to inform and try to educate them on the work WADA was doing. It had been very well received and very fruitful, he thought, and was something WADA would look to continue to do.

He agreed with Ms Berhane about AI and would look into providing a more detailed report. On the more technical questions, he was afraid that he did not have all the answers. He thought the API was expected to apply only to a very small number of organizations that had their own system and needed to have that exchange, but it was ongoing. If she needed more detail, it would be possible to provide more on that in the future.

He knew that WADA was looking at cybersecurity carefully. He had had a conversation a few days previously with the person responsible for it, who had told him that he was actually in contact with the IOC team in relation to the Milano Cortina Olympic Games, and he did not think that WADA was facing anything unusual because it faced attacks every day. That was nothing unusual, as far as he had been told.

Regarding the question on education, he would have to defer to Ms Hudson. Perhaps she could respond later on how WADA intended to measure efficiency.

He thanked Ms Twum-Amoah for her remarks. WADA certainly had to remain vigilant when it came to the Enhanced Games. He agreed with that. Private partnerships would be discussed under the following item. WADA was very thankful to SuperSport for the work done together.

Regarding the question asked by Dr Murofushi about CADE, he would encourage all of the public authority representatives to discuss with their colleagues. There were, he thought, a number of colleagues from that region coming for the Foundation Board meeting who would be there, and possibly others. He thought it was really for that region to get its act together and see who it wanted to appoint, from a country that was eligible, to the Executive Committee.

Mr Kejval's question was a very good one. If things were uneventful until 17 December and that was the end of the story, the damage would not be too much. If it continued, WADA was still in discussion with the insurance company, which would hopefully cover a portion of it. .

Then there had been a number of remarks in relation to certification and operational independence and so on. First of all, he thought it was clear, and it had been discussed with the athletes the previous day and he had heard the comments that day, that independent testing before and during major events was key. He thought it was key for the credibility of the system, and it was key to take away even if only a perception of potential bias in the program. That was very important and the burden was on Ms Bennett's shoulders, so he looked forward to hearing the group report. WADA would be really focusing on that in the coming months because it was a really important topic.

On the USADA certification programme, there were concerns, not just for the pre-games testing. There were concerns that there were a number of consequences. WADA had had discussions with the IFs, of course, but also with representatives of the Paralympic Movement who were extremely concerned about the problems it might raise for them and their athletes and so forth. WADA would ask USADA a number of questions. That was coming and would be done in the coming days. There would be a number of questions. But then it would follow the regular process. There was a process to assess whether such initiatives fell within the framework of the Code or not. And that was basically the compliance process. WADA would follow due process on that and would report to the members. There was a great deal of concern. He would try to understand everything properly and then would refer it to the internal process to be dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Director General and hoped that he had addressed all the members' questions and comments.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

- **3.1 Private partnerships update**

Before handing the floor over to the Director General, THE CHAIRMAN wished to emphasize that that agenda item was the result of his discussions with the colleagues from Japan, particularly with Dr Murofushi. When they had met in Japan, there had been a clear consensus that members of the statutory bodies, the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board, could be of great help in attracting private partners for WADA. However, for that to happen, they had first to be equipped with the proper tools and have a good understanding of what was expected of them. That was precisely why that item was on that day's agenda. Speaking of private partners, he wished to take that opportunity to thank all of WADA's current partners, whom the Director General would introduce. He thought that WADA had a few impactful and valuable partnerships and was ready, of course, for more.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he thought all were agreed, and had been discussing that the traditional funding model of WADA, which was 50% sports, 50% governments, needed to evolve and engaging private partners could really help enhance the fight against doping in sport. WADA would continue to do that. It was an important thing. WADA currently had five partners, in particular Sword, and there were representatives actually present during the conference, and he invited the members to go and talk to them in the booth. SuperSport, with whom WADA had a very good relationship, helped a lot in the African continent. ANTA provided in-kind material for athlete outreach activities, and so on. As the contract was finishing at the end of

that year, there would be another contract and another partnership starting at the beginning of the following year, but WADA could not yet announce who it was for contractual and confidentiality reasons. All that was good. There was, he thought, a lot of potential for private partnerships in science. WADA had been having discussions with the pharmaceutical industry for quite a while, and hoped to be able to convince the industry representatives to help in the science field in particular. As he had said earlier, WADA would like to try to find partners for the Ombuds program in particular to focus on that. It could be a program in itself. In the education field, WADA was also looking into refining its offer and seeing how to attract people to help it with that. All that was good. One of the goals of that paper was really to call on the members. If, within their country, within their relationships, they saw any opportunity or organization WADA might approach, he would very much welcome their support and assistance.

Speaking on behalf of OneVoice, DR MUROFUSHI said that he believed that securing stable private funding was very important at that time, especially given the current situation. He thought that move was very important. But he also believed that there were some key points. WADA had first to seek private partners aligned with WADA's mission or vision and not just be thinking about partnerships. He thought the vision was very important. Also, there were currently many major global companies directly sponsoring athletes and then, in the event of positive tests, they had a big brand image or loss of reputation and financial consequences. He thought those private partners might have some kind of educational program with athletes and that it might be possible to expand on that. He had just met with Mr Chris Solly, from the World Academy of Sport, who had thought that there might be a way of doing that too. WADA should also explore partnerships for technology or AI, biomedical and data science industries, not just existing sport companies.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Murofushi and thanked him for his openness. As he had said at the beginning, there had been a very fruitful discussion in Tokyo. He appreciated Dr Murofushi's willingness to facilitate some contacts and open a few doors for WADA.

MR KEJVAL said that the sport movement welcomed the report about the private partnership strategy. There had definitely been huge success over the past five years in securing five partners for the organization and especially, as Dr Murofushi had said, it was currently necessary to have that kind of partnership, but also, five years was a significant amount of time to make the first evaluation of that new source, and related to that, he had some questions. The first one was about WADA's insight related to the five experiences. It would be good to know, as well as the main challenges that were related to that. There was some question about WADA having different kinds of partnerships, such as international and regional partners, because there were also regional offices, and how the organization's reputation and communication strategy affected WADA's capacity to bring new partners on board. Finally, WADA was also talking about possible partnerships in terms of research and private funds. Because of the lack of payment from the USA and Russia, WADA had not fulfilled its original plans.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked Dr Murofushi for his comments. In response to Mr Kejval's questions, he thought that WADA's overall experience was very positive in terms of outcome. Its relationship with Sword in particular was clearly helping it to move forward in IT faster than it had been doing previously, and was also bringing more expertise to what WADA was doing. It had turned into a real partnership, as opposed to being sponsorship. Both organizations were really working and helping one another and that was very positive. It was the same thing with SuperSport. WADA really could do more on the African continent, with more outreach, more education and so on. All that was very good. But there were challenges, as had been pointed out. The biggest challenge for WADA was, to be honest, about the capacity it had internally to manage the sponsors and to actually get the most out of them. With Sword it was different because WADA had a whole IT department and it was working daily with it. But for the sponsors, and SuperSport, for example, it had been a lot of work. Regional partnerships had been mentioned. It was a kind of regional partnership for Africa, and the WADA regional office in Africa had had to do a lot of work in that regard. Also, it was time-consuming. Some of those partnerships were mainly in kind. And then they required resources from the organization to manage them. That was where WADA had to find the right balance. If there was money coming in, part of it could be invested to manage the relationship; but, if it was in-kind only, then WADA had to assess the balance because it required resources. All in all, however, at that moment, WADA felt it presently had a manageable number of partnerships and, in the future, it would look at making sure that, when there was a new one, it was manageable and truly beneficial.

He had distinguished between the private partnerships and calling on the public authority friends for support. WADA had issued a call for extra contributions to cover research, and had had some success. He thought WADA would continue to have some. It was fairly easy for WADA to manage because it went into the research program. With the pharmaceutical industry, if WADA managed to get the industry involved in the research program, then the Science Department would probably have to have a dedicated person to manage that agreement and make sure that WADA could follow up. Nevertheless, he thought there would be an upside if

WADA could get them involved because, for the pharmaceutical industry, the amount being talked about for WADA was small compared to what the industry invested in research and development; it could really make a big difference, yet it would be negligible for the industry.

DECISION

Private partnerships update noted.

4. Roadmap from Executive Committee Working Group on the Cottier Report Implementation update

- 4.1 General update

THE CHAIRMAN announced that Mr Kemp would provide an update on the progress made against the Cottier report recommendations approved in December 2024.

MR KEMP noted that the report had become a recurring item at Executive Committee meetings since the initial Cottier report in September 2024 and, following the composition of the working group that had made a series of recommendations, there had been reports to the members on the status of implementation of those changes. That had been done most recently in Prague. There was therefore not a great deal to share with the members that day; however, they would recall that the significant recommendations had had to do with improvements under the auspices of intelligence and investigations, WADA's IT processes, its Legal Department procedures and potential changes to the Code itself which, of course, would be reviewed that week. There were two elements on which the members had asked for more information at the September meeting which he was happy to report on that day and take any further questions on. Those were related to the ADAMS alert system that had been implemented, as well as the progress of the triage and prioritization framework (TPF) suggested by the Cottier report and the subsequent working group. With respect to the ADAMS alert system, he was pleased to report that that was currently in place, and that ensured that WADA was aware of all adverse analytical findings and that athletes were subsequently notified of their finding without delay, so that WADA could follow up as required. That process was currently fully automated. Secondly, with regard to the triage and prioritization framework, WADA's Intelligence and Investigations Department had come up with a thorough proposal on how that might be implemented, which was ultimately intended to ensure that WADA collected information and intelligence from across the organization and from the anti-doping ecosystem more broadly to ensure that it could identify risks early, both potential real risks and potential perceived risks, and that it was managing them appropriately. In terms of the implementation of that framework, what WADA needed to do was just make sure that it was not duplicating any existing work under its current risk management framework. In addition to the work of the Risk and Audit Committee, WADA also had an internal body called the Risk and Crisis Management Board. As the members knew, WADA currently had an internal auditor. It had many different resources looking at risk. The aim was to make sure that they were all working cooperatively with one another under that broader risk management framework. The members had more details in the paper and he would be happy to take any questions. Suffice to say, the implementation of all of the recommendations remained well on track.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Kemp for his report.

MR POPYK thanked Mr Kemp for the information. The public authorities wished to thank him for the update and for the implementation of the recommendations of the Cottier report. They also requested that WADA ensure that, in the consolidation of risk management process in relevant WADA bodies, it prevented duplication between respective departments and committees.

MR KAYANGE EMONYI spoke on behalf of the athletes to welcome the update on the Cottier report. It was really important to see WADA evolving and acknowledging and committing to a forward-looking approach. The development of the TPF was a positive step, and it gave a clearer, more consistent approach to handling risk so that nothing critical was missed. The first approach, in terms of building existing systems and avoiding duplication, was pragmatic and responsible. He thought that only went to reinforce the trust in the work that WADA doing, not looking back, but looking forward and evolving and strengthening the system for the future. He looked forward to the continued updates on that framework as it was implemented and the assurance that it gave the global anti-doping community.

MR KEMP thanked Mr Popyk for his comments, which he took on board fully. He was pleased to say that the Risk and Audit Committee, which comprised an Executive Committee member, would be made aware of all of the changes that were made within the risk management framework and the triage and prioritization framework in particular. He thought that it was an additional opportunity that the Executive Committee could be assured that there would be no duplication. Obviously, it was in WADA's best interest, with limited resources, to make sure that it was not doing things twice. WADA would therefore strive to be very efficient in that space.

He thanked Mr Kayange Emonyi for his support to the work that was being done. Maybe one additional comment that he would make was that, in addition to that regular report to the Executive Committee on the status of implementation, WADA also intended to publish something more broadly to the anti-doping community, some sort of communiqué on the status of implementation, which would probably be most appropriately done at the end of that week, once potential changes had been made to the Code itself and which were related to the Cottier recommendations as well.

DECISION

General update noted.

- **4.2 Working Group on Contaminations**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that Professor Engebretsen, who chaired the group, had unfortunately been unable to attend that day. Dr Sangenis would provide an update in his absence.

DR SANGENIS greeted everybody, noting that it was nice to be with them again in the beautiful city of Busan. As the President had just said, she would report on behalf of the chairman of the working group, Professor Lars Engebretsen, who had been unable to travel to Busan due to the illness of his wife (who was much better).

The contamination issue was complex, multifaceted and evolving, requiring ongoing adaptation, collaboration and transparency to protect athletes and sport integrity. She had good news to share that day. At the September meeting in Prague, a request had been made to prioritize the data information. The group had received the data extraction from 2021, 2022 and 2023 and partial information for 2024 and 2025 that was still in process. The group had agreed on a clear process to structure work, assessing leads and organizing meetings, balancing virtual and potential in-person formats. Since its formation in March 2025, the Working Group on Contaminations had met virtually already four times, in May, in June, in August and in October, and its fifth virtual meeting was planned for 15 December that year. Through the meetings of the working group, its members had established the lines of inquiry guiding its work. Just to give the members an overview, it was dealing with the scale of the problem, such as incidence, data analysis, prevalence, among others, reducing incidence through education, awareness raising, training, guidance, technological solutions, among others, managing the problem, dealing with and solving the problem, and also, of course, looking at preventing the problem. Those meetings had been highly beneficial and the working group currently had a clearer direction.

The colleagues had been provided with an attachment that included the list of areas and sub-areas that had been established. She kindly encouraged them to go through those areas and sub-areas to evaluate the extent of the task of the working group. She would just go through the titles of the presentation so as to inform the members about the areas that the group was working on. There were eight for the moment: athlete research, data and technology, science and medical, education and training, testing, investigations, legal and case analysis, and some other areas that were included in the title 'Beyond anti-doping'.

The last two points she wished to mention were that the working group had requested that consideration be given by WADA to supporting an in-person meeting at which members would truly be able to delve deep into those complex matters. That required a budget, of course. She asked for support in order to advance with the work. She added that the group was looking forward to maintaining the support for the research projects that it would also need. Finally, as a member of the group and a member of the Executive Committee, she wished to thank the staff members of WADA for their support and hard work in the different areas.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Sangenis for her report.

MR POPYK thanked the Chairman and spoke on behalf of OneVoice to mention three points. First, the public authorities appreciated what the working group had done to identify the main areas and sub-areas for consideration. He invited the working group to provide further concrete proposals in order to prioritize actions and follow-up activities. Second, he wished to invite WADA to ensure effective cooperation between the related working groups on contaminations, contaminants and unintentional doping as per their Terms of Reference. The final point was that, considering that the Terms of Reference would be ending in March the following year, the public authorities would like to ask whether there would be a need to extend the mandate of the working group.

