



## **Minutes of the meeting of the WADA Executive Committee 23 January 2020, Lausanne, Switzerland**

The meeting began at 10.30 a.m.

### **1. Welcome, roll call and observers**

THE CHAIRMAN warmly welcomed the host of the WADA Executive Committee meeting, Mr Thomas Bach, IOC President, who wished to address the Members.

MR BACH warmly welcomed the Members to the IOC and in particular to Olympic House. It was a symbolic meeting for the Executive Committee because it was the first one held under the leadership of the new WADA President and Vice-President, but it was also highly symbolic that it was taking place in Olympic House at the IOC. It was a symbol of the determination to have great and close cooperation to achieve the common goal: to protect clean athletes and fight against doping in sport. The members should use that new beginning. A German poet had said that every new beginning held a certain magic. He invited the Members to see whether they might make that new beginning a magical one and drive cooperation forward. In order to do so, he thought that it was necessary to learn some lessons from the past and, when analysing the situation, what they should learn was that they should have closer and better exchange among the WADA stakeholders. Also, in a way, not only were the two stakeholder groups involved, but also the different commissions and everybody in WADA, so that the stakeholders would learn more about the functioning of WADA itself and then also, among themselves, they would get to know one another better and better understand their respective approaches and backgrounds, because only then would it be possible to really achieve the trustful cooperation that was being sought and only then would it be possible to take measures that would be applicable and would really hit the target and take WADA forward in the fight against doping in sport.

There was another lesson, from his point of view, which he had expressed on the occasion of the World Conference on Doping in Sport in Katowice: he thought that more emphasis needed to be placed on the athletes' entourage. There was currently a very sophisticated system as far as the athletes were concerned. WADA had made great progress in the past with the long-term reanalysis programmes and the new testing methods, which would be applied very soon hopefully, with progress in research and so on, but it was also necessary to realise that, at the root of all the major problems WADA faced, it was not really the athletes, it was the entourage. Whether one looked at Russia, Thailand, Nike Oregon or Kenya, there was always the entourage at the centre. He could go back many years. It had always been the same: doping was not happening by the athletes themselves; it was happening in more or less secretive cells, which were managed or orchestrated by people, unfortunately even doctors and governments, and next time it could be a coach. The situations could be very different, but what they all had in common was the fact that a system was being built around an athlete or athletes and, although WADA wanted to try to eradicate doping (which it would not be able to do), it was also necessary to be realistic: as long as humans were competing, there would always be people trying to cheat. One could ask all the governments of the world to have laws against embezzlement or tax evasion, but that had not helped over the centuries; unfortunately, it was necessary to accept that human reality also in sport. However, if WADA wanted to prevent and get to the root of that evil, it was definitely necessary to focus on the entourage. That was one of the reasons why the IOC had offered an additional 10 million dollars, in particular in relation to investigations, and he took the opportunity to congratulate WADA and the investigative unit again on what they had already achieved. The IOC was therefore ready to make that other contribution, but it should then be based on a plan about how to better address the challenge of the athletes' entourage.

He thought that it was necessary to learn from the past, to look at procedures to see where they could be made even more efficient and streamlined, so as to be able to address problems more quickly

and effectively, to avoid lengthy periods of uncertainty and confusion and discussion. That was why, in relation to the procedure currently in place concerning Russia, the sole intention of the IOC was to have a decision as soon as possible and have an applicable sanction that did not leave any room for any kind of interpretation because, if it did, there would be more CAS cases and they would drag on and on and all credibility would be lost on all sides. That was the sole purpose of the IOC's intervention in the CAS. It was not about the sanctions as such; rather, it was to speed up the procedure and make sure that it would be applicable and, as far as he knew, there was the same intention on the part of the IFs intervening in the CAS case.

Another issue from which good conclusions could be drawn was the establishment of the ITA. He knew that some people had had concerns and some rumours had been spread and crazy ideas put forward that the establishment of the ITA would be a kind of unfriendly take-over of WADA. He stated very clearly that that was nonsense, and the ITA had been established to ensure greater independence in relation to testing and testing management and to support WADA and the application of the WADA Code, which also called for more independence, so he hoped that that had become clear to everybody and that, on that basis, the cooperation between the ITA and WADA would be fruitful and trustful on all sides so as to be able to tackle the issues and not be distracted by having to discuss rumours.

He could only offer what he had offered in Katowice: to join hands and work together on the Executive Committee and in WADA, because everybody shared the same goal, which was again to protect the clean athletes with all their ability and to fight against doping in sport and prevent doping as much as possible. One of the preventative measures had to be the toughest possible sanctions for cheats and, he insisted once again, for the entourage and those who were really orchestrating such systems.

He therefore wished the Executive Committee Members all the very best and hoped that they would be inspired by the atmosphere in Olympic House during their deliberations and, in a couple of years, hopefully in a couple of months, it would be possible to look back together at this meeting as the real start of a new beginning, and he hoped that that new beginning would also be magical. He welcomed the Members to the IOC and left it to the new WADA President to lead them through the agenda.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Bach for his speech and his attitude and amazing hospitality. He looked forward to cooperating with him and working hand in hand.

Since it was the first meeting of the new year, he wished the Members and their families all the best and hoped that it would be a good year for the sporting environment and anti-doping community and that everybody would work hard to eradicate doping and strengthen the anti-doping system and community.

He passed on his best wishes to the honourable Vice-President, who would shortly be celebrating the new year in China, as well as to her family and her nation.

He presented and welcomed the new members: Mr Kersch from Luxembourg, representing Europe. Being Mr Kersch's predecessor, he was keeping his fingers crossed for him, because he understood how difficult it was sometimes to present the CAHAMA mandate. He welcomed Mr Lalovic, the Foundation Board member who was now an Executive Committee member representing GAISF; and Mr De Vos, representing ASOIF, previously GAISF; and he presented the deputies, Mr Godkin, representing Mr Colbeck; Mr Díaz, representing CADE; and Mr Shepande, representing Mrs El Fadil from the African Union.

The following lists the full membership (including designated deputies) who attended the meeting: Mr Witold Bańka, President of WADA; Ms Yang Yang, Vice-President of WADA; Professor Ugur Erdener, IOC Vice President, President of World Archery; Mr Jiri Kejval, President, National Olympic Committee, Czech Republic, IOC Member; Mr Ingmar De Vos, IOC Member, FEI President; Mr Nenad Lalovic, Executive Member, GAISF Council, President of UWW, IOC Member; Ms Danka Barteková, IOC Member and Vice-Chairman of the IOC Athletes' Commission; Mr Machacha Shepande, representing Mrs Amira El Fadil, Commissioner for Social Affairs, African Union, Sudan; Mr Marcos Díaz, representing Ms Andrea Sotomayor, CADE President, Ecuador; Mr Kameoka Yoshitami, State Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Dan Kersch, Minister of Sport, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg; Mr Andrew Godkin, representing Mr Richard Colbeck, Minister for Youth and Sport, Australia.

The following Standing Committee Chair (not also Executive Committee members) attended the meeting: Mr Jonathan Taylor, Chairman of the Compliance Review Committee, Partner, Bird & Bird LLP.

The following representatives of WADA Management attended the meeting: Mr Olivier Niggli, Director General, WADA; Mr René Bouchard, Government Relations Director, WADA; Mr Frédéric Donzé, Chief Operating Officer, WADA; Mr Sébastien Gillot, European Office and International Federations Relations Director, WADA; and Mr Rafal Piechota, Director, Office of the President, WADA.

The following observers and presenters signed the roll call: Diane Smith-Gander (Chair of the inaugural Nominations Committee); David Dellea (PwC, presenting on the Strategic Plan); Darren Mullaly, Okabe Wataru, Sergey Khrychikov, Kumekawa Hirokazu, Fujie Yoko, Asakawa Shin, Alexandre Husting, Andrew Ryan, James Carr, Richard Budgett, and Hannah Grossenbacher.

#### – **1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest**

THE CHAIRMAN asked if any Member had a conflict of interest in relation to any of the items on the short agenda. In the absence of any declaration, he would continue.

### **2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 9 December 2019**

THE CHAIRMAN stated that the minutes of the meeting held in Lausanne on 9 December 2019 had been circulated to the Members and asked them to approve them. The minutes of the meeting held in Katowice would be circulated in the coming weeks, to be approved in May that year.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that Europe had sent in one correction to the minutes which was just a typo about a paragraph reference and which was noted.

MR GODKIN said that he had notified the management about one required change in relation to the spelling of Devonport.

### DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee on  
9 December 2019 approved.

### **3. Director General's report**

After wishing the Members a happy new year, THE DIRECTOR GENERAL joked that, with a sprinter as a president, his report would of course be a lot shorter. For the sake of efficiency, he proposed that any discussion on Russia be conducted under item 6.1 when dealing with the report from the Compliance Review Committee and Russia.

In relation to the additional funding mentioned a few minutes previously by the IOC president and for which WADA was very grateful, one of the topics of interest for the Sport Movement was the athletes' entourage; however, WADA had been clearly told that the expectation was to have from WADA and the Intelligence and Investigations Department some clarity before engaging in the matching funding from the IOC, so he asked the Sport Movement for some guidance as to what it wanted so as to engage in that matching funding. He understood that the entourage component was already central to the work WADA was doing, but was the Sport Movement expecting the Intelligence and Investigations Department to produce a plan in May? He asked for a clearer idea so as to be able to prepare.

In relation to item 3 in his report on the International Mixed Martial Arts Federation, the issue was how one could have a process in order to accept new signatories to the Code. There had been fruitful discussions between the Sport Movement and governments to progress a policy on that; unfortunately, a conclusion had not yet been reached, which meant that WADA had ended up in court the previous week for a preliminary hearing with the IMMAF. He really hoped that it would be possible to conclude the work as quickly as possible because, as he had said previously, it was in the common best interest to reach a solution with which everybody was happy rather than having a court decision telling them what

to do, so he encouraged the Sport Movement and the governments to find a solution that was acceptable to all and to get the IMMAF matter behind them.