MR KAYANGE EMONYI joined in congratulating the working group on the work done thus far. It indeed was an area that could use a lot of effort and a lot of collaboration to understand and mitigate the contamination risk. There was value in updating and exploring areas of testing, especially, as had been mentioned, hair analysis, DBS and the opportunity to reduce urine testing. And that would, overall, increase reliability in terms of the

results that were obtained and whether to confirm areas of contamination or not. He wished the group all the best and looked forward to the following update on that.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Kayange Emonyi. Seeing no requests for the floor, he handed over to the Director General.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would let Professor Rabin respond on the technical questions, but took note of the request for an in-person meeting. He understood the complexity of the issue and supported organizing that as soon as possible. As to the extension of the mandate, he had no problem with the mandate being extended. He thought that would just need to be requested by the group. But he understood also that that was not something that could be resolved quickly.

PROFESSOR RABIN completed the answers that the Director General had provided. First of all, the objective was to provide a more thorough report at the March Executive Committee meeting in Baku. As the members had understood, as presented by Doctor Sangenis, that was a very dynamic group, and it had very regular meetings. The idea was, in Baku, to present a very complete report, bearing in mind that WADA had received the data for contaminations from 2020 to 2025 and ongoing. It was a very dynamic process. The group would meet, as she had said, on 15 December, with the objective of reviewing the data. He really wanted to wait until the very end of the mandate to have a kind of state of the art as to where the group stood before requesting an extension; but, as said by the Director General, it was very likely that an extension would be requested. He could assure the members that there was very dynamic communication between the groups, between the Contaminants Working Group and the Working Group on Contaminations. Mr Wenzel and he were members of the two groups and maintained very close collaboration. The same applied to the Taskforce on Unintentional Doping represented within the Working Group on Contaminations by his colleague Ms Amanda Hudson. As such, there was a constant flow of communication, and that was key to tackling that complex issue.

DR SANGENIS wished to thank Professor Rabin for all the support given, and greatly appreciated the Director General taking note of the request for an in-person meeting. She thought that would be very important.

DECISION

Working Group on Contaminations update noted.

- **4.3 Working Group on NADO Operational Independence**

Having provided a detailed report at the Executive Committee meeting in September and a written report of the group's activities within the meeting agenda for that month, MS BENNETT did not propose to give a lengthy oral report to the Executive Committee that day. The working group had met three times since the Executive Committee meeting in September. Since September, it had received the responses to a survey of NADOs undertaken with the assistance of the NADO Expert Advisory Group which were currently in the process of being analysed. The group had also sought input from the Athlete Council for which it was very grateful, also in the form of an open questionnaire, although it had not yet received the responses to that survey. Following the adoption of the 2027 Code and International Standards on Friday of that week, the working group's work would begin in earnest. It would meet the following week to start considering the Guide for the Operational Independence of NADOs in view of the revised Code, as well as developing any other recommendations that the working group might consider to be beneficial for WADA and for the anti-doping system more broadly, including any recommendations that might sit outside the Guide. She wished to thank each member of the working group whose contributions and expertise had been of exceptional benefit to the working group's workings. She also wished to thank each member of WADA's staff who had offered expertise to the working group and to Mr Tom May in particular for his invaluable support and assistance. She would, of course, be happy to take any questions from Executive Committee members. The working group otherwise intended to provide a more detailed report to the Executive Committee at its meeting in Baku in March the following year.

DR MUROFUSHI wanted, on behalf of One Voice, to congratulate Ms Bennett and the working group on their diligent and constructive work in addressing the complex challenge of NADOs' operational independence. That was essential for trust in the global anti-doping system, and he appreciated her continued leadership.

DECISION

Working Group on NADO Operational Independence update noted.

5. Finance

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, due to the time constraints of that day's meeting and the need to be efficient, items 5.1 and 5.2 would not be presented. Members could refer to the relevant reports, including the documentation set for the meeting. He would move to the following agenda item, which was item 5.3.

- **5.1 Government/IOC contributions update**
- **5.2 2026 quarterly accounts (quarter 3)**
- **5.3 2026-2028 budget forecast**

MS TAILLEFER informed the members that she was submitting, for recommendation to the Foundation Board, the 2026-2028 budget forecast based on a yearly contribution increase of 3%. That proposed increase was anchored in three pillars, as presented in September: elevating the athlete experience, strengthening the global anti-doping system, and expanding the impact of WADA's science, education and intelligence work. The forecast reflected not only the budget reduction implemented the previous year, but also an additional one-million-dollar reduction identified for 2026 since the previous meeting in September. Following the dialogue during the previous Executive Committee meeting, WADA had revised the total additional investment estimated for the following three years, aligning it with the available contributions and, as a result, the 2026-2028 financial results had been shared with the members in the cover paper. As the members could see, they still presented annual deficits. However, the current cash reserves were sufficient to preserve solvency and withstand anticipated cash pressures. In addition, for recommendation, there was an adjustment to the timing of the contribution letters. A misalignment between the December issuance of letters and certain governments' budget cycles had been observed. She proposed that, where possible, WADA issue advance contribution letters in July of the preceding year when an increase had already been approved, for example, the 2027 invoice or 2027 contribution letter could be sent in July 2026, giving governments six additional months to process payments. The timing of the 2026 contribution letters, however, remained unchanged.

In summary, that forecast balanced strategic investment and financial responsibility while the proposed adjustment in terms of the timing of the contribution letters improved alignment with government processes.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Taillefer for her presentation and opened the floor for comments or questions.

MR PINI thanked Ms Taillefer for her report. He supported the recommendation, but just wanted to express his appreciation, on behalf of the Athlete Council, that elevating the athlete experience sat clearly as the first priority of that budget cycle. For the athletes, that was more than a strategic line. It signalled genuine intent to strengthen their experience within the anti-doping system. The commitments outlined in the strategic plan, particularly regarding improving digital systems, strengthening confidential athlete support, integrating human rights support considerations and enabling meaningful athlete engagement were all areas that directly improved how athletes interacted with anti-doping on a daily basis. He welcomed that direction and saw it as an important step in ensuring that the system continued to evolve in ways that protected athletes and built trust and created a fairer, more positive experience across the board. He supported the recommendation.

MR KEJVAL noted that the sport movement supported the principle of a 3% annual increase for recommendation to the Foundation Board. The forecast absence of the US contribution remained of concern to the Olympic Movement, which wished to see all partners around the table. Also, there was an expectation to receive the three consecutive payments from Russia. It was part of the budget and might be at risk in the future. It was important to keep a close eye on that.

DR MUROFUSHI welcomed the comprehensive report. On behalf of OneVoice, he wished to reaffirm the continuous support of the governments to WADA through their contributions. Financial stability was critical for WADA to fulfil the mission and advance the global fight against doping in sport. He also invited all of the public authorities to ensure the timely payment of their contributions which was essential to WADA's ability to deliver its mandate effectively.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded to what Mr Kejval had said about Russia. He could assure him that WADA was in continuous discussion with the Russian authorities. There was a technical issue in finding a channel to receive the payment. As he had mentioned many times, WADA was, according to the Swiss authorities, authorized to receive that money, but needed to find a channel where the banks, in particular the intermediary banks, were ready to transfer it. It was ongoing, and he was pretty optimistic that, at some point, WADA was going to find a way.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members, for the record, if they agreed to recommend the 2026-2028 budget forecast and the proposed adjustments to the timing of the 2027-2028 contribution letters to the Foundation Board for approval at its meeting on 5 December.

DECISION

Proposed 2026-2028 budget forecast and adjustments to the timing of the 2027-2028 contribution letters to be recommended to the Foundation Board for approval.

- **5.4 2026 draft budget**

THE CHAIRMAN informed the members that Ms Taillefer would present the figures for the following year.

MS TAILLEFER said that, in alignment with the 2026-2028 budget forecast that she had just presented, she was currently presenting the 2026 draft budget for recommendation to the Foundation Board. As highlighted earlier, that draft budget reflected the delivery of priorities set by the Cottier report recommendations and the 2026-2028 vision. The income presented included a 3% increase excluding the US contribution. In addition, it also included the first payment of the research funding agreement signed with Qatar that was expected in 2026, along with the special research fund resulting from the call for interest launched that summer. All other income assumptions remained unchanged from the previous presentation. In terms of operating expenses, the 1 million reduction in expenses implemented since the September Executive Committee meeting had been incorporated, whilst all other assumptions had been maintained as previously presented. The draft budget therefore presented a reduced cash depletion compared to the version shared in September, so that was a better outlook for WADA. She emphasized in conclusion that 2026 would be a pivotal year. It would include the Milano Cortina Olympic and Paralympic Games, as the members knew, the preparation for the new World Anti-Doping Code coming into effect in 2027, notably through the four regional symposia, and the extensive preparatory work across key departments for implementing both the Cottier report and the 2026-2028 vision. That concluded her presentation.

MR KEJVAL stated that the sport movement welcomed WADA's prudent financial management over the previous year and especially that year. He highly appreciated it, as it enabled WADA as an organization to work with a surplus due to its circumstances, and also he supported the draft budget for recommendation to the Foundation Board.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Kejval for his comment. Seeing no other requests for the floor, he asked the members, for the record, whether they agreed to recommend to the Foundation Board that it approve the 2026 draft budget.

DECISION

2026 draft budget to be recommended to the Foundation Board for approval.

6. Governance

- **6.1 Executive Committee and Foundation Board memberships**

6.1.1 Executive Committee 2026 composition

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL referred to the appointment of the Executive Committee which would be done by the WADA Foundation Board by circular vote over the coming weeks. There was no decision there, but just a few remarks. First of all, he wanted to thank Mr Kejval in particular, because his term on the WADA Executive Committee was coming to an end. He thanked Mr Kejval for all his work. He had also been on the Risk and Audit Committee. He had dedicated a lot of work to that organization, and he really appreciated Mr Kejval's help and advice throughout that time. There was no doubt Mr Kejval would be missed, but hopefully he would be seen again in other functions. Dr Murofushi was also finishing but had already been nominated to be reappointed, so there was no big surprise. The members were very happy with that. He offered his congratulations. That would be part of the vote. The last thing he wanted to say was regarding the three independent members, whom he also wanted to thank for their work. It was the first time there had been independent members. He thought everybody could see the value of having them around the table. He thanked them. They had all expressed their willingness to continue. He knew it was a commitment and they had all been recommended also by the Nominations Committee to continue their work. They would be part of the list of Executive Committee members to be approved by the Foundation Board.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Director General. He wished to echo what the Director General had said about the independent members. He was very happy that they were going to continue their work, of course, with Dr Murofushi as well. He was happy that the Japanese Government had reappointed him and that he would continue his mission. He welcomed the significant contribution made by Mr Kejval, who had always been very cooperative, with comments and passion and engagement. He would definitely miss him. But of course they would continue their collaboration in the sporting landscape, possibly in different roles, but there was no doubt, knowing his work with WADA, that Mr Kejval would be always very engaged and very pro-clean sport and pro-WADA working as part of the sport movement family.

DECISION

Executive Committee 2026 composition noted.

6.1.2 Foundation Board 2026 composition

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL noted that the Foundation Board also had to let the management know who the members would be. There were a number of members who needed to be reappointed. WADA had not received all the names. Whether from the public authorities or the sport movement, he urged the members to encourage their colleagues from the Foundation Board to make sure they got the names as quickly as possible, because it was necessary to provide that information at the beginning of the year to the Swiss authorities.

DECISION

Foundation Board 2026 composition noted.

- 6.2 Governance body 2026 compositions

6.2.1 New or renewed standing committee members for 2026

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the members had in their binders the composition of the committees. The process had been followed. The members were being proposed by the chairs of the committees after discussion with the president and himself. The members would see the full composition. There were just a few things to highlight. Ms Berhane had already disclosed a conflict of interest, but she would be leaving the Finance and Administration Committee because she was going to join (in a few moments, when he got to item 6.3.5.2), the Risk and Audit Committee to replace Mr Kejval. She would therefore have to leave the Finance and Administration Committee, and she would be replaced in her position and for the remainder of her term by Ms Petra Sörling, the President of the International Table Tennis Federation. That had been confirmed. There were 71 members in the committees, well balanced with 36 women and 35 men. There were 27 athletes and 15 independent members. The balance was always tipped in favour of Europe, which was a bit heavier with 34 members. There were still 11 from Oceania, which was quite good. Asia and Africa were still lacking candidates. He could only encourage the regions to put names forward. He sought a decision to formally appoint all the members of the committees.

THE CHAIRMAN saw no requests for the floor. For the record, did the members agree to approve the new or renewed members of the 2026 standing committees?

DECISION

Proposed new or renewed standing committee members approved.

6.2.2 Compliance Review Committee 2026 composition

MS SMITH-GANDER noted that she was delighted to be in Busan. It was quite a long way from Perth in Western Australia, but at least it was only a one-hour time difference, so she felt she had the advantage over many of the members. She was going to take the report that she had given the members as read. 2025 had been quite a busy year for the Nominations Committee. There had been many important appointments to make, but she thought the Compliance Review Committee was the one that always challenged the Nominations Committee the most. It was recommending that Mr Marc Leu be appointed an independent member of the Compliance Review Committee for a three-year term.

What she really wanted to speak to the members about was the suggestion that the Nominations Committee had made for the structural changes to the Compliance Review Committee. She could see the Director General looking at her and wondering what she was going to say next. Sometimes it might be seen as somewhat overreaching the Nominations Committee's mandate, but she thought the committee was in a unique position because it communicated with many people about the needs in the committees and the skills gaps. She thought that gave the Nominations Committee a unique perspective. And she found, as she had said, those Compliance

Review Committee matters the single most challenging, stemming from the fact that it was a six-person committee with only three independent seats, and one needed to draw the chair from those independent seats. What that meant was that, if somebody found themselves unable to put their hand up for the chair position, perhaps due to workload, changes in their circumstances, it was very difficult to plan a chair succession smoothly. If there was any committee in WADA that she thought deserved and required smooth succession, it was the Compliance Review Committee. She asked the members not to take anything she was saying to suggest that any information that had come to the Nominations Committee made its members feel that that committee was performing poorly. On the contrary, it was composed of really highly skilled and experienced people who were all contributing very generously to the anti-doping effort. The nature of the work and the administrative requirements regarding that were always going to mean that the candidate pool for the Compliance Review Committee would be quite limited. The Nominations Committee felt, in a way, that it was looking for the proverbial tooth in the mouth of a hen. And, in that recruitment process where it had actually found two candidates, and she did apologize to the chair of the Independent Ethics Board for having identified one of the members of his committee as a suitable appointment, she would like to suggest that there be strong consideration for an expansion of the committee and the potential to appoint that additional candidate without an open call and ongoing recruitment process. She thought it was very important that those matters be put before the Executive Committee members and she would be happy to take any questions on the recommendation or indeed her comments regarding the structure of the Compliance Review Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Smith-Gander for her report.

MR LALOVIC stated that the Olympic Movement fully supported the reappointment of Mr Gourджи as the chair of the Compliance Review Committee, as well as Mr Petrou as the public authority representative and the appointment of Mr Marc Leu as the new independent member of the Compliance Review Committee. On the other hand, before considering the proposal of the Nominations Committee to increase the size of the Compliance Review Committee, he would like to have a better understanding as to the reason for the increased workload of the Compliance Review Committee with the current membership, and whether all of the opportunities were being explored in order to facilitate its work. Also, what was the diversity required in terms of skill sets for that committee and was the committee able to achieve the existing workload with the current size? Also, another deep concern of the sport movement was the lack of cultural diversity on the Compliance Review Committee, as regional diversity definitely did not guarantee cultural diversity. Before agreeing on an increase in the size of the Compliance Review Committee, the sport movement would like to understand what the main challenges on that front were and how they could be mitigated in the future without increasing the size of the committee.

MS SMITH-GANDER welcomed the questions, which were exactly, she believed, the appropriate questions in the circumstances. Some of them were more questions for the Nominations Committee and for the WADA Executive Committee. She would give a perspective based on the information that came to the Nominations Committee. She thought the increased workload, as she observed it, was coming from the continued enhancement and maturity of WADA's approach to compliance with the Code and what that involved. It was also, she thought, a very positive step. She believed there was close collaboration between the committee and the WADA Executive Committee to ensure that WADA's Executive Committee was providing all the support that was necessary. There had not been any suggestion that WADA's management and the WADA Executive Committee was not leaning in an appropriate way. The skill set required an understanding of compliance matters, how one assessed whether the Code was operating effectively, whether it needed enhancement, and then how one checked against compliance with that Code, but also a good understanding of the legal aspects. A number of the committee members were legally qualified, and that provided an opportunity to understand how to ensure that the enforcement aspect of the Code was balanced with the compliance aspects. To the point on cultural diversity, it was a small committee, with only six members, and given the real need for deep experience in compliance, legal matters and so forth, she thought it was very hard to always have an appropriate balance of the various demographics that one would seek to achieve. She thought the earlier comments that the Director General had made about the overall demographics across all of WADA's committees were very much on point. And she thought, with that committee, that it was always going to be very solidly skills-based. She knew that the appointment that she was proposing was reducing the gender balance on the committee, and hopefully over time that could be increased. Certainly the additional person the committee had identified would address that. And it did have some southern-northern hemisphere representation, but perhaps not as much as would be required. She thought smaller emerging nations were the ones in which there could be some issues in terms of trying to find that right skill set and somebody who was able to devote the time. People with the skill set had many opportunities and commanded very high remuneration, and finding somebody who was coming, perhaps, to the end of their career and had the opportunity to give back to anti-doping added just another little interesting twist to trying to find the right people. She thanked the members very much for understanding all of that.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL indicated that what the Executive Committee was being asked to do was to actually appoint that new member of the committee. For March, he would prepare a paper on an extra seat on the committee. WADA's management could work with Ms Smith-Gander and with Mr Gourdji on the rationale and the reason for it, and also the cost, so that the members could have all the information in front of them. And the third point Ms Smith-Gander had raised was that, if and when that seat was created, the Nominations Committee already had a candidate it would like to recommend for the position. That could come as a third step in the process. That day, the members were being asked to approve the appointment of the member who needed to be appointed for the following year, and then the process would continue. He had heard exactly what Ms Smith-Gander had said, in particular the concern about succession and making sure that there was continuity, and it had been taken on board.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, for the record, the members were being asked to take the following decision: to approve the appointment of Mr Marc Leu as an independent member of WADA's Compliance Review Committee.

DECISION

Proposed appointment of Mr. Marc Leu to the Compliance Review Committee approved.

6.2.3 Nominations Committee terms ending May 2026

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the Nominations Committee had two members whose terms were coming to an end: Ms Smith-Gander, who chaired the committee, and Prof Zalaznik, the public authority representative. It had already been communicated to the management by OneVoice that Prof Zalaznik was supported for renewal, and she had expressed a willingness to do that. With regard to Ms Smith-Gander, he had received a letter from the committee, minus her, of course, recommending that she continue. She had also accepted and was willing to continue to fulfil that role. They were going to be for reappointment in March; but, understandably, he needed to have confirmation from the Executive Committee that it was comfortable with that and that it would not be necessary to go and start seeking a replacement.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members had comments or questions. He saw no objections, so Ms Zalaznik and Ms Smith-Gander could continue their mission, if they agreed. He thanked them very much.

DECISION

Proposal to reappoint Ms Smith-Gander and Ms Zalaznik to the Nominations Committee in March 2026 noted.

6.2.4 Athlete Council 2026 composition

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that, currently, the composition of the Athlete Council was full. Group three, the last group to be decided, had been selected by a panel of the Athlete Council and one representative of the Nominations Committee. A number of athletes from group three had actually been reappointed to their seats, including Mr Pini, the Chair of the Athlete Council, and the Vice-Chair, Ms Ahrens, as well as Messrs O'Leary and Gomez. They were already there and had been reappointed. Three new members had been chosen: a volleyball player from Peru, a water polo player from Australia and a squash player from Scotland. They would all join the council for 2026. The following step for that committee was that, in 2026, it would need formally to appoint or reappoint the Chair and the Vice-Chair. It would hold a virtual election, and it would also need to hold an election to designate the two members of the committee on the WADA Foundation Board. That would happen also at that time. Everything was on track for the Athlete Council to be constituted for 2026.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Director General for the update.

DECISION

Athlete Council 2026 composition noted.

6.2.5 NADO Expert Advisory Group 2026 composition

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that there had been an election for the members of the NADO Expert Advisory Group. The members had the list in their binders. There was quite a number of new members. There were two new members from Africa, one from Egypt and one from Tunisia. For the Americas region, there was a new country, and that was Brazil. And there were three new people, although the countries remained the same: Korea, Australia and New Zealand. It was also going to be necessary to elect a Chair and Vice-Chair

because that would have an impact on the Foundation Board. The Chair and Vice-Chair sat on the Foundation Board. They had indicated that they would do that in March when they had an in-person meeting. Therefore, that election would happen in March, and then he would have the names. The Foundation Board would not meet until the end of the year, so that was fine.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Director General for the update.

DECISION

NADO Expert Advisory Group 2026 composition noted.

- **6.3 Permanent Special and Standing Committee annual reports**

6.3.1 Athlete Council

MR PINI said that he would take the report as read. However, he would give a brief update on a few points. The previous day, the Athlete Council had met for the second in-person meeting and the final one for the year. It had been a very productive session. The Athlete Council had heard from the Intelligence and Investigations Department through Mr Younger, and had had an update on the Prohibited List from Professor Rabin. There had been a number of other opportunities and updates on ADAMS and the whereabouts mobile app, and the members had got to see a demonstration and an update on the current situation. There had also been open discussions with the leadership. He thanked Ms Yang and the Director General for taking the time to listen to the Athlete Council and to hear the members' concerns. A major part of the meeting the previous day had been dedicated to shaping the revision of the Athlete Council plan, which the members would see in the report. The initial action plan had finished that year, and the Athlete Council was planning to work closely with the 2025-2029 Strategic Plan. The Athlete Council had currently completed its final revision of the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act, following a lot of feedback received in September. He would give that update under agenda item 10. He did want to extend sincere thanks to Ms Samardžić-Marković for her leadership of the initial human rights impact assessment. Several of the Athlete Council members had been actively involved in that advisory group, and he truly appreciated the thoughtful and transparent way in which that process had been carried out, and looked forward to the final report in the presentation during the World Conference on Doping in Sport.

On the group three appointments, he wished to thank the members of the appointment panel, Messrs Kayange Emonyi and Ćosić, as well as the Nominations Committee, for their careful work throughout that process. It had been a very challenging process for them to go through, but he wanted to thank them. Finally, as he had said (and he was being very brief), as the Director General had alluded to the elections of the Chair and Vice-Chair and Foundation Board members, if that was indeed his last report as Chair under his current term, he just wanted to express his sincere appreciation. It had been a real honour to represent the voices of the athletes within that governance structure for the first time as an Athlete Council member sitting in that position, and there had been some genuine progress of athlete-led, athlete-centred leadership within WADA.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Pini very much. He wished to make one small comment. It had been very nice the previous day to have the meeting with the Athlete Council. He could only repeat that it was always very informative and very engaging. He had to say that the WADA leadership was really lucky with that Athlete Council, because it was a group of very engaged people bringing a lot of positive values and remarks about anti-doping under the leadership of Mr Pini and Ms Ahrens. It was really a great pleasure to work with them, although he knew very well that the business was not easy, but with strong support and with a really positive attitude, it was much easier for the WADA leadership to deal with all the difficulties. He therefore thanked them very much for their hard work.

DECISION

Athlete Council report noted.

6.3.2 Compliance Review Committee

THE CHAIRMAN noted that, for item 6.3.2, Mr Gourджи would take the floor as part of his compliance report later in the meeting. For the following few items, he was not planning any presentations or discussions, including for items 6.3.3 and 6.3.5. However, as mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, there would be an opportunity for the members to ask questions at the end of the meeting.

6.3.3 Independent Ethics Board

6.3.4 Nominations Committee

6.3.5 Risk and Audit Committee

6.3.5.1 Risk and Audit Committee terms of reference

MR KEMP informed the members that, in their binders, they would see that there were proposed amended Terms of Reference for the Risk and Audit Committee. To summarize those changes, the revised Terms of Reference accounted for the independent auditor that was currently a part of WADA's work. The independent auditor at WADA currently had a reporting role to the Risk and Audit Committee, and therefore the Terms of Reference included the Risk and Audit Committee endorsing the risk-based audit plan that the internal auditor would produce each year. Additionally, the Risk and Audit Committee currently had a role in reviewing the findings of the internal auditor and reviewing the controls the internal auditor suggested, as well as any corrective actions identified as being required in WADA's operations.

MR DE VOS noted that the sport movement welcomed those new Terms of Reference, as they really were going to allow the internal auditor to perform his duties more independently from the administration. He supported that.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members, for the record, whether they were in agreement to recommend to the Foundation Board that it approve the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Risk and Audit Committee.

DECISION

Risk and Audit Committee Terms of Reference to be recommended to the Foundation Board for approval.

6.3.5.2 Risk and Audit Committee Executive Committee member appointment

THE CHAIRMAN observed that the members knew the substance of the point. It had already been discussed, but he asked the members to allow him to do it for the record. As they might recall, Mr Kejval's term on the Executive Committee would conclude at the end of that year with no possible reappointment, as he would have served a maximum of nine years in accordance with the Statutes. As a result, his term on the Risk and Audit Committee would also end on 31 December that year. In accordance with the Governance Regulations, he had written to all of the members to ask that they either express their interest in being appointed as Executive Committee member on the Risk and Audit Committee or that they coordinate among themselves to nominate one of their fellow members. In November, he had been informed that the appointment of Ms Dagmawit Berhane was supported by the public authorities, the Athlete Council Chair and the sport movement. As no other nominations had been received, he would like the Executive Committee to approve her appointment to complete the remainder of Mr Kejval's term on the Risk and Audit Committee, from 1 January 2026 to 21 September 2027. That was for decision. For the record, did the members agree to approve the appointment of Ms Berhane as the Executive Committee representative on the WADA Risk and Audit Committee?

MR DE VOS wanted to give very strong support Ms Berhane on behalf of the sport movement, but he would also take that opportunity, as he had missed doing so under the previous agenda item, to thank Mr Kejval for the great work he had done, not only on the inaugural risk committee, but also as a fellow member of the Executive Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN again thanked Mr Kejval and congratulated Ms Berhane on her new position.

DECISION

Proposal to appoint Ms Dagmawit Berhane as Executive Committee representative on the WADA Risk and Audit Committee approved.

6.3.5.3 Internal risk-based audit plan

MR GILL said that he was excited to be there that day to present the first risk-based internal audit plan.

He would provide an overview of what he would like to cover that day. The first thing was to speak about the methodology that had been used to create the risk-based audit plan. And finally, it was going through the project overviews at a high level in terms of the following two years, for 2026 and 2027. Speaking to the methodology, the development of the plan had been guided by the Institute of Internal Auditors, which is a broadly recognized institution that provided standards for certified internal auditors such as himself. The first

few steps related to the plan was understanding the audit universe and prioritizing it. By way of definition, the audit universe was any activity, any function, any initiatives that were undertaken within WADA that could technically be audited as part of that. That had been done through a lengthy review of documentation as well as consultation with management as well as staff. Once completed, a risk assessment was conducted over the audit universe to verify which areas were considered to be higher risk and might need to be prioritized. The factors used as part of that included things such as materiality, in other words, the level of budget that was allocated for some of those activities, the risk of potential fraud, looking at complexity of processes and then finally the internal and external impact some of those areas might have on WADA's objective of being a leader in anti-doping in sport. The audit projects were then strategically selected. The selected projects were then cross referenced with WADA's organisational risks ensuring there was good coverage. And finally, the risk-based audit plan was approved by the Risk and Audit Committee first and then approved by the Director General. One thing he just wanted to emphasize was that the risk-based audit plan was a dynamic plan. There would be a semi-annual update to make sure that any projects that were being looked at remained relevant and any new and emerging risks were being reviewed. If there were any changes that did occur from that exercise, it would have to be approved by the Risk and Audit Committee and then finally approved by the Director General.

The next slide provided an overview of audits to be performed for the following two years, for 2026 and 2027. There would be an average of about four audits on both of those two years. He emphasized that each of the audits was different in terms of size, scope and objective. A high-level summary would be provided. Finally, there was a reserve list of audits that the members could see. The reserve list were other areas of audits that were considered high risk. But they were there in case there was potential capacity or bandwidth on his end to conduct them should there be any time left over for those in 2026 and 2027. The audits selected are all linked to WADA's enterprise risk categories. As part of the risk management framework that had been mentioned by Mr Kemp, there were four areas of risk at a high level: financial risk, operational risk, reputational risk and cybersecurity and IT risk. They would note that, for operational risk, most or all of those audits touched upon this risk. He explained that, when it came to internal audits normally focus on operational risk through the assessment of, operational compliance against policies, procedures, and reporting and monitoring, and finally governance and oversight mechanisms. resource management.