In relation to the International Weightlifting Federation, he could not add much to what was in his report. Different issues had been raised by a television programme in Germany, there was an ongoing investigation into an allegation of bribery in anti-doping, there were other allegations that did not concern anti-doping which WADA was not looking into, and there was also an allegation concerning a specific case of an athlete and a potential situation in Thailand, and that was being dealt with mainly by the ITA, which was in charge of the testing programme for the IWF. WADA had been liaising with the ITA on that. He currently had no further information from the Intelligence and Investigations Department. The work was ongoing. A lot of the things put forward in the television programme needed to be verified; WADA needed to look at the actual evidence and, once there was a complete report, it would of course go to the Executive Committee, but he had no timeline at that stage in the process.

Finally, he wished to make a remark in relation to the ITA. For the record, he wished to indicate that WADA had an excellent working relationship with the ITA and there was no question about that. Two weeks previously, there had been a meeting between WADA and the ITA. From an operational point of view, the two organisations were working together very closely, and WADA had absolutely no issue. Technical issues were being resolved when they came up, and both organisations sought to cooperate well in testing, investigation and other fields of activity. Obviously, the ITA was in charge of the pre-games testing task force, which would have an important role to play from then until the Olympic Games in Tokyo. The ITA would be the body trying to ensure that all athletes got properly tested before the Olympic Games, and WADA was working closely with the ITA to make sure that IT issues, for example, were solved. Just for the record, he thought that the working relationship was good.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that that had been the fastest Director General's report in history.

MR KEJVAL referred to the previous discussion about the Nike Oregon project and the concern that there were no athletes in the case. During that time, some confirmation had been received from the media and the UK NADO. Would it be possible to get the extended report?

With regard to additional funding, PROFESSOR ERDENER thanked the Chinese government for its commitment. The IOC President had also mentioned something on that subject. He wished to say a few words on contributions towards investigations in particular. The IOC commitment had been made on the basis of a strategic discussion on how to strengthen intelligence and investigation activities in WADA. Together with the public authorities, a strategic plan could be devised in relation to that important subject, and the matter might also be discussed in the general strategic plan, but there should be a good strategy for how to strengthen intelligence and investigation activities in WADA with the support of some additional funding.

As the Director General had said something about the International Weightlifting Federation problem, he could provide some information related to the subject. After seeing the programme on the television, in relation to Code compliance monitoring, the Olympic Movement fully supported WADA and had full confidence in the work done at WADA. The IOC's chief ethics and compliance officer had asked for some documents from the German broadcaster to carry out an internal procedure, and another important thing was that the IOC Disciplinary Commission, chaired by the IOC Executive Board member Mr Oswald, had the responsibility for taking necessary action on that matter, in particular in relation to the Thai athlete who had won the bronze medal in London. There was a very strong internal process still ongoing at the IOC.

MS YANG said that she was very happy to see the point about entourage being raised and the question about how to start working on that matter. She suggested starting with criteria to understand the entourage's responsibilities and also, for the future, if there were two or three cases from one team, for example, involving the doctors and team entourage, determining what action there should be. She was not sure the Members understood what she meant, but she definitely supported the idea and thought that WADA should start working on entourage criteria in order to identify and start investigating for the future.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL told Mr Kejval that, in relation to the Nike Oregon project, WADA was currently in the process of reviewing the file received. It was a very big file, and WADA was analysing the actions taken and the rationale for those actions. That was ongoing. What had happened recently in the media had been the result of an interview with the UKAD chairman. He was not exactly sure what questions the chairman had been asked, but he could tell Mr Kejval that, from WADA's perspective, WADA had never requested anything from UKAD. It had not requested samples and so on because it was not yet at that stage. That might come later, but it was not the case for the time being, so all the media discussion had been generated out of nothing or had not been based on fact. There had been a statement issued by UKAD the previous day clarifying that a request for the samples had never been received from WADA. He had been asked and had said that he thought that the UKAD chairman had probably been caught by surprise by a journalist more than anything else. He was pretty sure that, if there was a rationale to request the samples, WADA would have a cooperative discussion with UKAD in due course, but WADA was not yet at that stage.

He thanked Professor Erdener for his remarks. On the funding, the idea, if he understood it correctly, was to have a working group to have a strategy for the Intelligence and Investigations Department. The Intelligence and Investigations Department had an operational and strategic plan, so he proposed having an offline discussion with the Olympic Movement to see how to produce something meaningful, but (and he was also responding to what Ms Yang had said) the entourage was already at the centre of WADA's concerns. The problem with the entourage was that it could be dealt with only by way of good cooperation between the Sport Movement and governments, because the entourage was more often than not outside the jurisdiction of sport. Many of the doctors operated completely outside the sport system, which was why links with law enforcement bodies were extremely important, as was encouraging governments to have proper legislation in place, so there were several layers: the sport rules, the Code, legislation and law enforcement bodies, and then the issue of making sure everything worked together. WADA received a lot of information concerning the entourage through SpeakUp!, its whistleblower programme. He thought that the majority of the information was related to entourage and was then followed up. Clearly, if WADA had extra resources for investigations, it would be able to deal with more of the information it was receiving via SpeakUp!, but that would be discussed separately.

He added one thing on weightlifting. He knew that a process had been started and there had been interaction with the IOC Ethics Commission. In terms of monitoring, WADA had gone and done an audit of the International Weightlifting Federation the previous summer. Obviously, at that time, the ITA had taken over the testing programme and the auditors had been satisfied with the programme put in place. The audit had looked at the current programme and not what had happened in the past. For the time being, WADA was comfortable with the level of testing happening in weightlifting. Obviously, that was if everything was happening in accordance with the rules when the testing took place, but he had no reason to believe that that was not the case, especially since the ITA was doing the testing. The allegations about the past and potential corruption were under investigation, as he had said.

## DECISION

Director General's report noted.

### **4. Strategic Plan 2020-2024**

THE CHAIRMAN invited Mr Dellea from PricewaterhouseCoopers to make a presentation and respond to any questions.

MR DELLEA noted that the Members had received the strategic plan for 2020-2024 in their files, so he would give them a glimpse of the journey that he had gone through together with the WADA Management to prepare the plan in order to provide a broader insight into the process.

The journey had been viewed as climbing a mountain. At the very start, it had been deemed extremely important to have a broad level of engagement to get an understanding of where WADA currently stood, and that had been done from an outside-in perspective (he and his colleague Mr Meletiadis had interviewed a large number of people, many of whom were in that room) as well as from an inside-out perspective (quite some time had been spent with the Management to get a clear understanding of the internal assessment of performance and the key challenges in development). A lot

of time had then been spent with the WADA Management in workshops trying to understand who WADA was. That was a very fundamental question to ask of an organisation that was obviously under tremendous pressure and often being pulled in all sorts of directions, so there needed to be a really clear understanding of the identity and the DNA of WADA in order to invest in areas that would have an impact. The third point of focus was really where the organisation should focus and the real priorities over the coming four to five years. Then, a first layer had been set in terms of understanding how to get there, the concrete initiatives that needed to be undertaken and how to measure them, and that set a shared layer of understanding across the organisation and then, also for the stakeholders outside the organisation, the clear direction going forward. That was not the only layer required. There was obviously an implementation plan and an operational plan to be developed so that the priorities and initiatives would trickle down and ensure further detail.

As part of the assessment, some 158 key issues had been identified as things that were seen as working well and where there were challenges, also resulting from questions out of the trends looked at, as well as the number of expectations articulated by many in terms of the future. Those had been distilled down to about 20 core items, which he would outline later on in the presentation. It had also been necessary to deprioritise a number of issues considered to be potentially distracting or not leading to having a strong impact. Six strategic priorities had been looked at, and then 36 key initiatives had been identified, setting the core. Then, work had started on looking at over 100 concrete action plans rolling into each of the initiatives. The goal was ultimately to make sure that there was a clear link between the action plans and the key issues that the actions were ultimately there to address.

He gave an overview of some of the assessments. Starting with the strengths within the organisation, one key point that had clearly come across was the fact that there was undoubted respect and support for WADA as the ultimate global anti-doping body. The second point that had been consistent across all the discussions held had been the respect and acknowledgement of the dedication of the WADA staff. He did not think that there had been a single person who had not mentioned that very point, which he thought needed to be underscored. A third point, which was also extremely important, was the achievement in terms of creating harmonised rules and regulations, the Code, and the feedback was clear that there was not really any other international organisation that had achieved international standards globally within such a short period of time. That alone was a great achievement and needed to be acknowledged.

The impact of capacity-building globally was increasing day by day, although with difficulties, and that was something that had been acknowledged as a strength. Particularly looking at the recent past, the impact that intelligence and investigations had had in terms of strengthening the authority of WADA in relation to compliance had given teeth to the organisation. Then, clearly, the continued support in relation to funding from governments and the IOC was a strength.

Those were some of the strengths, but there was also a number of weaknesses. What had come across clearly (and hopefully the strategic plan would help resolve it) was the limited proactiveness: in essence, the challenge of the organisation being pulled into all sorts of directions and then naturally operating on a reactive basis. That was a difficult position from which to be driving the fight against doping in sport.

The second point that had come across in many discussions was the lack of unity and cooperation among stakeholders, a sort of pervasive lack of trust, and there had been a number of conversations with many in the room on that point, which was absolutely essential. Only through unity and cooperation could the fight against doping in sport progress. A number of people had spoken about a potential lack of independence in relation to governance and decision-making. It was not something that had been heard consistently across the board, but it had been mentioned.

Clearly, communication had been seen as an area of weakness, and the fact that the athletes' experience of anti-doping was not defined proactively. There needed to be a holistic approach to how to define the experience of athletes in relation to anti-doping.

Last but not least, the limited resources that WADA had for the sheer amount of work and the mission it had to achieve were seen as a weakness.

There were also opportunities and threats, and one of the biggest opportunities revolved around the ability to increase the impact of programmes through decentralisation and local delivery, and that meant having greater leverage in any of the actions the organisation took.

Scientific research was extremely important: showing better impact and communicating it clearly so that everybody understood the agenda and where research was having an impact. It was about integrating more data within decision-making and having a clear link to justify actions, and having the potential to engage and leverage athletes better and more assertively in relation to the agenda of the organisation. Last but not least, generating positive awareness through engaging content was important, and that related back to the issue of communication.

One of the threats mentioned a lot was the growing complexity and the potential move towards bureaucracy. That was a very serious threat that needed to be dealt with and there was a clear commitment on the part of the organisation to try to address it proactively. New cases of systematic doping were out there, and they represented a clear threat because they shook the organisation to its core; although, as had been seen in the past, they could also make the organisation stronger if the reaction was the right one.

New forms and methods of doping needed to be dealt with. Another big risk was the potential extension of WADA's scope of activity. That was an important point: as mentioned earlier, the organisation was at risk of being pulled in different directions and extending the scope could be a significant risk because it would take WADA away from focusing its limited resources on what really mattered.

Litigation costs represented a big threat that was very difficult to deal with. There was an increasing appetite for litigation on the market, and that obviously had a cost implication and an effort implication. Last but not least, the threat of increasing costs of testing and compliance also needed to be catered for. He had given the members an overview of the self-reflection carried out by the organisation as part of the process, and it had been truthful and quite deep.

The process had included a review of the mission, vision and values of the organisation. No significant changes had been made, showing that the initial vision of the organisation was still relevant and assertive, so it was about leading a collaborative, worldwide movement for doping-free sport with a view to making sure that athletes could participate in a doping-free sporting environment. That remained pretty much the same as it had been in the past. There had been some slight adjustments made to the values, but WADA had been working according to more or less the same principles as in the past. The biggest difference had been the reflection on who WADA really was and what the strategic position was. A number of options had been considered in the workshops carried out, and an attempt had been made to define what was meant by saying that WADA led a collaborative worldwide movement in doping-free sport. Was WADA just a regulator, developing policies, rules and controlling their implementation, or was WADA an all-round player, somebody who stepped in when needed and was in a position to have an impact? Or was WADA an organisation that drove leverage, an enabler? Every hour of effort and every dollar invested needed to have a leverage effect to enable other organisations to multiply that effect. Or was WADA a solutions provider, in other words, somebody who brought together a number of solutions and packaged and delivered them to stakeholders? Or should it be an innovator, pushing the focus on new products and services, leveraging technology and innovation? All of those could fit into the vision and the mission that had been looked at previously. The key question was where to set the focus, because WADA could not be everything for everybody. That did not work. A number of workshops had been held to look at positioning and to try to understand the impact of the various options and whether they would fit with the capabilities of the organisation and what the potential risks were.

The conclusion had been that WADA was at the cross-section between being a regulator and an enabler. That was the core of where the organisation saw itself, whilst acknowledging clearly that it was strongly being pulled into becoming an all-round player that stepped in wherever possible. That had been put into a summary position, clearly identifying that the main way in which WADA generated value was through harmonised rules and regulations, ensuring stakeholder compliance, generating leverage and enabling programme delivery through partnerships and capacity-building, and ensuring that their partners and stakeholders could deliver the right anti-doping programmes per region and for the different groups. Four unique capabilities had been chosen, and they revolved around what the organisation

needed to be extremely good at to be in a position to thrive. There were many more things that the organisation needed to be good at, but those on the right-hand side of the screen formed the core, and they were being in a position to develop superior rules and enforce them, and being a true leader, which meant being extremely good at engaging all of the stakeholders to achieve its goals. On those two aspects, the organisation was doing well. The two aspects on the bottom of the screen were also identified as being critical, and they were the ability to make decisions based on data, which meant having a thorough understanding of what was going on in the ecosystem and with the stakeholders, and being in a position to be proactive when it came to managing communications and reputation. Those two aspects had been felt to be less positive when it came to WADA's current performance, and they needed to be built on if WADA was to be more successful.

In terms of the guidelines followed during the strategic planning, he had articulated, based on the insight generated from the first phase, six priorities for the 2020-2024 period, addressing the core of the issues and the challenges, and then each area of activity within the organisation as part of the workshops had contributed to understanding how the priorities would be achieved. Those priorities had then been translated into key initiatives, which were actionable, and areas to be measured so as to be in a position to check progress. The six areas identified had been summarised in such a way as to be able to communicate them effectively, to make sure that external stakeholders and the public at large had a better understanding of what the organisation was going to focus on. First and foremost, it was about leadership, which meant being proactive in terms of tackling key issues and being agile and innovative across all facets. It was about being visible, meaning having a proactive narrative that would demonstrate the impact of WADA, and about being athlete-focused, having a clear understanding of the athlete journey, making it easier and looking at it from a holistic perspective, including the athlete but also obviously the entourage. It was about growing impact, which meant capacity-building, knowledge-sharing, and then really empowering delivery of programmes on a local basis. The fifth one was about collaboration and uniting, and that meant engaging and collaborating with everybody involved in the process and increasing support, unity and coherence. Last but not least, it was about performance, which meant ensuring that complexity was reduced and making sure that there was cost-effectiveness. Those were the six areas of focus for the 2020-2024 period, and the management felt that, if it managed to tackle a good portion of the objectives, it would be on a positive transformational agenda.

A thorough process had taken place during the workshops to identify, for each of the strategic objectives, the concrete objectives and key performance indicators, and then look at initiatives, trying to identify corresponding key actions. As a follow-up, each of the initiatives was increasingly being populated with concrete actions together with the Management.

One key point related to leading was about being able to execute the strategy, monitoring trends and development, being proactive and measuring that; it was about embracing new technologies to boost effectiveness, leveraging data, having impactful research actually based on clear priorities and outcomes; it was about partnerships, which were not only with pharmaceutical companies and law enforcement agencies, but went much further; and then having a clear strategy and views in terms of how to tackle fundraising. Visibility was all about brands, having the Communications Department working hand-in-hand with the business area to support objectives; about positioning WADA as a leading voice in anti-doping, as a thought leader; about transforming the digital footprint so that everybody could engage coherently; about engaging athletes in relation to the agenda and also engaging within the organisation and the Executive Committee so the leaders and employees were on board. Athletes played a key role from a focus perspective, and that started with having a clear idea of the athlete pathway, understanding the right patterns or behaviours that could be seen so that the vulnerable athlete groups could be supported effectively and accommodated properly by WADA. It was about establishing an education framework so that stakeholders could educate athletes and entourage accordingly, making sure that education was easily accessible and making sure that the experience from a digital perspective was up to par. Growing impact was practically the core of a lot of WADA's activities. It was about monitoring compliance, sharing knowledge, ensuring proper qualifications for anti-doping professionals, strengthening the region for programme delivery, cooperation among laboratories and, last but not least, further strengthening the investigative capability of the stakeholders to drive more impact. Collaborating and uniting was about building and fostering and reinforcing that trust among all of the stakeholders so that they would collaborate. It was about organisational culture, dialogue, collaboration and collegiality, decision-making with integrity and competence, diversity and inclusion, continuously assessing WADA's governance to make sure that it was up to par in terms of structure and processes, making sure that



there was dialogue with stakeholders on the work of WADA. On performance, the key initiative revolved around reviewing the organisational structure of WADA, which had grown organically over time and needed to be refreshed. It was about having appropriate financial and planning systems for the new challenges, and being able to deliver the right information to the Management. It was about people, working out how to dedicate resources to certain projects and how to drive the hiring strategy. It was also about crisis management, making sure that the organisation could deal with crises effectively so that it did not get distracted from the core mission it had when a crisis did happen, and they would obviously continue to happen. Finally, it was about monitoring key performance indicators and ensuring an effective project management strategy. As the Members would see, the work was in progress and nearly 120 key actions had been defined, and the WADA management was currently being supported to be in a position to prioritise and set a clear agenda for 2020 and 2021 so as to be able to realise that vision over a five-year period.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Dellea for his comprehensive and professional report.

MR DE VOS said that it was of course a very important document in relation to the future of the organisation and especially for the framework of the fight against doping in sport; so, on behalf of the Sport Movement, he thanked WADA and PricewaterhouseCoopers for their work and for developing the draft, which he presumed was a first draft. He would try to explain why he presumed that. He also thanked the speaker for explaining the methodology, because the Members had only received the strategic plan or the draft, and not the reasoning and methodology behind it and, when looking at the draft without the background, it had looked somewhat vague and very general and lacking flesh on the bones. He thought that it could be more detailed in terms of what was really meant and he tried to give some examples.

Key initiative number one under the 'lead' point referred to planning and overseeing strategic execution through the consistent implementation of key initiatives to materialise WADA's 2024 vision. Reading that a couple of times, he had asked himself what vision was being talked about, because there was only one reference to WADA's 2024 vision. What did it mean? It should be further developed, because the only reference to a vision was the vision of tomorrow on page 9, which referred to a world in which all athletes could participate in a doping-free sporting environment. That was not really new, so it would be interesting to understand what was meant in greater detail. That was only one example. There was also, and it had been spoken about during the IOC President's introduction, and everybody agreed, the fact that the role of the athletes' entourage should be highlighted much more in WADA's future work, and he found almost nothing about the entourage. There was a lot about the athletes and they were central, but he found little about the entourage, and it had become increasingly clear that the entourage was a very important group that also needed to be incorporated in the future strategy of WADA. Looking at the athletes, with all due respect, he came from an international federation and he saw a lot about athletes, who were very important, but the role of some other stakeholders that were essential to the process (such as NADOs, NOCs and IFs) should also be highlighted more in the document.