The first audit earmarked for 2026 was the audit of purchase order processes and contract management. Contracting was considered a large expenditure for WADA and the audit would review how vendors were being identified, selected and paid, including any other reporting and controls in place related to how WADA was managing costs and expenditures related to contracts that were being awarded. One other point he wanted to mention was the audit would also focus on value for money principles, verifying how contracts were being awarded using those principles.

The following audit, and there was no surprise in terms of the significance of that area, was the audit of results and litigation management. Again, the audit was selected on the basis that it was a significant and complex area in relation to WADA operations. Additionally, the audit aligned with a key interest of the Risk and Audit Committee that had also been presented at the Executive Committee meeting in Riyadh. The audit would focus on the appeals as well as litigation in terms of decision-making criteria being applied. Key questions would be: Was it being applied consistently? How was it being documented, and what was the governance process related to that?

Moving on to the following project for 2026, stemming from the renewed priority provided from the President regarding increasing oversight on signatories. The audit of the compliance audit framework would focus on the audit methodology when it came to the compliance audit performed over signatories, looking at how decisions were being made, how audits were being conducted, what the documentation looked like and the evidence that was being gathered to come up with some of those with areas of non-conformity versus conformity, and, of course, there was a general expectation of ensuring that they aligned with the definition of the Code.

The last audit for 2026 was the science research grants. The audit will focus on assessing whether the grants themselves had been administered in a way that was fair, looking at whether, when WADA did receive grants, it was consistently assessing them equally, how WADA reached decisions on them, and finally, the last piece on that was, when recipients were awarded grants, how it was monitoring the expenditure versus the deliverable provided.

Moving on to 2027, the first audit was a review of private funding and partnerships. Going back to the comment received from Dr Murofushi related to ensuring that there was alignment with WADA's values and mission. That audit would focus on the process in place when it came to private funding and partnerships, ensuring that WADA was looking at it, ensuring that it was getting into partnerships that did align with WADA's values and there is a due diligence process that was being followed consistently. Risk-based considerations

were used as part of that. Finally, the audit would also look at once WADA did get into a partnership or a private funding agreement, how it was assessing the benefits that were arising from the agreement.

The second project for 2027 was on the audit of travel expenditures. Evidently, it was quite a significant cost when it came to WADA's operations. This audit would be more of a sanitary check related to the reimbursement of costs of WADA staff and management and looking at ensuring that they were being reimbursed as applicable, and in accordance with the applicable policies and procedures related to travel, hospitality and accommodation. Local travel would be excluded. There was not much of that anyway, but the audit would be looking at international-level travel.

The next audit was the audit of the management control framework over ADAMS. That was probably the larger audit for 2027. Increasingly, ADAMS was a critical application for WADA. That audit would focus on ensuring that there was an appropriate IT infrastructure and security application controls in place when it came to the data that were being collected. Some of the areas that could be included were access management, in other words, ensuring that access was appropriate versus all the models that were presented within ADAMS; data integrity and quality controls, again, making sure that WADA had the right controls in place, that there was no incomplete data and how WADA was assessing that; business continuity plans and disaster recovery procedures, that was again more of a verification that if there was an outage, that there was an appropriate plan that was being updated and tested to make sure it was relevant and it was possible to sort of bring back operations with a timely perspective; and finally interdependencies with other applications as ADAMS utilized a lot of other applications.

The last audit for 2027 was the audit of social science research grants. That was very similar to the one that was being communicated for the science research grants in 2026. It was really looking at how applications were being reviewed, how were they being documented, how they were being awarded and then, of course, how WADA was monitoring them on a continuous basis.

The following slide was on the reserve list. where the preliminary objective of each audit was presented. He highlighted that those would be undertaken only if there was sufficient capacity in terms of the plan. And then, finally, if those audits were not being conducted, they would be reassessed as part of the semi-annual update that the risk-based audit plan would be conducting. That concluded his presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the very comprehensive report and presentation.

MS BERHANE expressed her appreciation on behalf of the sport movement for the first proposal of the internal audit and the RAC's proposal. She had also taken note that, in the presentation, it had been decided to follow the highest standard, though not required. But that actually provided a clear understanding and message that WADA was serious about it and also added to the credibility of the entire process. She wished to take that opportunity to state that she appreciated that it had been decided to follow the highest standards in the field. There were two requests from the sport movement, one of which was to have the summary and recommendations of the audit made public or published. The second one was for the audit of the scientific and social research also to be taken into consideration on the impact measurements as well, when the audit was done. Besides that, the sport movement also sought reassurance from the internal audit and the Risk and Audit Committee that they had been provided with sufficient resources to mandate the necessary support and external expertise to perform their work. For the reputation of WADA and the credibility of the audit, it was important for external expertise, in particular, in support of the WADA Code and the International Standards process, to act independently and also be perceived as being independent.

MR GILL welcomed the comment. In terms of the summary of recommendations of the audit as well as the audits on the grants, that was certainly something that he could take away. Again, he was not entirely sure in terms of the process that needed to be followed, but it was certainly something he could look into. When it came to the external expertise, that was something that was definitely on his mind and the Director General's; they had had conversations related to that and to some of the audits that there could be value added regarding independent experts helping on some of those areas, and certainly that was something that was being discussed, hiring external experts where needed. Again, that was going to be done in a way that was strategic and that provided the utmost value in terms of the audits that were completed.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that, regarding the request to make that public, that would have to be looked at carefully and the best practices in the field would have to be discussed, because he would not want that exercise, the aim of which was actually to improve internal processes, be transparent, be done in collaboration with the Risk and Audit Committee and all of that, to then become a media frenzy every time an audit was done, because that would actually be counterproductive to what WADA was trying to achieve. He could see how the Executive Committee could be apprised of it, and some of it would be in the minutes, but he could certainly not commit to making it public.

DECISION

Internal risk-based audit plan update noted.

6.3.6 Education Committee

THE CHAIRMAN said that, once again, the members would rely on the written reports only for items 6.3.6 and 6.3.7.

6.3.7 Finance and Administration Committee

6.3.7.1 Finance and Administration Committee terms of reference

MS TAILLEFER informed the members that two amendments to the Terms of Reference suggested by members of the Finance and Administration Committee were being submitted. As they could see in the cover paper, the first amendment introduced an out-of-session notification mechanism. Entering members were promptly informed when financial positions changed or when issues arose given that the Finance and Administration Committee typically met in person once a year. The second amendment clarified the committee's scope, refining its purpose, goals and objectives to focus specifically on finance-related activities and policies. That concluded the presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Taillefer for her presentation. Did the members agree to approve the amendments proposed by the Finance and Administration Committee to its Terms of Reference to come into effect on 1 January 2026?

DECISION

Proposed amendments to the Finance and Administration Committee Terms of Reference approved.

6.3.8 Health, Medical and Research Committee

THE CHAIRMAN said that the members would rely on the written report only

- 6.4 ITA Foundation Board appointments

THE CHAIRMAN said that he would take that point. For the record, it was for decision. As the members might recall from previous meetings, the terms of three members of the ITA board were coming to an end that year with no possible renewal given that they had reached the maximum term limit. They were the independent Chair, the member representing the international sport federations and one independent member. Therefore, in March, the Executive Committee had mandated the Nominations Committee to review the qualifications of the candidates to be submitted. As a result, in October, WADA had been advised that the following three candidates were proposed: Mr Jacques Antenen as the independent Chair to replace Doctor Valérie Fourneyron, Mr Ingmar De Vos as the representative of the IFs, to replace Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, and Professor Doctor Mao Yuan as an independent member to replace Professor Chen. As that item was for decision, he asked the members, for the record, whether they agreed to approve the Nominations Committee's recommendation to make those three appointments to the ITA board to enter office in January 2026.

He thanked the members very much and congratulated all of the newly-appointed members. Before announcing a short break, he wished to use that opportunity to say a few words about Dr Fourneyron, who was currently concluding her mission as the Chair of the board of the ITA. She had been involved in the clean sport movement for many years in various capacities, as the sport minister in the French Government and representing Europe on the WADA Executive Committee, and finally in her role as the Chair of the board of the ITA. He wished to congratulate Dr Fourneyron on her achievements and thank her for her ongoing service to clean sport. The plan was to present her with a token of appreciation for her contribution to clean sport during Friday's Foundation Board meeting.

DECISION

Proposed ITA Foundation Board appointments approved.

7. Legal

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

MR WENZEL noted that the members had the paper in their binders, so he would be quite brief. By way of recollection, WADA had received shortly before the previous meeting in Prague the opinion from the Committee of Legal Advisors on Public International Law of the Council of Europe (CAHDI). He had not, by the time of that meeting in Prague, had time to review it fully. That opinion was also attached to the members' document bundle. And, as set out in the paper, the discussion group had met in mid-November to discuss that opinion and to discuss the proposal for the consequences of the voluntary withholding of funding more generally. He thought, on all sides of that discussion group, it had been seen as encouraging that the CAHDI opinion recognized that there was a commitment on the part of the State Parties anchored in the international legislative framework to make contributions to WADA, that those payments were not voluntary in nature. He thought also that it had been seen as encouraging that the opinion of the CAHDI recognized the possibility for WADA to impose consequences in the event of the voluntary withholding of those contributions. The discussion group had discussed at some length the paragraph in the CAHDI opinion which appeared to suggest that the consequences that WADA might impose were limited to WADA's internal institutional framework. The opinion did not give any detail as to exactly what the scope of the internal institutional framework would be. It gave a couple of examples such as the suspension of voting rights and exclusion from governing bodies; but he thought, more importantly, and that had been said at the discussion group meeting, the opinion did not give any basis for the apparent view that consequences should be limited to internal institutional matters. There was no legal principle that was provided to make that good, no reference to any law or treaty or even case. At the meeting in mid-November, WADA had advised the discussion group that it had itself engaged two renowned public international law experts to assess the proposal that had emanated previously from the discussion group and also to assess the CAHDI opinion. But, by the time of that meeting, he thought it was on 11 November, WADA had not yet received the written memorandum from those two experts. It had received it several days after that meeting and provided it immediately to the members of the discussion group. And, of course, that paper would, in due course, once it had been discussed by the discussion group (and it intended to meet later that week, he thought on Thursday), be shared with the Executive Committee. He would not dwell on the detail of the WADA expert memorandum at that stage, but the upshot of that memorandum was that those experts saw no impediment to the imposition of consequences beyond the internal WADA framework. If that was the opinion of the CAHDI, that there was a limitation there, then the experts, both academics, both professors engaged by WADA, did not appear to agree with that position and, as the WADA management and he had said consistently, he thought for the consequences to be effective as a deterrent, if nothing else, and to be fit for purpose, he saw the two consequences related to the major events as being key to that package of consequences. As mentioned, the discussion group, which currently had the memorandum from WADA's experts, would meet again as early as that week and perhaps again in the new year. Certainly, the hope was that he would be able to come back to the March Executive Committee meeting and present something concrete as a way of moving forward.

MR DE VOS thanked Mr Wenzel for his report. Of course, he supported the ongoing work of that discussion group and it was good to see that finally, again, it was moving on. He particularly welcomed the CAHDI report or opinion. He hoped that, for once and for all, it was crystal clear that the funding of WADA was not a voluntary matter, but that it was really an obligation and a responsibility of all parties to WADA. He hoped on behalf of the sport movement that that would put an end to those never-ending discussions of the past. He also hoped and was confident that the opinion was sufficient to prevent such discussions in the future, which was very important for the future of the organization. He also supported the work of the discussion group when it came to looking at the consequences for, for instance, international events and excluding countries that were voluntarily withholding funding from bidding processes or from allocation of international events. He did, however, wish to make it very clear, and he thought it was also mentioned, but for the avoidance of any doubt, that that could be only for international events such as world championships or games, for events that were subject to a bidding process and that were allocated by the respective international sport organization. It could not be for recurrent regular events that were taking place in the country that was voluntarily withholding its funding, because that would have a very important negative economic impact not only on the organizers but also on the events in that country and the athletes. Even if they were international events, he knew that the local or the national athletes were participating in those international events at a higher percentage than the athletes coming from abroad. From that perspective, he thought it needed to be crystal clear on behalf of the IFs that it could be only for events that were subject to bidding, but not for recurrent regular events in the country.

DR MUROFUSHI welcomed the comprehensive report. On behalf of OneVoice, he wished to acknowledge and commend the constructive work and positive discussions carried out by the discussion group on that important issue, and he invited WADA to follow clear, transparent due process. In particular, he requested that

the memorandum prepared by the external experts in public international law be shared with the Executive Committee members as soon as possible to enable an in-depth review.

MR WENZEL took note of the comments from Mr De Vos and Dr Murofushi. He did not necessarily disagree with anything that had been said. Even in the event-related consequence, as currently phrased in the package, it related to an inability to allocate events as part of a bidding process. He did not think it would cover events that were always, for whatever reason, in the same country. He would nonetheless have a look at that wording to make sure it was crystal clear. That was certainly, he thought, the purpose. And of course, he thought the plan was to at least allow the discussion of that memorandum. He was going to meet that week with the members who were all there in person, and then after that, at the latest in advance of the meeting in March but perhaps before, he would share the memorandum that he had.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he thought that the goal was to finalize that topic definitively at the following Executive Committee meeting in March and to have a document ready for the members to take a decision about the consequences of the withdrawal of funding.

DECISION

Voluntary withholding of contributions to WADA's budget by governments update noted.

- **7.2 Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada investigation**

MR WENZEL reiterated the confidentiality and sensitivity of that matter, as the investigation was ongoing and there was a possibility for litigation. He wanted to recall the importance of confidentiality regarding that matter. The members had a paper on the OPC (the Office of the Privacy Commissioner in Canada) investigation. Given the significance of the issue, he did want to recall some of the background and salient elements. WADA had for some time been subject to the OPC investigation, which had resulted from a complaint that the Code provisions that allowed the use of anti-doping data in ADAMS for other non-doping purposes (he would refer to them as secondary purposes), such as gender eligibility, breached Canadian data protection law and, as reported previously also at the Prague meeting, WADA had argued that, first of all, the case was not within the jurisdiction of the OPC, not least because the secondary uses of those data had been done by organizations, anti-doping organizations, for the large part, of course, outside of Canada and had been subject to applicable laws in the relevant countries. It had argued also that, in any event, any processing or use by WADA was consistent with Canadian data protection law and made the point that the Code was not positively authorizing the use of data for those secondary purposes, but was simply clarifying that, if that was done by signatories in accordance with applicable laws, it would not be a breach of the Code for compliance purposes.

[As the discussion that follows relates to pending legal proceedings, it is redacted from the public version of these minutes. The members considered the matter and unanimously determined that it was in WADA's best interests to pursue, if possible, a non-litigious resolution of the OPC investigation.]¹

DECISION

Proposal to pursue, if possible, a non-litigious resolution of the OPC investigation approved.