The fundraising strategy had been spoken about and was clearly an initiative of the President, and it was necessary to be careful to do that with due process and avoid any potential conflict of interest. Some people might give some money, but they did not always have the right motivation for doing so.

There were some other further comments, and he did not wish to take up too much time, but he thought that the framework of the meeting was perhaps too short to discuss a document that was so important for the future of the organisation. He knew that the consultation process was anonymous, but it would be interesting to know in slightly greater detail which stakeholder groups had been interviewed, because he felt that certain statements had been made in the SWOT analysis and he wished to understand if it was really a general view, because some were rather shocking to him, or just the view of a very small minority. In relation to the methodology, in what way had some weighting factors been built into the SWOT analysis? It would be interesting, at least for him and the group he represented, to understand that. When talking about measuring success, it was very good to identify what one was going to measure, but it would also be interesting to have more details on how to measure it.

In his view, it was not detailed enough, and it was very vague. It was nice to read, of course, but it needed to be a tool that gave a clear indication of what was wanted and how to do it. The how was very important. Some indications had been given in the presentation that he did not find in the strategic plan.

On behalf of the Sport Movement, he proposed seeing if, within the framework of the symposium in March 2020, it might be possible to organise a meeting together with representatives of the Public Authorities and of course WADA and PricewaterhouseCoopers to see how far they could contribute to trying to further improve the document. He was grateful for the framework, which was very interesting, but he thought that it needed to be further developed if it was to be presented to the Foundation Board for approval in May. That would be the proposal from his side, with all due respect for the work done.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that his colleague and friend Mr De Vos had mentioned some of the points he had wished to make related to the WADA Strategic Plan. Everybody knew that PricewaterhouseCoopers showed great interest and was active in relation to the subject and there had been many conference calls and interviews with the Members and some of the stakeholders. He wondered, however, with which groups, and how many of the main stakeholders had contributed something. He would need more details and clarification in relation to that important plan, because it would cover four important years for WADA, and he fully agreed with his colleague: during that short meeting, he thought that there would not be enough time to go through it. In any case, most of the Members would be present in March at the WADA Symposium, so perhaps there could be a meeting on that item for further discussion.

MR GODKIN welcomed the informative presentation, which had been very helpful in explaining some of the background to the generation of the report received. In some of the consultations about the strategic plan in his region, one of the key issues that had come up, which Mr De Vos had already touched on, was the absolutely critical nature of achieving the outcomes set, and he suspected that that was something that had not been done very well in the past and that WADA could do better on in the future, in particular with an ambitious new strategic plan, which he assumed would be supported by an operational plan linked to budget, etc., so he underlined the criticality of having some meaningful metrics to measure success in a much better and more effective fashion than had been done previously.

MR KERSCH pointed out that it was unclear how the strategic plan related to the current four-year budget up to and including 2021, so he asked the WADA management to provide detailed information on the budgetary implications of the Strategic Plan. Given that the proposal was rather abstract, he asked WADA to develop a concrete implementation plan in time for the approval of the strategic plan by the Foundation Board and, as his Turkish colleague had also mentioned, he would also be interested to know the extent to which the Public Authorities had been involved in phase two of the Strategic Plan, called outside-in consultation.

MR DÍAZ added to the comments. The documentation received had been somewhat short on information and it was difficult to decide on a recommendation for May, so the idea of having some time to work on that in greater depth was a good idea.

MR KEJVAL asked if the presentation could be provided by e-mail.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the presentation could of course be provided by e-mail.

MR DELLEA responded to the comments. The Strategic Plan set an overarching direction; the Strategic Plan as it currently was set an overall direction for the organisation. Each of the initiatives was backed by about six to eight action plans, which were being prepared. The WADA Management had already articulated about 70% of that, so that was work in progress, trying to turn the initiatives into concrete actions, trying to understand how that would then translate into an operational plan. It was a first layer that set the overarching direction of the organisation, but it obviously needed to be backed by concrete action plans for each of the areas. PricewaterhouseCoopers had started to push WADA in the right direction to develop a proper operational plan, so each of the points, including the first one, on launching the strategic process, was backed by concrete actions. As part of the next phase, it would be possible to share and get feedback on that layer of actions.

In relation to the indicators, the second point addressed before, he had shown some of the areas that would be measured, but had also gone one step further in terms of drafting concrete measurement methodology, which included surveys and having internal measurements, and that was also backed up by further details and was being developed. It was necessary to understand the transition from having an overarching strategic plan, which set out where the organisation was headed, to showing the

implementation plan and how those initiatives were going to be implemented, within what timeline, by whom, in what sequence and the priorities over the five-year period.

The additional funding strategy was set as an objective, but that strategy would obviously need to address the acceptance process and any risks and issues that needed to be catered for so as to be in a position to accept additional funds. That remained to be defined; it was currently the vision. His understanding was that there was not yet any concrete implementation. That needed to be thoroughly looked at, which was why he had mentioned that he wanted to develop a funding strategy and not go out and seek funding immediately. That was his key message. The implementation plan was progressing, and he thought that that was what the members were seeking: more details in terms of how each of the initiatives would be implemented, and that was part of the work in progress by the WADA Management.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that, in terms of the detail of the plan, it was necessary to be very careful not to transform a document that should allow somebody reading the Plan to understand in a relatively short time what WADA was doing, what it was all about, into something that was too operational and incomprehensible to an outsider. There had been a previous Strategic Plan, which had been more detailed and more operational, but nobody had read it, so the aim of the overarching document, although some of the points would be clarified, was to remain readable by people who might not be as involved as the Members were in the business so as to understand what WADA was all about. Based on that, there would be a more detailed operational plan, leading to the budget process and the requirements. To reassure the public authorities in particular, there was no intention to work outside framework agreed upon in terms of the overall envelope for the budget. When the Management prepared the proposal for the 2021 budget to be submitted to the Finance and Administration Committee in June, it would take into account the new direction that the Strategic Plan indicated. That would be for 2021, which was a transition year, and the Management would then develop a more long-term plan to have a vision, and that would then go into the budget process, so that was work in progress.

There could certainly be a meeting in March to discuss that further. It would be necessary to have a small group and liaise with both sides to ensure appropriate representation, and the Members could be provided with more details if they wished. He understood that there had been a number of questions about the kind of feedback received by PricewaterhouseCoopers, and that should be no problem, as everything was documented. The discussion would make it possible to agree on a document to be put forward. He did not think that the document should become too detailed, because then the objective of having something that was accessible to everybody would be lost.

MR KERSCH agreed that one could not be too detailed, but there had been a concrete question. What would it cost for everything that PricewaterhouseCoopers proposed? It was necessary to know what it would cost, and there was no indication in that Plan.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that he did not have the answer because, as he had indicated, there were three categories of elements that would need to be looked at. Those were the new activities to be carried out in line with the Plan and, to be very concrete, there was talk about digitalisation and being more data-driven, AI, etc., so new activities would entail a cost. For current activities that WADA still needed to carry out, there would be a number of activities that WADA would have to continue to do but, to make it work, some activities would have to be dropped. That was part of the exercise of turning that into an operational plan, which would then lead to the budget, and only after that exercise had been completed would WADA have that vision. For the coming years, WADA would work within the 8% budget increase and would not deviate from that. For the future, there would be a proposal reflecting what was in there, then there would be a decision and what WADA could afford to do it would do and what WADA could not afford to do, it would not do.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that he was waiting for an answer to his question. On the slides, there appeared to be some working group activities related to the Plan. He wondered what the composition of each group had been, how many working groups had there been and what kinds of discussion had taken place in relation to the stakeholders' contributions. There appeared to have been some telephone contributions only.

MR DELLEA responded that, from an overall process perspective, during the outside-in analysis, approximately 30 people had been talked to, including Executive Committee and Foundation Board

Members, the IOC, international federations, athletes and a couple of media people and some additional stakeholders, with a view to having a very broad approach and, for the Executive Committee Members, there had been a balanced approach between Government and Sport Movement representatives. The working sessions had taken place within the management team of WADA, involving a cooperation process whereby each director and member of the management team of WADA had had an opportunity to set out objectives, and that had been done in a series of three sessions in Montreal between September and December.

MR DE VOS welcomed the answers, although he reiterated that he still believed that some points needed to be better incorporated in the Plan, such as the entourage and the role of other stakeholders and organisations; but, again, he was giving only a couple of examples. He clearly understood that it was necessary to strike a balance between the Strategic Plan and the operational plan and that the Strategic Plan should not be too detailed, but also it should not be too vague because, at the end of the day, that was the statement made by WADA as an organisation for the next four years to the outside world. It was WADA's statement, so he did not care if some people did not read it; that was their choice, but WADA had to ensure that it was right and that it was not going to be too vague. It was necessary to be clear about what was wanted, how it would be done and how it would be measured. He fully understood that it could not be too detailed, but the document on the table was too vague, which was why he thought that it would be good to have a discussion and gain the full support of the Executive Committee and later of the Foundation Board. It was much more important than being happy with a vague document. He thought it would be useful to do it but fully understood the need to find a balance. On finance, of course, it was necessary to set priorities and that should be done in the next phase when discussing budgeting, so he fully agreed and supported what the Director General had said.

MR SHEPANDE said that his understanding of the Strategic Plan was that it was a document that outlined a broad framework of objectives and what WADA planned to do, but asking for details at that stage was presumptuous because the next step should be, as outlined earlier, to unpack the Strategic Plan into action plans, and that was where the Members should be talking about the details on how to realise what was contained in the Strategic Plan.

MR KEJVAL said that he wished to support Mr De Vos. The Strategic Plan had to be precise. Not all of the Members were native English speakers, and they had been using different terms, for example, when talking about the entourage. It was not true that there was nothing about entourage, because there was reference to athlete support groups, athlete influencers and other terms, but he asked the drafters to be specific and precise, and they should not hesitate to repeat the same term throughout the document to ensure clarity.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL responded that he understood. It was necessary to find the balance mentioned by Mr De Vos. The Management would of course keep working on the next layer, which was the operational plan. His proposal was to organise the workshop in March, and a time and a place to do that would be found. The Members would probably be asked to do some homework and send in comments in advance, and the Management would bear in mind the balance that needed to be struck, the operational plan and the budget process. He thought that that was the right process and he was comfortable with that.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the Members were happy with that, as well as with the idea of doing homework.

#### DECISION

A working group to be coordinated by WADA Management with a small workshop of some members to be convened in March, with the objective of the ExCo relooking at the Plan in May 2020 in order for it to then be recommended for approval by the Foundation Board at its May 2020 meeting.

## 5. Governance reforms

THE CHAIRMAN suggested starting with items 5.1 and 5.2, followed by a short break, which had been requested by the Public Authorities to discuss the presentation, after which the Executive Committee would be asked to approve the proposals, followed by item 5.3 before coming back to the independent member profiles.

### – 5.1 Implementation plan update

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the Members would see an update on the different timelines for the various projects in terms of implementation of governance reforms. As it was a never-ending story, the next matter that would come to the table, probably in May, was the work on the Ethics Committee and how to progress that. That had been put on the back burner for a while, because it had not been possible to do everything at the same time, but the Management would provide some initial documents for discussion and then start the process in relation to that.

By way of information, after the decision taken in November to adopt all the statutes, the Management had been in touch with the Swiss authorities and there was a meeting scheduled with them on 2 March for discussion to get their approval on the modifications to the statutes, so work was in progress on that.

### DECISION

Implementation plan update noted.

### – 5.2 Inaugural Nominations Committee report

MS SMITH-GANDER advised she would refer to a presentation visible on the screen.

She would cover first an overall process overview of what the inaugural Nominations Committee had done, and follow that with more detail on what work had been done to determine recommendations as per the report on the standing committee chairs, and then move on to the independent Executive Committee member process and some thoughts on next steps and observations on various process efficiencies and so forth. She knew that there were more detailed biographies in the report, but thought that it was worth pointing out to the Members the composition of the Nominations Committee and the skills and expertise brought to the table. The three independent members had substantive expertise and skills in human resource process, line management and, importantly, governance. For her own part, for the past decade her career had largely been focused on governance roles. She had formal qualifications in the topic, had received an award from the Australian Governance Institute, the President's Award for exemplary service to the profession, and she lectures in the topic at the University of Western Australia, which is a top 100 university. Regine Buettner is the global human resources head for DHL, Stewart Beck is a Canadian with a significant human resources background working in the diplomatic corps and currently led a large major think tank, and she thought that the members were well aware of the Sport Movement nominee and the Public Authorities nominee.

The activities undertaken since starting in October had been quite substantial. Half-way down the chart, the Members would see that the Nominations Committee had come into its own and had been conducting activities without involvement from the WADA Executive Committee. Obviously, to get started, induction and briefing from the WADA Executive Office had been necessary, together with support in the initial teleconferences and in-person meeting in London, but the interview of the existing Compliance Review Committee (CRC) chairman and the conduct of the process on the decision to bring a recommendation to the Executive Committee on the CRC chairman and the standing committee chairmen, the writing of the report and the final teleconference leading into that meeting had been conducted by the committee without the involvement of the WADA Executive Committee. She noted the process followed was different between the CRC and the other standing committees.

Starting with the CRC, the applicants had been sourced not by the Nominations Committee but through WADA and the Foundation Board and then the Nominations Committee had sought guidance from the current CRC chairman (whom she wished to acknowledge and thank for the guidance he had

given to the Committee), looked at the resumés of the two applicants and then as a full Nominations Committee interviewed those applicants, conducted reference checks and vetting through a company called Control Risks. The process for the other standing committees had been much less weighty because the nominations had been sourced from the Members and then received by the Nominations Committee, and the task had been to ensure that the vetting was done appropriately, and of course the Athlete Committee had been a vetting-only process, as the athletes had been allowed a different process.

It had actually been quite a privilege to chair the Nominations Committee; the members had been uniformly engaged, diligent and extremely professional. The group had developed some familiarity and insight in relation to the activities at hand. She had been asked a number of times whether it was likely that the members would want to be given an opportunity to be considered for a permanent committee, and each independent member had expressed a willingness to be considered in such fashion. The preference was that, given that the members had come together and formed a good working relationship, if that were to be the case, the independent members would prefer to move to the permanent committee as a group. The other key consideration was that the work of the Committee remained real work. It was the clear understanding that the Nominations Committee worked to develop considered recommendations and that the decision rights remained with the Executive Committee, but the members had heard concerns that stakeholder groups might question the robustness of the process, not the integrity, given the rather small candidate pool. The members had seen in the SWOT analysis that there was perhaps a question about independence, so it was quite important that the Nominations Committee continued to do very real work.

Moving on to speak of the standing committee chairmen, she wished to speak first in a little more detail about the process she had outlined for the CRC chairman. The first task that the Nominations Committee had undertaken had been to define the profile for the chairman. The Committee members had been able to speak to the current chairman and the WADA Executive Committee, looked at written documentation approved and taken soundings via some of the members through the Sport Movement and the Public Authorities to come up with what was deemed to be the appropriate profile. In parallel, the Committee had looked at the resumés of the two candidates and developed a targeted selection interview guide so that, when speaking to the two candidates, it would be getting comparable information to be able to assess and make a recommendation. The interviews had generally been conducted with the full Committee. One member had not been able to join one interview, but information had been provided to that member. The profile had been taken and scored against and that scoring process had been used to make a first-cut comparison between the two candidates and to inform the additional information to be gained through the reference checks. The reference checks had been undertaken with referees nominated by the two candidates, three in one instance and four in another, and they had been undertaken by the independent members of the Committee. There had been an opportunity to match interviews with referees speaking the same mother tongue, so as to be able to have good, open conversations. She noted the reference checks are confidential; they will not be provided to the Executive Committee, but they are documented and shared across the Committee, and with the vetting information received on the two candidates had been used to reach a decision. She noted that, reinforced by the conversation on the Strategic Plan, it was necessary to provide more information to the Executive Committee Members ahead of the meeting to make the decision process clearer; but, given the nature of the Committee and the nature of the work, the Nominations Committee members would always have more information at their disposal than they were going to be able to provide to the Executive Committee, so defining the profile, that very first step, was absolutely key. Therefore, it was necessary to make sure that a better view of that was provided.

The profile the Nominations Committee had come up with was documented in the table on the left-hand side of the screen, and was inherent in the questions asked of the candidates during the interview, which are contained in the appendix of the provided report. On the right-hand side is the assessment of the candidates against that set of criteria, and she hoped that the Members could see that it was very clear that both of the candidates were appointable to that role.

Of course, it had not been the mandate of the Nominations Committee to recruit candidates, so she hoped that the Members would take the next comment in the spirit with which she offered it, because the Executive Committee had observed that these were two candidates who brought expertise in the topic to hand, a real passion for sport integrity and clear independence, and that combination of factors in one human being is in very short supply. It is a very scarce thing, and so the Nominations Committee

very much hoped that the Members would find a way to involve both of the candidates in the future in some way, because they both had great passion to be involved and both brought very much what the Vice-President had been speaking about: an ability to understand how to bring activity around the entourage. Looking at the contribution that, in particular, the Honourable Justice James Wood had made to sport integrity, the Nominations Committee had been very struck when speaking with him about his thought process on that particular element of the work of WADA. However, the Nominations Committee had come to the view that the recommendation should be to appoint Mr Markus Hauptmann to the position of chairman of the Compliance Review Committee. He was fully independent and had offered to step aside from his role with the IBU, something the Nominations Committee strongly recommended. He had unquestioned integrity through the reference checking and the Control Risks vetting, and strong exposure to anti-doping issues, and the Members would have seen on the previous chart that, in some ways, that was the distinction between the two candidates. He had a developed perspective on deterrent effect, well developed demonstrated consensus-building skills, evidence obtained through the reference checking, and he also had broad international exposure through his role in White & Case.

Moving to the balance of the standing committee recommendations, starting with the Education Committee, the Nominations Committee had received three nominees. There had been no vetting concerns, and the Committee recommended that Ms Kady Kanoute Tounkara be appointed, believing that that would help with regional and gender diversity, as she was very Europe-Africa bi-regional and her skills and experience in education at a grassroots level should be well regarded. Checking against the profile in the written documentation, the Committee had wanted to ensure that she would be able to manage the Education Committee smoothly, and two members of the Committee with expertise in that field had interviewed her and had been given great comfort from that interview, so that was the rationale behind that recommendation.

For the Health, Medical and Research Committee and the Finance and Administration Committee, the Nominations Committee had received only one nominee, but there had been no vetting concerns, so the recommendation was that Dr Lars Engebretsen and Mr Ser Miang Ng be appointed to those positions. The Nominations Committee had been somewhat concerned about the shallowness of the candidate pool; but, given that it had been a first time for that exercise, the Nominations Committee had attempted to ask whether it had candidates who met the criteria and whether they were appointable and quality candidates and, if it had been able to give itself comfort on that and in particular on any deep conflict matters, it had been happy to move on. That was what had happened in each case.