8. Testing

- **8.1 Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis revisions**

MR RICKETTS informed the members that they had before them proposed amendments to the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis, otherwise known as the TDSSA, version 11, recommended by WADA's Strategic Testing Expert Advisory Group. Just for background, the TDSSA was a mandatory level-two document that set out minimum levels of analysis by sport and discipline for specific sets of prohibited substances that were not part of a standard urine sample analysis procedure. To summarize, there were three areas of amendments. The first was a change to align the TDSSA with the revised Technical Document on Dried Blood Spots (DBS), approved by the Executive Committee in September that year, and the DBS samples that were analysed for either growth hormone-releasing factors or erythropoietin (EPO) receptor agonists would be included in the calculations for testing authorities. That went towards meeting the minimum levels of analysis for those prohibited substances. The second area of amendment was an area that WADA addressed on an annual basis related to several sports and disciplines, which were listed in the appendices of the TDSSA

¹ Where relevant, other references to these legal proceedings within these minutes have been removed or summarized.

following a request from a number of IFs advising that there were either new sports or disciplines that had been created and required a minimum level of analysis for the prohibited substances and/or existing sport disciplines that had had their names modified. The final area of amendment related to the growth of the esports industry, and the TDSSA clarified that all relevant minimum levels of analysis applied to any sport or discipline that had a physical esports version. An example of that was a cycling competition on a stationary bike but in a virtual digital environment. And that was based on the esports having similar physiological requirements and risk of prohibited substance use as the actual sport itself. That concluded his overview of the amendments to the TDSSA. He would be happy to take any questions or comments.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts and asked the members if they agreed to approve version 11 of the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis.

DECISION

Version 11 of the TDSSA approved.

- **8.2 2026 International Standard for Testing and Investigations**

MR RICKETTS said that, as part of the review of the 2027 International Standard for Testing and following the recommendations from WADA's Haematological Athlete Biological Passport Working Group which were based on the outcomes of research on the stability of blood parameters post-exercise and lessons learned from many years of implementation of the current program, it was proposed that the wait time for athletes who were required to provide a blood sample for the haematological module of the ABP after training or competition be reduced from 2 hours to 60 minutes. In addition, the 60-minute wait post-training or competition and prior to collection would also apply to all blood samples collected in a serum tube for the different other modules of the ABP. Given the reduction in wait time was of significant benefit to the athletes and sample collection personnel, which would ultimately lead to both spending less time in doping control stations and which would also result in a reduction in costs for sample collection authorities, both the IST drafting team and the Strategic Testing Expert Advisory Group recommended that that change be expedited for implementation earlier than 1 January 2027.

In terms of the advanced implementation time, he had had discussions with the ITA on behalf of the IOC and also the International Paralympic Committee regarding the impact of that potential change as it related to the implementation of testing programmes at the 2026 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games, which were just around the corner in a few months' time. As such, it was proposed that such changes come into effect on 1 April 2026, which was after the games, and that was due to technical and IT logistical components that needed to be changed. And, given that the games were only a few months away, it was felt that it would be better to implement that after the games. The effective date in April the following year would also provide the anti-doping community with sufficient time to adjust its procedures as well. As such, amendments would be made to Annex D (collection of venous blood samples) and annex I (collection, storage and transport of blood samples for the Athlete Biological Passport) in the current ISTI.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts for his presentation. Did the members agree to approve the amendments to the International Standard for Testing and Investigations to come into effect on 1 April 2026?

DECISION

2026 International Standard for Testing and Investigations approved.

9. World Anti-Doping Programme – final updates prior to the World Conference on Doping in Sport

- **9.1 2027 World Anti-Doping Code**

MR SIEVEKING informed the members that he would start and then he would give the floor to Mr Young, who was present that day. The third revised draft had been tabled and presented to the Executive Committee in Prague. In and around that meeting, the sport movement, OneVoice and the CAHAMA had all provided additional submissions. Those had been discussed and reviewed by the Code team, which had organized a meeting. All the changes had also been discussed in separate meetings with those three groups (with the Olympic Movement, the CAHAMA and OneVoice). There had been some very good comments made which had led to some additional changes in the third draft that the members had received. All of those changes had been included in the so-called final draft that had been made public early in November and that the members had in their papers, together with the summary of the major changes.

However, there were two small changes that he would like to make and present to the members. The first one, as they knew, was that article 10.7.4 had been added, which was when an athlete provided other valuable information that was helpful to the fight against doping but was not sufficient to fulfil the conditions of substantial

assistance. The team had forgotten to include 10.7.4 in the list of decisions that could be appealed, and that list appeared in article 13.2. He would make the changes in red and add article 10.4, as it was important that the parties with the right of appeal could appeal a decision to reduce a sanction based on 10.7.4.

The other small changes could be seen on the screen: article 14.5, where the doping control information database and the monitoring of compliance were discussed. A change had been made in red, and his colleague Mr Ricketts would explain why, because that change had been made in relation to a change to be made to the International Standard for Testing.

Those changes would obviously be made available to the Foundation Board prior to the approval of the final Code on Friday. But he would be pleased to know at that stage if the members would recommend their approval. If there were no objections, he thought that Mr Young had a few words to say.

MR YOUNG said that there was a schedule for when people were supposed to submit comments and all that. But, to be quite honest, he was willing to accept any good idea that he could get that made the Code better as long as it was before the following day. At the meeting in Prague, he had had some very productive discussions with people before the meeting, and there had been some good suggestions at the meeting, and he had incorporated those into the revisions from the third draft to the fourth and final draft. He could go over those if the members wanted. They were in the magic four-colour document that showed how each article had been changed. If the members had questions about that, he would be happy to answer. He would address one of them in particular, because it was the issue that Ms Bennett and Mr Pini and Mr Lalovic, and he thought Dr Murofushi, had raised that day about external testing outside of NADOs. There was a little irony going on there, because one of the things that World Aquatics had said had come out of the Chinese swimming situation was the requirement that athletes of a country not be tested only by their NADO, but also by people outside their NADO. To the extent that a NADO would be trying to limit that, that was not a good thing. A change had therefore been made in article 5.2.7 which in effect said that NADOs should not unduly limit or restrict testing by outside anti-doping organizations. Whether or not an analysis had been done on how that applied to USADA's compliance or anything else, he would have thought that was implicit in the Code, but it was currently explicit as of 2017, and the reason was because that was front and centre in the World Aquatics report. If anybody had questions, he would be happy to answer them.

MR DE VOS thanked the team, Mr Young and his team and Mr Sieveking on behalf of the sport movement and the Olympic Movement. It had been a very long journey. He thought that the new Code was making the organization and the protection of clean athletes, instead of the fight against doping, even better than before. He saw currently that, in national doping cases, the athlete could appeal the decision of the national jurisdiction also to the international Court of Arbitration for Sport, the CAS, and he could agree with that and he presumed that that had also been checked with the CAS and that it agreed because it could represent an unexpected increase in its workload. For the international sport movement, it was fine, but on the condition that it did not increase the costs for the international sport movement, which was already funding the CAS, and it was becoming quite expensive. He just wanted to bring that to the attention of the team. Had it been checked with the CAS? For the sport movement, that was fine, as long as it did not increase the cost of the whole process. In other words, it should be self-funded by those national cases.

MR YOUNG said that Mr Wenzel and Professor Haas had been on the committee when that matter had been discussed and there was no expectation that it would increase the cost. It might increase the workload of the CAS but, if they were national-level cases, that was not the free international federation appeal. Was that fair enough?

MR WENZEL stated that they would necessarily be paying cases. The appellant would, and perhaps the respondents, if they chose to, fund the arbitration costs. It should not lead to any change to the funding structure. It could result in more cases, but there were hundreds of arbitrators on the list so he was sure that the CAS would be quite happy with the additional appeals, rather than the opposite.

MR DE VOS said that nothing was for free and there was an increasing need for administration and things that were not covered by the fees, which were already extremely high. He just wanted to make sure of that. He knew, of course, that it could not be controlled, but he had wanted to make the remark for the minutes and he would take it up also with the CAS.

MR YOUNG said that the team had made one change, which he thought was important in that regard and that was that Mr Michael Beloff had said that national-level athletes had to have an appeal right to the CAS. And, in version three, athletes had been taking provisional suspensions directly to the CAS if they wanted to challenge either the imposition or the failure to lift. What the CAHAMA was saying and what he had also heard from the athletes was, if they were going straight to the CAS, whether the anti-doping organization should have a right to decide whether it made any sense to lift or not, either administratively or through their first-instance

hearing body in a quick hearing, because otherwise they were before the CAS on something they might agree with and, from the athlete's point of view, if the only avenue was to go straight to the CAS where it was expensive and in a language they might not speak, that was not good. It gave the athlete a chance to get the first kick at the can in their own language, in a local tribunal. That change had been made to agree that there was a right to appeal to the CAS if one was a national-level athlete, but they at least got one shot at the local level first. That was the change between 3 and 4 and it had come from the athletes and the CAHAMA, so it had been a pretty easy change.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the gentlemen for their report and the hard work. He was keeping his fingers crossed for the following days to finalize that process successfully.

DECISION

2027 World Anti-Doping Code update noted.

- **9.2 2027 International Standards**

MR HAYNES said that he was pleased to be presenting the final update on the international standards element of the Code update project, which, as the members knew, had started back in September 2023 and had resulted in over ten months of stakeholder consultation and thousands of hours of intense work by the various drafting teams. What had started as a fine-tuning exercise had turned into a comprehensive review of the entire regulatory framework, thanks to the engagement and energy of the stakeholders to continually improve the anti-doping system. Some of the updates and improvements contained in the standards would certainly future-proof the robustness of the legal framework for the years to come, and from the Code and standards project team, he thanked the drafting teams for their tireless efforts and the members of the Executive Committee for their guidance as the steering committee throughout that huge undertaking. As mentioned before, since the September Executive Committee meeting in Prague, a number of additional comments and feedback had been provided on certain standards, with the relevant drafting teams making themselves available for various meetings to reach consensus and update their standards as a result. Earlier that month, the members had received the final drafts, and those were the same versions that had been published on WADA's website and made available to all stakeholders in advance of the World Conference on Doping in Sport. Also, in their document package, they had a summary of the changes made to those standards since the September Executive Committee meeting, and the lead drafters for each standard were there at that meeting to answer any final questions that the members might have. Regarding some late changes to the International Standard for Testing, Mr Ricketts was there to provide an update. Should there be any further changes to any other standard, the members would, of course, be apprised of them in the coming days prior to approving them at the special Executive Committee meeting on Friday morning. That concluded his brief overview.

MR DE VOS congratulated those involved on all the work that had been done. He had more of a question than a comment, because when he looked in the agenda at point 10.1, the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act, where specifically in article 11 reference was made to the fact that athletes had the right to undergo sample collection in a manner that upheld their dignity, privacy and well-being, that possibly there should also be such a provision reflected in the International Standard for Testing, because he thought there were sometimes issues for the doping control officers and that also possibly it should be embedded in the regulations and in the International Standard for Testing that also doping control officers had the right to be treated appropriately by athletes or by their entourage, but also by organizing committees sometimes, when they had to carry out their work. They also had the right to be treated in a way that upheld their dignity, privacy and well-being, so that there was a kind of reciprocity and that it was not only a right, but also an obligation to respect the well-being of the doping control officers. But possibly it was already in there. If not, he would like to suggest such a provision in order to establish reciprocity with the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act.

DR MUROFUSHI said that OneVoice agreed, and also Europe had a comment.

MR POPYK said that he had a number of very short comments also in relation to the previous point. Europe would like to express appreciation for the incorporation of many comments and contributions in the Code, and it was grateful to the WADA team for its cooperation. Europe would like to note the lack of impact assessment of the changes to the Code and the overall complexity and extent of the anti-doping rules. It also risked further reduction of athletes' rights. For European states that had a broad mandate to address doping beyond elite sports, some Code provisions disproportionately affected recreational athletes. And finally, the separation of power remained an important issue for many European public authorities, particularly when NADOs were held accountable for issues such as legislative measures, independent hearings and appeals panels. With regard to the International Standard for Testing, he also expressed his gratitude to WADA and the whole team for the cooperation during the consultation process. However, there were still some concerns regarding potential compliance issues when NADOs performed testing upon request from national federations and major event

organizers. Europe would continue working with respective WADA departments to find an acceptable solution for future editions of the International Standard for Testing.

MR DE VOS thanked Mr Popyk for his intervention, but wished to have a better understanding of his comments. Did he have specific proposals for amendments to the Code and to the International Standard for Testing further to the comments that he had made, because he did not see any specific proposal. Did he have any?

MR POPYK responded that he did not.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked him. He believed that Messrs Haynes and Ricketts could address the comments made by Mr De Vos and the requests.

MR RICKETTS thanked Mr De Vos for his comments. Throughout the International Standard for Testing, there were some references to ensuring the privacy and dignity of the athlete. But in terms of aligning that with article 11 of the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act, it would be necessary to take that away with the drafting team and have a look at it and see if it could be strengthened over the coming 24 hours.

MR WENZEL thought that there was already, in annex G, at least of the current ISTI, although he was not sure if it was the same annex number or letter in the 2027 draft, but there was already an annex that dealt with some minimum requirements with respect to the training of doping control officers and the way that those were obligations that were imposed on sample collection agencies which WADA could then monitor through its compliance monitoring. He did not believe that there was currently a reference to safeguarding type language in that annex and that was something he thought he could consider. He queried, and that was all he was doing at that moment, whether that might take a little bit more time and consultation than 24 hours in terms of liaising with signatories and also understanding what programs there were, what educational tools existed already to be able to require, for instance, training in safeguarding by sample collection personnel. Perhaps something could be developed also by the Education Department. He was just querying whether, if that was to be added, and it was in an annex of the ISTI that did not relate to obligations of athletes, that was something between signatories, it would not need to be implemented in rules, that would be perhaps one change that could be considered down the road rather than before Friday.

MR DE VOS clarified that, with regard to the doping control officers, it was basically to protect them. Of course, there was the education and the whole methodology for the sampling and the respect for the athlete and things like that. But it was basically the other way around. He was saying that it was to protect the integrity of the doping control officers as well, because he saw that it did not always refer to athletes and that their entourage sometimes became very violent. And sometimes the organizing committees did not like the visits from the doping control officers or were not sufficiently accommodating. He thought that there should be something strong in the rules, wherever it was appropriate, to protect also the integrity of the doping control officers. That was basically what he was saying. There should be reciprocity with the athletes and their entourage.