On the Athlete Committee, there had been a process agreed to that had seen the Athlete Committee make a nomination. At the end of the Athlete Committee's process there had been two candidates. There had been some suggestion that there might be more, and the Nominations Committee would have had more than a vetting role if there had been more than five candidates. As it had turned out, there had been two, and there had been no vetting concerns, so the Nominations Committee had been comfortable to confirm the Athlete Committee's recommendation of Mr Ben Sandford.

That was the piece of the presentation the Executive Committee had wanted her to cover before the break.

MR DÍAZ said that, in general, the Public Authorities' position was that most of the information lacking had been provided; however, the Public Authorities wished to make a request for the future. The Nominations Committee was a new body within the organisation and it was operating for the first time, but the Public Authorities felt that there had been a lack of information and asked for the Management to guarantee more information prior to the Executive Committee meetings, in particular when the Executive Committee Members were supposed to make a decision. He knew that the criteria had since been provided; however, most of the public authority members had arrived with concerns in their regions that none of the criteria expressed in the presentation had been received. There was another concern about the lack of candidates, in particular given that WADA was a world organisation. Some of the standing committees had had only one candidate, and there had been only two for the Compliance Review Committee. That was the common position of the Public Authorities. He thanked the members and chairman of the Nominations Committee for their work.

MS BARTEKOVÁ raised a point about nominations for the Athlete Committee chairmanship for the future. There had been a common agreement that, if there were fewer than five candidates, they would

be vetted and, if not, five would be suggested and they would be vetted. Regardless of the number of candidates, they should all be vetted properly for the next time. She understood from the report that the candidates had all been vetted. She therefore congratulated Mr Sandford on his election as chairman of the Athlete Committee. The elections had been quite tight, and showed great support for the other candidate, Dr Yuhan Tan, who had received seven votes, so she thought that he should be kept as a regular member of the Committee, as it would be a pity to lose that kind of candidate.

MR KEJVAL said that he had an issue in relation to Mr Sandford and the length of this term. There was a new rule; Mr Sandford had come to the Athlete Committee on 1 September 2013 and his mandate would end on 1 January 2022, so the proposal was to elect him for two instead of three years in order to comply with the rule.

MR GODKIN had a question about meeting protocol. Would the Members be getting into a discussion about those items at that point in the meeting or later? He wanted to know when to make his interventions.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for questions prior to the break.

MR GODKIN said that he had understood that there would be a break so that the Public Authorities could consider their position on the particular decisions to be taken.

MR DÍAZ thought that it would be a good idea to have the questions, and then the Public Authorities could consider their positions, having heard the answers, during the break.

MR DE VOS referred to the point about the nomination of independent Executive Committee members. The Sport Movement wanted to recall that both stakeholder groups, the Public Authorities and the Sport Movement, were responsible for appointing one independent member of the Executive Committee. The Sport Movement would consider how many candidates it would submit as a result of its research. However, he recalled that, for both positions, the role of the Nominations Committee was to vet the candidates put forward by the two stakeholder groups.

MR GODKIN noted that, in relation to the Education Committee chairman, one of the applicants for the role was the current chairman and it would be useful to have an explanation as to why the current chairman had not been seen as competitive in reappointment. He said that because, as all the Members were aware, there had been some difficult issues in the past in relation to litigation, etc., and there was potential for an optic to which the Members needed to be very sensitive.

In relation to the Athlete Committee chairman, the mandate that he had was that there was merit in aligning the Committee chairman tenures and that WADA did not want to be seen to be limiting the Athlete Committee tenure in relation to the others, as that might also have another unfortunate optic that WADA might want to avoid, bearing in mind that the chairing role was slightly different to the standard membership role.

The third comment was in relation to the Honourable Justice James Wood. He wished to declare to the Executive Committee colleagues that he did know the candidate professionally through work that he had done for the Australian Government. He was arguably the architect of some of the world's most advanced sports integrity arrangements, including in particular anti-doping arrangements, and there was currently legislation in front of the Australian Parliament dealing specifically among other things with the third-party enablers question and the entourage, which reflected the advanced thinking the candidate had in relation to such matters, and he could speak in some detail about the qualifications that he had should anybody wish to consider those, but he let everybody know that he was a highly esteemed judicial officer, a royal commissioner into anti-corruption, a former justice of the supreme court, a long-term chairman of the law reform commission and the parole authority, and the reviewer of a number of sport-related matters including anti-doping matters, and he thought that WADA was actually very fortunate that he had expressed an interest in the position, given the criticality of the position and the independence requirement.

MR KERSCH noted that, regarding the procedure for the appointment of the chairman of the Athlete Committee, the document indicated that the chairman had been proposed by the members of the Athlete Committee, and he thought that it was a very good idea; but, in the future, the plan was that the process



would be aligned with the process for the other standing committees. He wondered if the Executive Committee should not maintain the principle that it was up to the members of the Athlete Committee to propose their chairman.

MS SMITH-GANDER said that she very much appreciated the questions and also acknowledged on the Nomination Committee's behalf the thanks that a number of the Members had expressed. A number of common concerns were shared, and she took the feedback on board about the need to provide better information and would certainly do that for the next meeting and the next set of decisions. She also agreed that the small number of candidates was a risk. She did not think it risked the integrity of the process, but perhaps questioned more the robustness of the process. Nevertheless, it was very much in the Members' hands to determine ways to identify the right candidate pools. She did acknowledge the comments that the role of the Nominations Committee was not to recruit but it was to assess, vet and rank; however, the more fearless that the Executive Committee could be in providing a vibrant slate of nominations that could then be assessed, vetted and ranked, the more robust the process would be and the more the Executive Committee would step towards the evolution of the governance that was very rightly sought.

She did think it was possible to accommodate the voice of the athletes in the process by seeking nominations via the Athlete Committee but then not allowing the Athlete Committee to hold the key in terms of the final recommendation because, if the vetting process worked appropriately, there would be candidates of integrity and, if the assessment process worked well, there would be candidates who had the skills, expertise and competence to discharge the role, but they would have come from the athlete community so, by their very nature, they brought the voice of the athletes and the question would be whether that was a respected athlete voice. She thought that it would be possible to design into the assessment process some soundings in the athlete community and some other mechanisms to respect that, so more robustness would be built into that process. That would be her recommendation, but it was very much the Members' decision as to how to identify that.

She confirmed that both of the candidates put forward for the Athlete's Committee had been vetted, because the Nominations Committee had wanted to make sure that it understood the second candidate in the event of a stumble at the vetting hurdle for the preferred candidate, and it lined up very much with the way in which the Nominations Committee had considered the quality of the candidate pool, that the Members would want to keep that second person from the Athlete Committee involved.

There had been some questions on tenure and whether it was sensible to align tenure. Often, in the corporate world, staggered tenure was the way in which one operated, because it allowed one to spread the workload across time, making things a little less pressured, and it also meant that there could be history in one committee while another was going through a renewal phase. That was why staggered tenures tended to work nicely. The Members had to consider that. It was not something the Nominations Committee had turned its mind to, so the Members were currently hearing a top-of-mind answer from the chairman; however, if the Members wanted the Nominations Committee to take that work on, there was expertise around the table and the Committee would be willing to provide some considered recommendation in the future.

Turning to the Education Committee chairman, she had been asked to give some reasons behind the decision that had been made. With a very small number of candidates, it had been very difficult to be able to meet the requirements on increasing diversity (in terms of gender, geography, skill and experience) and there had been one woman in the candidate pool, so the Nominations Committee had decided to assess whether it felt that that candidate would be able to do the task, and it had felt that that was the case. The Nominations Committee had also understood that the incumbent chairman had been in the position for a six-year period and felt that it would not be disrespectful not to reappoint, given that a sizeable contribution had been made over the length of that period. That was the thinking when evaluating the Education Committee candidates.

Addressing the comments made on the Honourable James Justice Wood, who was a very impressive individual and had a very well developed perspective and a great deal to say and advanced thinking on the entourage and on how to bring some interesting thinking to that particular question, the candidate had been interviewed at length, and part of the Committee's assessment on the distinguishing factors between the two candidates was based on the Honourable James Justice Wood's self-assessment. He was a very perceptive human being when it came to his own skills and criteria. As the Committee had

noted, he met the criteria and profile and, in many cases, exceeded the requirements of the role. Both of the candidates were very appointable to the role and were both people of great passion, integrity and understanding of the topic area in slightly different ways, but also independent, so a very scarce commodity, and the Committee had been startled to have two candidates of such solid criteria.

She thought that she had answered the questions posed. During the break, she would be available to answer any questions that might come up.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL remarked on the number of candidates. This time, the deadlines had been relatively short, and that aspect would probably be done differently in the future. He told the public authorities' representatives that the Management had been highly disappointed by the number of nominations received from the Public Authorities. In fact, very few had been received, explaining the fact that there had been only one candidate for some of the positions. He hoped that there would be better coordination in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Smith-Gander for her exceptional and hard work. He announced a ten-minute break.

On return to the meeting after the break, THE CHAIRMAN started with the first standing committee chairman proposal for approval by the Executive Committee. The proposal by the Nominations Committee was Mr Markus Hauptmann for the position of Compliance Review Committee chairman.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that, according to the Nominations Committee report, the other candidates were also highly capable, and the Sport Movement recommended the Honourable Justice James Wood as the chairman of the Compliance Review Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were other comments or opinions.

MR GODKIN observed that there were different views among the public authority members about preferences on the selection of the Compliance Review Committee chairman, so he thought that the only way to resolve the matter would be to go to a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, if the Sport Movement was already supporting the candidature of the Honourable Justice James Wood, a vote might be avoided and would not be necessary.