MR WENZEL said that he would take the comment away and discuss it and come back with something by Friday.

MR RICKETTS thought that there were two elements, as Mr De Vos had just mentioned. One was the protection of athletes through doping control officers being screened before they were appointed to make sure that they did not have any criminal records and they had had the safety checks, etc. That was going to take a bit of time to work through from a safeguarding perspective. But the other was really just to treat the doping control officers with respect and dignity and likewise with the athletes. He thought that was where Mr De Vos was going with his comment.

MR RICKETTS said that he had a slide for the changes to the 2027 IST in particular.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they wanted to see the slide.

MR RICKETTS noted that there were some late changes to the 2027 IST, which had originally proposed to mandate the entry of whereabouts in ADAMS for athletes from individual sports and teams in a testing pool. For background, the testing pool was a whereabouts pool that sat underneath the registered testing pool and which had different requirements in terms of whereabouts information provided by the athletes and also minimum levels of testing on the athletes. Under the current rules, the provision of whereabouts in ADAMS was optional for athletes in team sports. He was aware that many team sports operated their own systems to gather that information from their national federations, from team representatives, and it was quite complex, given the nature of it. Following further feedback and recent discussion with the team sport community, the IST drafting team proposed that the filing of team sport whereabouts in ADAMS remain optional. Instead of a 'shall', it would

be a 'should' in the 2027 IST, with a view though to becoming mandatory late in 2028. And that was based on team whereabouts not being filed by individual athletes, but by representatives of each team, given that team activities were set by the team, and also it avoided a whole team of athletes providing the same information individually. In addition, there were many athletes who competed for more than one team during a year. Many athletes plied their trade in different countries than the one they represented internationally, and that brought multi-jurisdictional complexities and the need to deliver a robust education program for all team representatives on the filing requirements, which required more time than expected. In saying that, it would remain mandatory for athletes from individual sports in a testing pool to file their whereabouts in ADAMS from 1 January 2027. Really, it was a phased approach for athletes in a testing pool. That period would provide the opportunity to further develop the team sports platform in ADAMS as well, with the support and input of the team sport federations and the NADOs too. In addition, as his colleague Mr Sieveking had alluded to, there was also a connected change in Code article 14.5 b, which he had touched on as well. That concluded his summary.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricketts and asked if there were any comments or questions on that part of the presentation.

DECISION

2027 International Standards update noted.

- **9.3 Human rights and anti-doping framework**

MS SAMARDŽIĆ-MARKOVIĆ reminded the members of the question asked in Prague by Ms Berhane. Following that question, she had promised that there would be an annex that she would submit to the Executive Committee for consideration. She wanted to present the annex and explain the difference between the two documents. On the one hand, the members had had the initial human rights impact assessment in front of them in September, and that focused on the 2021 version of the Code and standards and on the real or perceived impact on athletes' human rights while the annex, which was in front of the members for that session, focused on changes that were either inspired by or related to the initial human rights impact assessment and its recommendations. Those were two very different but complementary documents as a matter of fact. It was important to illustrate the substantial change that had taken place in the meantime. It also contributed to WADA's transparency and accountability. It was possible to compare what there had been before and what the changes were. She thought it also showed leadership from WADA and that committee, too, in advancing human rights within the global anti-doping system. She had mentioned the previous time that almost 50% of the recommendations had already been implemented through changes in the World Anti-Doping Code and standards, through policy measures from WADA, and she wanted to give examples in detail of what those changes meant. It was not going to be a comprehensive presentation of all the changes. The members would see four different recommendations. One of them was for immediate action ('Know and show'). The other three were for mid-term action. Also, there would be one addressing the adverse human rights impact. And, of course, the final one would be about prevention.

In terms of 'Know and show', WADA was not legally liable for all sorts of potential human rights infringements, and it did not really have the resources to control all the entities that it and its work was connected with. But it could show an understanding of human rights and its public commitment. What had already happened was that, in the two important texts, one was very, very important, and that was the World Anti-Doping Program, there had been changes and, in particular, in the Code introduction or rather the purpose of the Code, unlike previously, where human rights and the principle of proportionality had been together, currently it was explicitly said that applications of anti-doping programs needed to respect the Code, International standards, human rights and the principle of proportionality. That commitment was also substantiated throughout the Code, but it was very important that human rights be so clearly prioritized.

Also, in the Strategic Plan that had been adopted by that committee and later on by the Foundation Board, there were explicit references to human rights and in particular in the third goal, which was to be athlete-centred. Of course, it would be also very good if there were a public policy statement adopted which would also show publicly the importance of human rights for WADA. Why was that important? It communicated WADA's commitment to human rights to the broader public, but it also signalled the importance of human rights to signatories and to those who interpreted the Code, and to the anti-doping community in general. It did promote respect for human rights across the anti-doping landscape and, above all, that strengthened the Code. That was about immediate action. When it came to mid-term action ('Avoid infringing on human rights'), one of the recommendations was about minors. Before, minors had been protected in the Code; they had been present in the Code, of course, but what had been lacking was more of a strategic approach to minors and their human rights. There had been a visible change, and minors were included in several provisions for protected persons. When it came to prevention in education, also, minors were very present. There were tailor-made programs for

them. The athlete support personnel also were required to attend anti-doping education. There was a role for governments when it came to minors and education. Also, when it came to anti-doping rule violations, trafficking, administration and complicity involving minors were considered particularly serious, and they could potentially result in longer periods of ineligibility. There was an automatic investigation of athlete support personnel who were responsible for minors who committed anti-doping rule violations. There was a requirement for more stakeholders to do that automatic investigation. Then, information and assistance related to doping involving minors might be of particular value. And also when it came to potential public disclosure, currently optional public disclosure took into consideration the best interest of the child, which was an internationally-recognized human rights principle. And why was that important? Because minors had a special role for the future of sport and clean sport in particular. Many athletes started their career when they were very young. Minors belonged to the most vulnerable group of athletes. And, in a way, that was an attempt to balance, on the one hand, the growing search for talent and professionalization and, on the other hand, the protection of minors. She thought that was also a very clear response to the findings from Operation Refuge. That was an example of avoiding adverse human rights impacts. One of the ways of addressing that in her recommendation was to ensure greater respect for legal and procedural security of athletes. There had been many shifts and changes in the Code, as shown by the different articles listed in her presentation. But why was it important? Procedural clarity had been present before, but it had been strengthened. And also it showed respect for the human rights of athletes. It also reassured the athletes that there was a stronger sense of responsiveness and fairness in sanctioning, which allowed more individualized outcomes. But more importantly, in a way, that was a shift from institution-centred enforcement, which the Code had represented also very much and reasonably, towards athlete-friendly justice, a very important shift.

She would give a short presentation on prevention as a mid-term action in which education played a very important role. There had been excellent changes in the part relating to education in the Code and International Standards. In the Code, there was an explicit statement that the main focus of education was athletes. Of course, other stakeholders should be educated; there was no doubt about that. But the athletes were the main focus and that could be seen in the introduction to the second part of the Code. Education was currently a strategic pillar for anti-doping, emphasizing prevention, empowerment and athlete autonomy. Education was currently explicitly linked to human rights, including the right to information, protection from harm and tailored learning for vulnerable groups. Also, there had been a lot of discussion before about the role of athlete support personnel and making them responsible. They were currently included in the education pool alongside any other signatories deemed necessary. That was important because that was a shift to incentivizing athletes to be engaged and empowering them; but, more importantly, it was an implicit move from perceiving athletes as objects of control and sanction to perceiving them as proactive partners in protecting clean sport.

In terms of conclusions, that showed, of course, as she had mentioned before, the utility of the recommendations, but it showed the efforts of WADA and particularly the Code drafting team devoted to the improvement of the global system. She knew that improvements were not easy to make and in such a large scale on a global level. But she was very glad to see, and especially with the budgetary constraints to which WADA was exposed, that there were those efforts. It showed that the process in itself, not her report alone, but the process itself was also very beneficial because many stakeholders had brought good improvements. The members had heard from Mr Young how many actually, so that was encouraging. The draft new Code looked much more athlete-centred without losing any of its regulatory power. And she thought it was also altogether the historic legacy of that committee, too, because it had followed and supported her work from the very beginning.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Samardžić-Marković for her very comprehensive report.

On behalf of the sport movement, MS BERHANE thanked Ms Samardžić-Marković for following up on the request and also thanked WADA for remaining committed, within its remit, to making sure that the human rights element was very much incorporated, because it was not an easy job.

MS BATTAINI-DRAGONI said that she wished to say three things. The members would have noticed that she did not talk too much, but she would like to make three comments. She remembered when that committee had approved the initiative of the initial human rights impact assessment in November 2022. The Executive Committee had been regularly informed and supported in the process since then. For her, it was very important and she was very glad to see the result: many human rights improvements visible in the Code and the International Standards, which was very important. The second point was that she wanted to thank Ms Samardžić-Marković for her serious work, her transparency towards the Executive Committee and the way she had been constructive in cooperation with WADA and the athletes. Thirdly, it was important that those achievements be made known to a broad public. She really wanted to insist on that. Transparency was important, but so was the legacy. Everybody could be satisfied with what they left for the future. Therefore, she

believed that the initial human rights impact assessment report should even be made public, preferably in the form of a book or something. But how could WADA bring all that knowledge out in order to involve many other people and make them aware of it? Those were the few things she had wanted to say. She tried to show a real duty to really succeed in that particular work for the organization and to see how it could work more and more with other people in relation to that.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Battaini-Dragoni for her comments and compliments. He agreed with her that it was worth it to promote and to speak out loudly about all those achievements and the great work that had been done by Ms Samardžić-Marković and the WADA team. Her comments were much appreciated, particularly taking into account her experience in that area.

MR PINI said that he had said his thanks during his presentation, but he just wanted to repeat them for that session. He thanked Ms Samardžić-Marković for her work. It was something that the athletes were very proud of. And on behalf of the Athlete Council and the former Athlete Committee members who had put that recommendation or request through initially, he knew they would be proud of the work.

MR MUROFUSH spoke on behalf of OneVoice to commend the report.

MR POPYK welcomed the report and presentation. Europe invited WADA to include gender equality principles in the public policy statement on human rights and anti-doping.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked everybody who had been involved, in particular Ms Samardžić-Marković.

DECISION

Human rights and anti-doping framework noted.

10. Athletes

- 10.1 Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act

MR PINI informed the members that, as they would recall, he had presented the background to the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act at the September meeting. That day, he wanted to focus briefly on the final stages and the steps of the process and acknowledge the important contributions that had helped shape that version too. First, he expressed his sincere thanks to all the Executive Committee member colleagues there that day, from the sport movement to the public authorities and independent members who had provided thoughtful and constructive feedback in September. A lot of time had been taken to review every submission carefully. It had not been possible to incorporate all of the suggestions, but each had been considered, discussed and assessed against the purposes of the Act. Where the committee had not adopted a recommendation, it had followed up with the contributors to explain the rationale. The deliberate and transparent approach strengthened the document. He thanked everybody for their suggestions and comments. He wanted to emphasize how valuable that input had been to that final version as presented that day. The Act had undergone a thorough refinement, which was balancing clarity, athlete accessibility and alignment with the Code and International Standards. Many changes were subtle but important, improving coherence in part one, reinforcing the aspirational nature of the Act in part two, and ensuring consistency with evolving standards and human rights principles.

He wished to extend special thanks to those who had led and supported that work. To Mr Cunliffe-Steel, who was the lead on the sub-group, who had real care and attention to detail, Ms Henrie and indeed the whole Athlete Engagement team whose guidance and coordination had been instrumental throughout that process and to all the sub-group, including the Athlete Council members, Mr Sandford, Ms Thorstenson and Ms Samardžić-Marković, and also the WADA department leads for their thoughtful contributions and their commitment to producing that document, which he knew would serve the athletes while supporting the system as a whole. The Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act remained a non-binding tool, but it was an important one to provide clarity, and it supported consistency, and articulated the standards athletes expected and deserved within a fair, athlete-centred anti-doping system, even if it was ambitious. The following steps would, once it got adopted and approved, involve going through and making sure that it was accessible and readable for athletes, but he would welcome any questions or comments from the members.

MR POPYK stated that the European public authorities welcomed the work of the Athlete Council in creating an inspirational document and invited the Athlete Council to develop implementation guidelines ensuring flexibility for others, particularly those with fewer resources.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Popyk for his comment and Mr Pini for his report.

DECISION

Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act update noted.

11. Compliance

THE CHAIRMAN noted that item 11.1 was for decision. He believed that Mr Gourdji would provide a general update prior to addressing the non-compliance file. But before he started, he noted that an updated compliance paper had been circulated on 26 November following the ongoing work of the Compliance Task Force and the Compliance Review Committee.

MR GOURDJI informed the members that he would start first with a summary of the annual recap of activities as the Compliance Review Committee from agenda item 6.3.2. He would then segue quickly into 11.1 for decision. The year 2025 had started with two new members joining the committee, one new independent member and one member representing the sport movement. The Compliance Review Committee was currently concluding the year with the departure of an independent member and the appointment of a new member just made by the Executive Committee, and he thanked the members for that. He also thanked the Chair of the Nominations Committee and her team for the work done on that file. The Compliance Review Committee had met four times that year, twice in person and twice virtually, together with the WADA management. For each meeting, the Compliance Review Committee had held in-camera sessions to review the documentation and discuss the decisions. Additionally, continuous efforts had been made to document, enhance and continuously mature the Compliance Review Committee's operations by establishing procedures, revising them, and to ensure consistency and standardization in how the Compliance Review Committee functioned. At each Compliance Review Committee meeting, the members had reviewed cases of non-compliance and received updates on the developments concerning non-compliant signatories. In total that year, it had reviewed ten cases of non-compliance, of which six had eventually been presented to the Executive Committee for a decision. The other four signatories had resolved their non-conformities in between the Compliance Review Committee and the Executive Committee meetings. Beyond meetings, the committee also maintained regular oversight, with updates on non-compliant signatories provided roughly every two weeks by the WADA taskforce. In 2025, two signatories had remained non-compliant throughout the year: RUSADA and the International Federation of Fitness and Bodybuilding.

In addition, the Compliance Review Committee received updates on the signatories placed on the watchlist and their progress. At that time, there were three signatories on the watchlist. That essentially meant that they had four months from the time of the Executive Committee decision to implement the critical corrective actions. Otherwise, the automatic consequences agreed by the Executive Committee would be alleged against them. He would be presenting a case with a recommendation of a watchlist that might bring that to a total of four. There was currently one signatory, Russia, whose case had been referred to the Court of Arbitration of Sport, and the Compliance Review Committee received updates on that case regularly. With respect to standards, the Compliance Review Committee had provided input to the revision of the standards related to compliance, and had participated in various discussions with the drafting team throughout the year. Those were scheduled to come into force in 2027. Throughout the year, the Compliance Review Committee had played an important role in providing guidance and oversight to WADA's compliance program, and was very satisfied with its progress and maturity. It had also been actively involved in WADA's Compliance Risk Management System, which had currently been in place for three years. Together, the members compared the risk register that they had for the Compliance Review Committee and identified new or emerging risks and agreed on mitigating strategies. The committee had been actively involved in discussions with WADA throughout the year, and would continue in 2026 to revise and improve the methodology of the compliance monitoring program to ensure that it remained fit for purpose. That concluded his annual summary.

DECISION

Compliance update noted.

- **11.1 Non-compliance cases**

MR GOURDJI said that the members would note from their documentation, as the President had mentioned, that the report had been revised and the latest version was dated 26 November. The update to the document was for the purpose of closing the compliance procedure for two NADOs. Both had implemented the corrective measures based on updates provided to WADA and then to the Compliance Review Committee to review. He was presenting one new non-compliance case, and it was audit program-related. It was a case for the watchlist with an automatic allegation of non-compliance after four months if the non-conformity was not resolved, and that was to be applied for the Uzbekistan NADO. The details of the case could be found in section three, starting on page one of that report. The Compliance Review Committee had discussed the case at its meeting in October, and at that time the NADO had had five critical corrective actions not implemented, primarily in the areas of testing and bringing the legal system in line with the Code. However, there had been good progress reported, and the Uzbekistan NADO had provided a solid corrective action plan. Therefore, the Compliance

Review Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that it watch-list the Uzbekistan NADO with the consequences and conditions of reinstatement as reflected in pages 12 to 14, 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 was still not resolved 12 months after the signatory consequences set out above had been imposed. The decision requested for the Executive Committee was summarized in section one, page two of the report. That concluded his presentation.

DR MUROFUSHI said that he approved the proposal and updated decision, and noted that there was a comment from Africa.

MS TWUM-AMOA wished to extend her sincere thanks to Mr Gourджи, the Chair of the independent Compliance Review Committee, for his report and comprehensive briefing on the various cases. It was with both appreciation and relief that she noted the progress made by several African NADOs in addressing the identified shortcomings in their programs. She also recognized the vital role played by WADA's management team in assisting and supporting those NADOs to implement the required remedial actions. The Compliance Review Committee's commitment and guidance were deeply valued. The African Union continued to advocate for diligence by the signatories and public authorities to ensure full compliance with the Code and to cooperate with WADA in aligning their legal instruments and programs with the Code and the standards.

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed all the compliments. For the record, did the members agree to provide a four-month watchlist starting from 2 December 2025 to the National Anti-Doping Agency of Uzbekistan to correct the outstanding non-conformities, failing which WADA would automatically send a formal notice alleging non-compliance and proposing the consequences and reinstatement conditions recommended by the Compliance Review Committee?

DECISION

Proposed non-compliance case approved.

12. Education

- 12.1 Social science research impact update

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the item had been deferred from the September 2025 meeting

MS HUDSON stated that, since the members had had possibly an extra three months to read the impact report, she would do her best to be as brief as possible. For members who might be new to the committee, she would give a quick recap on how social science research had evolved in recent times, starting way back when, in 2005, handing out money in terms of social science research grants and evolving to where the Executive Committee had actually been able to approve the second Social Science Research Strategy at its December meeting the previous year. And that had really provided an opportunity to take a more strategic approach to social science research, supported by some great experts on an expert advisory group. The Executive Committee had asked the Education Department to provide some examples of how social science research had had an impact on the evolution of education and also the anti-doping system. For the purposes of that presentation, the definition of impact that the department used was related really to public health. It was interested in evidence that was supporting changes in behaviour or policy or practice. One of the challenges with social science research was that it was multidisciplinary, and included everything from psychology to sociology, behavioural science and political sciences as some examples. Trying to capture tangible examples of impact was not always easy, but she would try and run through a few quick examples.

Taking a more strategic approach to social science research had made it possible to consider how social science research grant funding was distributed. There had been a disproportionate allocation going to Europe; there were lots of great researchers in Europe, but WADA had been able to redistribute that money beyond Europe as more research was taking place, particularly in Asia and Latin America. Those had been very underrepresented regions. That had contributed to more knowledge and obviously peer-reviewed journal articles were a good output for social science research because it was contributing to the body of knowledge, particularly for the underrepresented regions. And she knew through evidence from the Code Compliance Questionnaire that stakeholders were actually using that evidence to inform their programs. The members had heard her say before that social science research had contributed to an understanding of what doping was and what WADA was dealing with. It was a behaviour, a complex behaviour, a wicked problem as defined by social science research, very similar to other public health challenges, such as addiction, obesity and vaping. That very simply meant that there was no one single solution that would solve that problem. And social science research had shown that the best chance WADA had to deal with that problem was through a preventative approach. And social science research was the evidence behind, including in the 2021 Code, the actual

prevention model that clearly outlined the strategies that WADA and the anti-doping community needed to invest in in order to have the best chances of preventing doping.

Through that research, taking a preventative approach, it had also enabled WADA to shift the narrative and the way that athletes were viewed. Everybody understood that anti-doping had been born out of a crisis, but actually the reality was that most athletes had no intention to dope and certainly did not start in sport because they wanted to pick up a needle and inject themselves with steroids. That made it possible to shift the narrative and how to apply that in WADA's day-to-day work. Recognizing that, as the system became more complicated, the concept currently coming through social science research was of clean sport or clean athlete anxiety, where those clean athletes who had no intention of doping were concerned about how they might be in situations that might cause them to have an unintentional anti-doping rule violation. And currently it was understood, through social science research, that athletes could become vulnerable to doping, and that there were various strategies that could be used to try and mitigate that. And that was the result of a survey that had gone out to the sporting community to help WADA understand both vulnerability and the solutions.

She asked the members to imagine taking the knowledge learned through research and using it to test assumptions, one assumption being that supplements were the biggest cause of unintentional doping, and to consider how to deal with that situation through information or education programs, which at the time had been very knowledge-focused in the way that they had approached those topics. If one actually went and spoke to athletes to find out what their reality was on the ground, because the messaging a number of years ago had been that supplements were risky and athletes should not take them, but that was not the reality for athletes. And using social science research, the educational approach had been adapted: decision-making, risk-based approach, and how to actually use interventions with medical practitioners to inform that decision-making. And hopefully, WADA had improved the situation and helped athletes to navigate the minefield that was supplements. But, in order to know that, it was necessary to use social science research to track that change. And if WADA was super smart, it might even ask some of the social science researchers to give it an impact measure for how that change had actually resulted in a reduction in analytical adverse findings due to supplements. That was an impact of social science research at every stage of a process, from problem to intervention to impact. But if WADA were really, really smart, it might even go and see the economist to help it understand what the economic benefit was of making that change. And that savings point was an example from Australia. It was a real example, and it was the cost savings that it had anticipated making because of those changes. That took into account the cost of actually making the change.

Social science research could be used to improve and support the evolution of the system and to have an impact. And that mattered because the practice mattered, because WADA had lots of athletes that it had to deal with, about 100 million, if one took the figures from the Code Compliance Questionnaire. Analysing practice led to understanding what good practice was, possibly what was not optimal practice, and using policy as a positive tool to improve practice.

And that was how the 2021 International Standard for Education had become what it was that day, because WADA had understood that there was a disproportionately low level of education being given to athletes and that it needed to change the situation. WADA had thought introducing a standard would make a difference, but had it? WADA had used social science research to do an independent policy evaluation of the introduction of the International Standard for Education to tell it. And, thankfully, as the members would see on the screen, there had been some positive outcomes. That had fed into the development of the 2027 International Standard for Education. The members had heard earlier that those around the athletes currently needed to be much more focused on in education programs, with a bigger emphasis on minors. But there were still some challenges and WADA could only attack them with external funding. The members had heard earlier that WADA was leading some work on the unintentional doping challenge. That was going to be driven by social science research, and there were great connections between that work and the other groups that she had spoken about earlier. But WADA could only do that with external funding. Those were the big-ticket items that WADA did not have the resources to address. That was another one in terms of what WADA could be doing, or how social science research could contribute to the further evolution of the anti-doping system. And that slide was deliberately complicated. It was a very lame attempt at trying to summarize on one slide everything that social science research had taught WADA about doping behaviour and all the factors that contributed to it. But it was complicated for a reason: because doping behaviour was complicated. She asked the members to imagine if they had the funding that possibly her colleague in scientific research had, or even in public health. They might be able to have a vulnerability index. They might be able to better inform the deterrence effect. It might actually be possible to add psychosocial factors to improve testing and how testing was conducted. Those were the big-ticket items with which, given more investment in social science research, WADA could help to improve some of the work that was going on in the anti-doping system. That had been a whistle-stop tour of how social science research had affected and could affect the anti-doping system.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Hudson for her presentation and asked if any of the members had comments or questions.

MS YANG thanked Ms Hudson for her very detailed and very encouraging report. She had one comment on external funding. Every time she spoke to potential sponsors, they were interested in education. Education in their business was something that involved no conflict. She thought it would be important to come up with a helpful business proposal. Everybody was trying to find external funding. They might also think about how WADA could help the NADOs to deliver those very comprehensive education programs and give them ideas about promoting education programs. She thought that that would be very powerful.

MS HUDSON thanked Ms Yang. She would be happy to discuss the matter, and more investment would be great. It was challenging. There were lots of competing priorities, understandably. She suggested working together and seeing what might be done.

DECISION

Social science research impact update noted.

- **12.2 GLDF4CleanSport – Erasmus+ final report**

MS HUDSON provided the members with a quick, high-level summary of an Erasmus+ EU-funded project for which WADA had been successful in attracting lots of money to involve the European Observatoire of Sport and Employment, as well as a number of different national anti-doping organizations and IFs in some work to advance the Global Learning and Development Framework (GLDF). That program was really centred on how to invest in the workforce in anti-doping, and that was not the front-line workforce in terms of educators or DCOs, but people like her working as a practitioner in the anti-doping system. That project was based on some initial work that the GLDF had already produced. WADA had initiated it in 2020, and the GLDF training for intelligence and investigation officers had already been deemed credible and fundable as part of the EU-Intelligence and Investigations Capability and Capacity Building project. It had given WADA a good foundation to go and attract additional funding. The core components of the project were in four different categories. One was some research and analysis. Who worked in anti-doping? Where did they come from? When had they arrived? Did they like it? Did they have university degrees, etc.? What were the functions and skills needed of the anti-doping system as a unified workforce? What training existed or did not exist? And that was why the GLDF had been initiated in the first place. And could it create some tools to help people on their journey to become competent at their roles?

In terms of research and analysis, a number of things had been done. There had been a global workforce survey with over 145 responses, and WADA had got some interesting statistics and information about who was working in anti-doping. There had also been interviews with some anti-doping organizations and government organizations and a lot of desk-based researchers as well.

In terms of highlights, there was one, in her view, which was that there were not enough skilled applicants for roles within the anti-doping system. There was a lack of expertise. And, on a more positive note, even though they were relatively new, the professional standards that outlined the competencies per role that had made their way to the Executive Committee were actually being used in practice by ADOs to improve their recruitment, training and retention of their staff. Outside of the comprehensive analysis of the workforce, the project team had tried to have an attempt at understanding the different functions within the anti-doping system. It was very hard to do, but it had actually enabled the team to prioritize the roles that the project was going to focus on, which in the end were testing, compliance, major event organizations, people associated with anti-doping and government advisors. And through the funding, WADA had been able to train trainers and also run pilot training seminars of those programs at which 64 practitioners had been trained.

Just as a final summary, the members could see the sort of outcomes in terms of impact that the project had had and that there had been good engagement with the training programmes and that they had been seen as valuable by those accessing them. She was very pleased with those outcomes because they kind of validated why WADA had entered into that space in the first place. Where most people arrived in anti-doping by luck or by chance, they currently were learning a lot on the job by osmosis. There was no pre-entry training and it was taking most people between six months and three years to become familiar with their role and the Code and standards. But the most important thing was that there were currently no ten-year-olds waking up saying that they wanted to be anti-doping practitioners when they grew up, and that was something she would like to change. It was good to see some early evidence that anti-doping could start to be seen as a career choice because, otherwise, looking around that room, there might be an expertise debt coming through if WADA did not start training the following generation of people to service the anti-doping system in the future.

MR POPYK thanked Ms Hudson for her presentation. On behalf of OneVoice, he wished to thank WADA, Ms Hudson and the partners for their work on the GLDF project and to invite WADA to extend the scope of that project to other regions where it was most needed.

MS HUDSON said that she would really love to expand the scope of the GLDF. It was much needed, but it did require investment. And, in the current climate, it might be necessary to look at how to deliver that in the future in a more sustainable way. But, definitely, the members could probably tell that her passion was making sure that people were competent in their roles because it affected athletes. She appreciated the thanks.

DECISION

GLDF4CleanSport – Erasmus+ final report noted.

13. Science and medicine

- 13.1 2025 scientific research projects (cycle 3)

THE CHAIRMAN gave the floor to Professor Rabin to talk about the 2025 scientific research projects cycle three. That item was for decision.

PROFESSOR RABIN informed the members that that was the first year WADA had completed three full cycles for scientific research. It was very pleasing. There had been very good feedback not only from the research teams and the principal investigators, but also from the Health, Medical and Research Committee members, who found that process much more flexible as it allowed them to really address some of the issues faced in the past. For that third cycle, WADA had received 36 expressions of interest. 16 of the candidates had been invited to submit full applications, and 10 of them had been reviewed and recommended for funding and were being presented that day to the Executive Committee. The total amount of money was a little bit above 1.1 million US dollars. That was a little more than set out in the document and he would explain why. For one of the projects, in fact, a little more money than initially anticipated had been requested.

Looking at the ten projects that were recommended for funding, three were in the area of anabolic agent detection. As the members knew, that was one of the most popular classes of doping substances. The first project was about a designer drug. It had been reported in the past and still occasionally some designer steroids would be detected. That one, 6 β -Bromo-Androst-4-3, 17-dione had been really identified, and it was necessary to work on the metabolism of that new designer steroid so as to better identify its metabolism and how to really improve the detection of the substance. As the members knew, some designer steroids had been used in the past to evade anti-doping tests.

The second project was about a SARM (selective androgen receptor modulator), which was a sub-section of anabolic steroids, the kind of newer anabolic steroids that had been in development by the pharmaceutical industry but never made it to the market. A new one had been identified that was available on the Internet. WADA really wanted to further explore the excretion and metabolism of that substance.