MR DÍAZ stated that there was a motivation on the part of Australia for the same candidate proposed by the Sport Movement and, if it was possible, if there was a majority, perhaps a vote could be avoided.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that there was a majority.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL asked if the Executive Committee could proceed on the basis that there was a majority in favour of the Honourable Justice James Wood and take it that the rest of the Members would support that position and move on, or did the Members want a formal vote?

THE CHAIRMAN said that there was a strong majority and so the decision was that the Executive Committee would approve the candidature of the Honourable Justice James Wood as the next chairman of the Compliance Review Committee.

On the Education Committee, the Nominations Committee had recommended Ms Kady Kanoute Tounkara. She would be the next chairman of the Education Committee.

On the Health, Medical and Research Committee, the proposal was Dr Lars Engebretsen. There was only one candidate, so Dr Lars Engebretsen would be the next chairman of the Health, Medical and Research Committee.

On the Finance and Administration Committee, the proposal was Mr Ser Miang Ng, so he would be the new chairman of the Finance and Administration Committee.

On the Athlete Committee, the proposal was Mr Ben Sandford. The next chairman of the Athlete Committee would be Mr Sandford.

MS SMITH-GANDER said that, in relation to the independent Executive Committee members, she wanted to talk through the five factors identified in the report on selection to deliver diversity, how the agreed profile had been developed (feedback on that was of course sought), candidate attraction, setting up the independent members for great success and a quick comment on remuneration which she did not think was too contentious.

The first thing was the robust selection delivering diversity. The considerations to be taken into account based on the understanding of the requirements were to attempt to increase gender diversity and geographical diversity, to deliver a sizeable pool of candidates for selection rather than confirmation, and she did understand that it was a potentially contentious point, but she hoped that she had made the case in answering the question before lunch as to why she thought it was important to step fearlessly into selection rather than confirmation processes to really embrace the evolution of governance recommended by the task force. At the end of the day, the intention was to meet an agreed profile but with people who were different to those sitting around the table. She knew that there had been a few questions about why the skill set of the people around the table would be considered and how that would actually inform the view of the profile, and she thought that that was a very good and valid question because, as the Nominations Committee had built the profile and had thought about diversity, it had added as a criterion increasing diversity because it was not in the process of asking the Members to identify candidates who filled skill gaps. It had been useful to have a consideration of the current Executive Committee composition, because it had given the members of the Nominations Committee some insight into the type of people that the stakeholders had thought would be good representatives around the table. It had not been about trying to identify gaps. Any board or governing body could never have at every single point in time all the skills it needed sitting around the table, so the task was more to know where there were potential gaps and to be able to identify independent experts, advice for management and the broader organisations behind to make sure that all the information and skills were necessary to get the task done. That had been the purpose behind having a very high-level and quick view of the people around the table to inform the building of the profile. The Members had the information in the report, so she would be happy to provide clarification later on. The Nominations Committee believed that it was about independence as defined in the regulation, then governance credentials, which might be evidenced by board experience or perhaps a large publicly listed company or a large institutional setting, such as a university, a government department, a foundation or an NGO, so a very broad way of demonstrating governance credentials. Clearly, a passion for sport integrity was critical to maintain alignment with the WADA mission, although she did indeed take on the challenges, which were very valid, about making sure that the mission was as broad as it needed to be. The environment was volatile and uncertain, rules-based, evidence-based, regulatory and compliance-focused, so it was necessary to have somebody who was quite a strategic thinker to bring some good challenge to the work done around the table. Obviously, to work in a group of that nature, one needed good social skills and the experience that allowed one to build those, so it was necessary to have somebody who could work collaboratively and had awareness of consensus but also had the strength of character to stand their ground when it was necessary to bring a different view into the room. It was necessary to understand the environment and the ecosystem in which WADA worked or have an ability to learn very quickly; so, if a person had not had some exposure to sport, government or anti-doping in their career, they would probably struggle to get up to speed as quickly as was deemed necessary. Clearly, WADA wanted individuals who understood and accepted diversity and were prepared to include people from diverse backgrounds. The time commitment was reasonably significant compared to many other activities people would do, and there was a significant amount of international travel, and she was not telling the Members anything that they did not already know. There needed to be availability and a good enthusiasm for the task. As she had said before, adding to demographic diversity on gender, geography and age would be a useful outcome of the process as well. She was sure that the Members knew where those people were; but, to provide some guidance about where some of those candidates might be, obviously in the legal fraternity, the financial community, operations with digital operating models, etc., as WADA was moving forward, that was the sort of strategic thinking that would be quite useful. Non-profit organisations that had had a strategic approach to fundraising, marketing and communications, very much in the digital, next generation area, people with a forensic or law enforcement background and people with a research or science background would be of interest. It was not seen as an "eye-of-a-needle" exercise with a very narrow skill set or narrow experience base being sought, but really a very broad potential pool of people,

although it was more about attitude and enthusiasm for the task. To make them as successful as possible, and again she thought that that should be a relatively non-controversial recommendation, a formal induction process, with induction from WADA in Montreal and an in-person briefing from the President and some videoconference briefings from the various committee chairmen would be quite important. It was felt important to remunerate the independent Executive Committee Members, and she suggested that 20,000 US dollars per annum would be sufficient to attract people, not that that would be a major part of the attraction, but it was felt important to recognise the value that people brought. Once the Nominations Committee had received feedback on the profile and the various process steps, it would be necessary to finalise a process to recruit and recommend the permanent Nominations Committee, consider the candidate call for the Independent Members of the Executive Committee to provide a ranking and then finalise that process and vet candidates, so that the two top-ranked candidates were fully vetted, along with, perhaps, two backup candidates, but she would take input from the Members and of course any other activity that the Members might request that the Nominations Committee undertake on their behalf. The Nominations Committee had learnt a bit about being more efficient, and needed to build more time into the process for vetting, and there was an interesting challenge with 100% attendance for the committee to be quorate; if somebody had a conflict for whatever reason or a logistical travel problem, that made it somewhat difficult, so that was something that might be considered in the fullness of time. Candidate pool activation had been talked about quite a bit. The most important thing there was stakeholder expectations, and she thought that it would be worth trying to find ways to take soundings about how people were feeling about the robustness of the candidate pool, because it was very much the Nominations Committee's view that a deeper candidate pool could be more effective.

THE CHAIRMAN reminded the Members that the deadline for receiving names from the stakeholders was 13 March that year.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL wanted to make sure that the Executive Committee agreed. First, there was agreement on the profile presented by the Nominations Committee; he thought there was consensus on that. That would be the profile both constituencies would look at when trying to find candidates. He really hoped that they would be able to find more than one. He made it clear that, in the rules, the function of the Nominations Committee was actually to vet but also to rank if there was more than one candidate, which it would do, and then the Foundation Board would appoint the Independent Members.

The second question raised was about remuneration. What was the position of the Executive Committee there? There would be a meeting on 2 March with the Swiss authorities, and that was something that would have to be raised with them. He thought that it was reasonable to offer some remuneration for Independent Executive Committee Members, but sought instruction from the Executive Committee. Should that be brought to the Swiss authorities to get permission to do so?

The third issue was that of a quorum. Having a 100% quorum sometimes made it difficult for the Executive Committee to function. Could the Members agree on four out of five as an appropriate quorum? What was the view of the Members on that?

MR LALOVIC said that the Director General had clarified what he had raised before the break and he thanked him for listening so carefully.

MR DE VOS said that the position of the Swiss authorities was important, even crucial, which was why, given his experience, it would be better to stop talking about remuneration but start talking about compensation, which was better wording than remuneration in Swiss legal terms. If remuneration were referred to, there was a greater risk that the Swiss authorities would not agree. He also raised the point made already at a previous meeting about the remuneration (or rather compensation) of the Vice-President. That should also be addressed at the same time. It would be good to know where WADA stood with that. The same independence requirements were asked of the Vice-President as of the President and the Independent Members, so it would not be fair to compensate the others and forget about one Independent Member.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the matter was on the table and he would bring it up with the Swiss authorities, and would go back to the Executive Committee for a decision with figures on paper in May. That would be part of the overall discussion to be held with the Swiss authorities. Did the Executive Committee agree on having four out of five members as a quorum?

THE CHAIRMAN confirmed that in the absence of any concerns raised by Members, they would proceed. He thanked the Director General.

#### DECISIONS

1. Proposal to elect the following candidates as standing committee chairmen approved: Compliance Review Committee – the Honourable Justice James Wood AO QC; Education Committee – Ms Kady Kanoute Tounkara; Health, Medical and Research Committee – Dr Lars Engebretsen; Finance and Administration Committee – Mr Ser Miang Ng; Athlete Committee – Mr Ben Sandford.
2. Proposed Independent Executive Committee Member candidate profile approved.
3. Proposed quorum of four out of five members approved.

#### – **5.3 Term length – Athlete Committee chairman**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that the rules of governance had been set, stipulating a maximum of nine years, so there were two situations: either the Executive Committee should consider that the Athlete Committee chairman had to finish an existing term that he was serving or it would be an appointment for three years, allowing him to go one year above the nine years. That was the decision that the Members had to take and their views were welcome.

MR KAMEOKA said that, for the Executive Committee, he believed that the term should be the same: three years. The Public Authorities' consensus was that three years, which would be the same as for the chairmen of the other standing committees, would be the best option. He believed that that had been the consensus at the government meeting and therefore proposed three years for the term.

MS BARTEKOVÁ also suggested that Mr Sandford should be appointed as the chairman of the standing committee for three years.

THE CHAIRMAN concluded that a three-year term would be approved for the next Athlete Committee chairman.

MS BARTEKOVÁ reiterated the suggestion that the second candidate, Dr Yuhan Tan, be proposed as a standing committee member for the coming years.