Finally, there was testosterone that was sometimes used in the form of patches. The aim was to continue, as science evolved, with improving the detection of that substance.

As to the other projects, one was in support of the work WADA was doing on contaminations, and there was certainly, as he had stated earlier that day, a need for research. That was a project that came with two anabolic steroids, seeking to find out how to improve detection between environmental contamination and use for doping purposes.

Another project that was very innovative, and on which there had been a lot of discussion by the Health, Medical and Research Committee members because it was about autologous blood transfusion, was a very innovative approach, looking at how to use the memory of some cells when they were exposed to red blood cells that had been modified, and how the memory could be kept by some white blood cells. There was a research team that had submitted a very innovative but slightly more risky project that had really seduced the members of the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

There was one project that was also related to the pharmacokinetics of a well-known product, furosemide, which was, as the members knew, a diuretic. Sometimes, low levels of furosemide were seen, and WADA wanted to really explore that area of low concentrations of that diuretic.

Finally, there were two projects in support of dried blood spots. WADA continued with the development of DBS. It was really one of the priority projects. That was a strategic project for WADA, and there were two projects aiming at the detection of a kind of multi-menu anti-doping approach using DBS, which WADA continued to support. As mentioned earlier, one of the projects had initially requested a little bit more money, about 20,000

US dollars more. Following the request by the reviewers of the grant and by the Health, Medical and Research Committee members, that was the project on the detection of recombinant EPO by DBS and the approval had been given by the Health, Medical and Research Committee to slightly increase the budget for that project.

There was one project on gene doping detection. A lot was heard about gene doping detection. It was an issue for horse racing as well, and WADA had been working with horse racing and one of the projects was to do a kind of bridging study between what was done in horse racing and what was done in human testing, and see how to better collaborate and better adjust anti-doping methods for gene doping detection. As the members knew, that was becoming more and more of a reality.

Finally, there was a project in support of a development about performance: how to measure performance enhancement and rupture in performance in order to identify athletes who potentially doped. That was a project that was the continuation of what WADA had supported for several years, and it was currently being used by the ITA. WADA was expanding that work, and that project was also recommended for doping.

Looking at 2025 retrospectively, assuming those ten projects would be approved, there had been three cycles completed with a total of 31 projects recommended and eight projects targeted so, in total, there were some 40 projects, which was a good number, he thought, and for a total of a bit more than 4.7 million US dollars, which exceeded the amount WADA had. But luckily, there were some projects that had not been completed in the past from which WADA had been able to recover part of the money. The budget was there; the message was that WADA was really spending the money being given to it on good projects. That was the view of the Health, Medical and Research Committee members, and certainly he hoped that, in 2025, WADA would be able to continue that effort, possibly with more resources, because there were some very interesting and innovative projects coming into the pipeline.

MS TWUM-AMOAH noted that, sadly, Africa was missing from the list of 36. She would continue to advocate to change that. Africa would definitely benefit from those science research projects by gaining access to cutting-edge anti-doping research, strengthening local laboratories and NADOs, and building capacity to detect emerging doping methods while aligning with global standards. However, it was very important that it contribute to that set of knowledge. The African Union would therefore continue to encourage its constituency, particularly governments and universities, to apply for other grants as active participation positions, as a positive, proactive partner in global anti-doping science, rather than the passive recipient of external standards.

PROFESSOR RABIN thanked Ms Twum-Amoah for her comment. He had to insist that the Health, Medical and Research Committee and all the reviewers reviewed the projects based on quality and relevance to what WADA was doing in anti-doping. There was no geographical consideration. All good projects were accepted. Of course, there were a few coming from Africa, more than in the past, and he would say what he had said to other members of the Executive Committee in the past: WADA would be more than happy to help the researchers in Africa by explaining what was expected and how to better formulate the project submissions to increase the chances of being approved. The Health, Medical and Research Committee was very neutral in the way it reviewed the projects. Really, relevance and quality were the two main criteria. WADA was ready to help.

MS BENNETT thanked Professor Rabin for his presentation. She always admired the way that he was able to translate that technical information into a language that even she could understand. That was following on from the presentation that Ms Hudson had given in relation to the social science research projects and the impact that they had had and she had found that to be a very interesting and engaging way to demonstrate the value to WADA that came from funding research projects in the social science area. She wondered whether there might be scope, perhaps not to provide such a detailed impact assessment, but to provide some feedback to the Executive Committee on the impact and the innovations that were derived from the significant expenditure on scientific research, but on innovative projects such as the ones that had been described that day.

PROFESSOR RABIN thanked Ms Bennett for her comment. He could assure her that the Health, Medical and Research Committee members were very interested in the impact of the scientific research that was conducted. Every year, there was a retrospective view on the impact of the research projects that had been conducted. If the budget is sufficient to fund all research projects, WADA can also use the funds that are still available to conduct an independent review of the impact of scientific research. One could count the publications, one could count the number of projects that came to fruition, and he meant completion and concrete implementation. He could assure the members that a lot of the projects did end up with some very concrete outcomes for the laboratories to improve their capacity to address some of the issues that they were facing. If the members wanted to attend session 14 on the List of Prohibited Substances and Methods, there were some achievements that he would share with the audience to show that there were really some very concrete effects. There would have been more than 24 years of investment in research. He knew it made a

difference, but it would be useful to have more metrics, to be able to review that. Again, that was something that was in the pipeline. Hopefully, it would be possible to do it in 2026, if not, possibly in 2027.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they agreed to approve the funding recommendations for research proposals for the 2025 cycle three call for grants.

DECISION

Proposed 2025 scientific research projects (cycle 3) approved.

- **13.2 Technical Documents**

DR BARROSO said that he would briefly present four new Technical Documents for approval that day. The Technical Documents had been developed in line with the current review of the International Standard for Laboratories (ISL). As the members would see, three of them were based on the current ISL 2021. The reason they had been made technical documents was because it would allow WADA more flexibility to address and update the requirements depending on needs without having to really review or change the International Standard again.

The first one related to the WADA External Quality Assessment Scheme (EQAS). That was the scheme by which WADA sent samples to the laboratories to monitor their performance, to make sure that they detected what they had to detect and that they reported the correct results. Basically, that Technical Document was based on the current 2021 ISL, section 6, and was almost a copy-paste, but it had been further extended to include the issue that WADA was currently compliant with ISO standard 17043 for proficiency testing providers, and then it provided in that regard further details regarding the preparation and characterization of the samples and their analysis, and an assessment of their suitability to monitor laboratory performance. Last but not least, it was important to see that the EQAS program would be slightly modified. The blind EQAS samples would comprise only ten samples over two different rounds in one year, while WADA maintained the same number of samples (six) for the double-blind program. Currently, there were 15 samples; but, after a risk assessment, it had been considered, also for financial reasons, that it would be better to reduce the number of samples and possibly put the extra money into the laboratory assessment program, which was a more effective monitoring tool. That was the first document presented for approval.

The second document was on laboratory performance evaluation. Basically, those were the monitoring tools that WADA had to assess laboratory performance based on the current article 7 of the 2021 ISL. That included a very detailed description of all the monitoring tools, including the evaluation of the candidate and provisional laboratories, the evaluation of the accredited laboratories or the program for the WADA assessments, as well as evaluation of the EQAS for the Athlete Biological Passport-approved laboratories. Finally, because it was important in terms of audits performed by WADA, there was a clear qualification of the non-conformities into major, minor or recommendations, because that had a tremendous impact on how the laboratories addressed the outcomes of the assessments.

The third Technical Document was a very important one, regarding harmonization of the requirements for the validation of analytical testing procedures. Basically, the validation of the test methods was an essential step in making sure that those methods were fit for purpose, and also before they could be included in the ISO 17025 accreditation of the laboratories. In that Technical Document, all the necessary requirements, depending on the type of analytical testing procedure, were described to ensure consistency in how the laboratories approached the method validation and how they produced their validation reports. That facilitated transparency and regulatory compliance not only for WADA but also for the ISO 17025 accreditation bodies. There was a table that listed all the validation parameters that applied to the different kinds of testing procedure, whether they were the screening procedures or confirmation procedures, either qualitative or quantitative.

The last Technical Document did not come from the 2021 ISL, but was an important Technical Document not only for laboratories but also for anti-doping organizations, because that technical document listed the analytical testing procedures as mandatory for all samples collected in competition or out-of-competition, mandatory for the laboratories, but performed upon request by the testing authorities, or optional analytical testing procedures, which would be available at some laboratories only, not all of them. Those were more complicated or specific procedures. There were three tables that listed each kind of mandatory procedure. For example, those that could be performed upon request only included EPO, human growth hormone and IRMS. That was not performed on every sample, but only upon request. However, the laboratories had to have the analytical capacity. Finally, there was also an explanation about what was called WADA-specific procedures. In general, those were new procedures upon which WADA wanted to ensure proper harmonization, for the testing

authorities to know exactly what to expect when they sent samples to the laboratories, what kind of procedures could be applied to their samples or not. That concluded his presentation on the Technical Documents.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Barroso for his presentation. Did the members agree to approve the following new technical documents to come into effect on 1 January 2027: ISL TD2027ATP, ISL TD2027EQAS, ISL TD 2027PERF and ISL TD2027VAL?

DECISION

Proposed technical documents approved.

- 13.3 Laboratories

13.3.1 Shanghai, China – laboratory accreditation

DR BARROSO said that he was asking the Executive Committee to approve the Shanghai Laboratory as a new WADA-accredited laboratory. That would be the second WADA-accredited laboratory in China after Beijing. The laboratory was already approved for the ABP, but it had taken an extra step. And, as the members could see from the timelines, it had taken the laboratory six years to get there. However, WADA had performed an on-site assessment and pre-probationary tests. Over the past year, in the final probationary phase, the laboratory had successfully analysed all of the samples sent to it. During the assessment that had been performed in September, all of the assessment observations had been satisfactorily addressed and the Laboratory Expert Group was therefore recommending the full accreditation of the Shanghai laboratory.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they agreed to grant WADA laboratory accreditation to the Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory located in Shanghai, China.

DECISION

Proposal to grant WADA accreditation to the Shanghai Anti-Doping Laboratory approved.

13.3.2 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia – laboratory accreditation candidate

13.3.3 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia – Athlete Biological Passport laboratory candidate

DR BARROSO referred to the dual request for approval regarding the Saudi laboratory in Riyadh. First of all, the Executive Committee was being requested to approve that laboratory as a candidate laboratory for accreditation. That was the first step in the accreditation program. That would allow WADA to follow the laboratory as it prepared for future full accreditation. That was a new laboratory. However, he had to say that the director of that laboratory was a very experienced person who was well-known in the anti-doping system. He was the former director of the Athens laboratory and then the founder director of the Qatari laboratory in Doha. He was going to be taking over the directorship of the Riyadh laboratory. At the same time, the Laboratory Expert Group was recommending the approval of the laboratory as an Athlete Biological Passport candidate laboratory. The reason for making two recommendations at that stage was because it was much easier and faster to get Athlete Biological Passport approval. Within one year, that was possible, whereas the laboratory would have to wait for the accreditation, which might take several years. If it could manage to get Athlete Biological Passport approval, it would soon be able to start doing analysis for the Athlete Biological Passport. Those were the two proposals.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Dr Barroso. Did the members agree to grant candidate laboratory status to the Saudi Anti-Doping Laboratory located in Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia? Did they agree to approve the Laboratory Expert Advisory Group's recommendation to grant Athlete Biological Passport Candidate Laboratory status to the Saudi Anti-Doping laboratory located in Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia?

DECISION

Proposal to grant candidate laboratory status and Athlete Biological Passport candidate laboratory status to the Saudi Anti-Doping Laboratory approved.

14. Other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any questions from the members on items that were on the agenda but had not been discussed. He saw none. He thanked the members because they had finished 30 minutes ahead of schedule. They had been extremely efficient.

The Executive Committee would meet again on Friday to approve the final versions of the International Standards, which would become effective in 2027, as well as the Athletes' Anti-Doping Rights Act. That meeting would also be followed by a Foundation Board meeting on 5 December, at which the 2027 World Anti-Doping Code would be submitted for approval. Then the Executive Committee would meet in Baku, Azerbaijan on 17 March the following year. The meeting would be followed by the 2026 European Regional Symposium. He wanted to extend his sincere thanks to the Azerbaijani colleagues, who had kindly offered to host those two important events. The members were being asked to stay on for the second day for the opening of the European Regional Symposium, but also some governance training with the World Academy of Sport. More information on that would be coming later on; but, in the meantime, he asked the members to save 17 and 18 March. Later in the year, the Executive Committee would meet on 10 September 2026 and on 11 September for the second part of the governance training in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and on 24 and 25 November 2026, in Manama, Bahrain. For March 2027, the Executive Committee would be back in Lausanne, and WADA was continuing to look for locations later in 2027. He thought there was a host for the Foundation Board meeting in 2027 but he would update the members once that was finally confirmed.

He thanked all of the on-site staff who had supported the Executive Committee members for that meeting and would continue to do so throughout the World Conference on Doping in Sport. He thanked the interpreters and the volunteers and WADA staff and all those involved in the preparation of that meeting, and looked forward to seeing them all at the opening ceremony. He looked forward to fruitful discussion and important progress over the week to come.

DR MUROFUSHI sought clarification regarding the governance training workshop.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that all of the information would be provided in due course.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked the members and congratulated them on their efficiency. He looked forward to seeing them at the opening ceremony of the World Conference on Doping in Sport.

DECISION

Executive Committee – 17 March 2026, Baku, Azerbaijan;
Executive Committee governance workshop – 18 March 2026, Baku, Azerbaijan;
WADA Europe Regional Symposium – 18-19 March 2026, Baku, Azerbaijan;
WADA Africa Regional Symposium – 28-29 April 2026, Cairo, Egypt;
Asia and Oceania Regional Symposium – 2-3 June 2026, Beijing, China;
Americas Regional Symposium – 1-2 July 2026, Lima, Peru;
Executive Committee – 10 September 2026, Buenos Aires, Argentina;
Executive Committee governance workshop – 11 September 2026, Buenos Aires, Argentina;
Executive Committee governance workshop – 24 November 2026, Manama, Bahrain;
Executive Committee – 25 November 2026, Manama, Bahrain;
Foundation Board – 26 November 2026, Manama, Bahrain;
Executive Committee – 16 March 2027, Lausanne, Switzerland.

The meeting adjourned at 1.38 p.m. GMT+9

FOR APPROVAL

MR WITOLD BAŃKA
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA

MR OLIVIER NIGGLI
DIRECTOR GENERAL AND RECORDING SECRETARY