MR DÍAZ referred to the note at the bottom of the slide for the Nominations Committee and the Athlete Committee. Was that something to be decided on by the Executive Committee or was there a procedure for the future? There was reference to the approach of the Athlete Committee to elect its chairman; however, the Nominations Committee suggested that, in the future, it should be aligned with other procedures. He sought some clarification on that.

Bearing in mind how the Public Authorities operated, THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thought that it would be more reasonable to take that comment by the Nominations Committee on board and prepare for a discussion on that point at a later stage. That could be part of the discussion on the Athlete Committee. There was also a broader discussion on the appointment of Athlete Committee members. All of that was ongoing work. His view was that the recommendation of the Nominations Committee should be taken on board. There was an agreement and a consensus on a three-year term for Mr Sandford, and there was also a request and support from the Executive Committee that the other candidate, Dr Yuhan Tan, be made a member of the Athlete Committee. He would take that on board together with the President for the subsequent process, which was the selection of the Athlete Committee members. Was that okay?

MR KERSCH stated that he was not in favour of the proposal made by the Nominations Committee.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that there was no decision, but he had said that the issue would be factored into the discussion to be held on the structure of the Athlete Committee. A lot of work was

ongoing as to the representativeness of the members of the Athlete Committee and how they should be designated. That work would be continued and the issue would be taken on board.

## DECISION

Proposal for a three-year term for the incoming Athlete Committee chairman approved.

### **6. World Anti-Doping Code**

#### **– 6.1 Compliance Review Committee report – Russia update**

MR TAYLOR informed the Members that, since the Executive Committee had met in December, the Compliance Review Committee had not met and the process was in the hands of the lawyers. He had been in close contact with the lawyers, Messrs Ross Wenzel and Nicolas Zbinden, as he had promised he would be, and he knew that the WADA Management had also been in close contact with them. The notice asserting non-compliance had been sent out the day after the Executive Committee meeting, and it had been disputed by RUSADA. There had been a cover letter from the Director General expressing dissent with the dispute; nevertheless, it had been disputed by RUSADA and WADA had sent in its request for arbitration to the CAS on 9 January and had nominated an arbitrator, and that week RUSADA was due to answer and nominate an arbitrator. The rules set out a briefing schedule and a hearing. Under the Standard, there was a right for certain bodies to intervene and other bodies to apply to intervene. The deadline to do so had been Monday, and 15 different intervenors had written in. Of those, the IOC and the IPC had written in, and WADA had heard from the President of the IOC, Mr Bach, that it was a question of seeking a speedy and clear resolution. The Russian Paralympic and Olympic Committees had intervened, which was not surprising. It appeared from their intervention that they would fight every aspect of the case. GAISF had intervened, seeking to ensure clarity as to what the consequences meant, and the EOC had intervened. There were five Russian national federations seeking to intervene and two groups of Russian athletes and one Russian individual. They did not have a right to intervene, but they were applying to intervene. That would be a matter for the CAS to decide on, and it had sought comments on whether that was allowed. That was the situation. In terms of timing, everybody had expressed concern, and it was a concern of WADA to seek as speedy as possible a resolution. That was what was provided for in the International Standard. There was always tension between a speedy outcome and ensuring fair and due process. One of the key drivers of that would be the attitude of RUSADA and the intervenors and whether or not they would like a speedy resolution. If the Olympic Games drew near and there had been no decision, WADA might be able to seek some sort of provisional measures to gain clarity. One of the things that WADA was proposing to do to obtain clarity from the CAS was to put before it the details of the neutral athlete mechanism, i.e. the conditions that needed to be met to qualify which included non-incrimination in the underlying doping scheme and sufficiency of testing in advance of the event in question. One thing he would say to that was that there was not a chance to wait two or three or four months, because testing for the Olympic Games was needed immediately, but of course that was an issue that needed to be addressed in any event, forgetting about any court case, and he knew that there was a pre-games task force that was addressing that point and he hoped very much that it would make clear to IFs and NADOs what testing should take place in any event for all of the athletes who were supposed to be participating in the Olympic Games, because then people could implement those requirements and did not need to wait for a CAS decision, which might come out in March, April or May; he did not know. That was an overview of where the court case was. After that, he would be going to see the lawyers to see if there was anything new. That was an up-to-date report of the situation in relation to the proceedings. He would be very pleased to answer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Taylor.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that that was of course a very important matter for everybody, all parties, and he thought that the IOC President had clearly defined the IOC's position in relation to RUSADA.

MR KAMEOKA agreed that it was a very important issue. If it took three to four months to finish testing, it would be necessary to be able to decide on the conditions and process to determine the neutral athletes by March that year. That was a very important timeline. It was therefore necessary to be very diligent and prepare for any decision that might be taken by the CAS. It was only 160 days before the

start of the Olympic Games, so it would be necessary to be very diligent in terms of preparing for testing for the neutral athletes.

MR TAYLOR thanked the two speakers for their comments. On the testing point, he advised the Members to forget about the CAS case. Before the Olympic Games, the pre-games task force would meet and decide where the risks were and what testing should take place and make those recommendations to the IFs. As he understood it, the task force was in the process of doing that, and that would need to happen immediately, not in three months' time, and that was separate from the court case. One would expect that, as part of its analysis, the task force would be making a recommendation as to Russian athletes and other athletes and those requirements, which were independent of the court case, that should hopefully happen quickly and be implemented immediately. The CAS would at some point provide a decision; but, by that point, the Olympic Games would be only two or three months away. The testing needed to start before that.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL added that, of course, the Olympic Games were the next big event; but, once the CAS decision came out, it would also concern world championships, federations and so on, so the importance of understanding the requirements in terms of testing and other intelligence on athletes was key and should be out as quickly as possible, so the intention, and that would be part of the CAS proceedings, was that WADA would issue some guidelines with those criteria as soon as possible so that the IFs and the pre-games task force were aware of the position and what needed to be done. When the CAS decision came out, there should be no surprises.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that, according to the pre-games task force suggestion, all summer IFs had arranged their programmes before the Olympic Games mostly related to testing of Russian athletes and also some other athletes in accordance with the risk groups.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Taylor for the update.

#### DECISION

Compliance Review Committee update noted.

#### – **6.2 Moscow approved laboratory for Athlete Biological Passport – accreditation status**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL referred to the update. WADA had changed the process being followed for a number of reasons, but mainly because WADA had received valid comments from the Public Authorities as to the need to ensure that the formal process be followed. It was not an accredited laboratory: it was an approved laboratory, because it did only blood testing. By analogy, WADA had decided to apply the same procedure that would apply to an accredited laboratory. There was a recommendation from the Compliance Review Committee and the Laboratory Expert Group, and both concurred when it came to requesting the revocation of the laboratory, so a disciplinary process had been started. In the meantime, the approved laboratory was provisionally suspended. Once the disciplinary process was over, which would be within the coming 30 days, as per the rules, the matter would come back to the Executive Committee by way of circulatory vote to confirm the outcome of the disciplinary procedure, and then of course there was the possibility that it would go to the CAS. WADA was following the process. Some of it was not in the rules because the rules were somewhat silent on the matter; but, by analogy, WADA was applying the same rules as would be applied to an accredited laboratory.

#### DECISION

Update on the Moscow approved laboratory noted.

#### – **6.3 Policy for WADA's initial application of the International Standard for Code Compliance by Signatories**

MR TAYLOR said that the Executive Committee had approved the policy that was in place. The Members would remember that there was discretion in the standard for prioritisation of certain elements of the compliance programme because of the volume of work at the beginning, and it was detailed in the policy what that prioritisation was, with an ability in exceptional circumstances to depart from the policy. It had worked well. Hopefully it was fairly clear, and it was only two pages long. At the end of the previous year, the Compliance Review Committee had discussed whether it could and should be made

stronger, given that WADA was a couple of years into the process, and he fully expected that that would be the recommendation of the Compliance Review Committee, although it would be under new leadership. WADA was currently in a period of transition and moving towards a new chairman and new rules and a Code in 2021. The proposal was to maintain the policy for the interim period with a view to having a new policy at the beginning of the following year, and he would be happy to discuss it if necessary.

#### DECISION

Interim policy approved and timeline for the revised policy for WADA's initial application of the ISCCS noted.

#### **7. Any other business**

MR DÍAZ informed the Members that this would be his final Executive Committee meeting, and he thanked his colleagues on the Executive Committee and the Foundation Board. He had spent four years as the CADE president. After Ecuador had taken over CADE, he had been asked to spend one more year with WADA, so his commitment to CADE would end before May. Ecuador would take over the seat. He thanked the WADA staff and the Director General's office, as well as Ms Withers, Ms Chinnarassen, Ms Nezan and Mr Bouchard. It had been a wonderful five years and he was honoured to have been able to contribute to sport through that wonderful agency. He would continue to contribute to anti-doping through the Bureau of the UNESCO Convention, so he would see his colleagues around. He would be happy to support the activities. He thanked and congratulated everybody.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Díaz. It had been a great pleasure to cooperate with him and he thanked Mr Díaz for his efforts, knowledge, experience and friendship. He was happy that there would be many more opportunities to cooperate with Mr Díaz. Mr Díaz was the chairman of the UNESCO Convention Bureau and he looked forward to working with him.

#### **8. Future meetings**

THE CHAIRMAN listed the upcoming Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings. He thanked the hosts for their hospitality, and also the interpreters and audiovisual providers and staff. He thanked the Members for their patience during his first meeting chairing the Executive Committee and looked forward to seeing them soon.

#### DECISION

Executive Committee – 16 May 2020, Montreal, Canada;  
Foundation Board – 17 May 2020, Montreal, Canada;  
Executive Committee – 15 September 2020, Shanghai, China  
Executive Committee – 11 November 2020, Istanbul, Turkey  
Foundation Board – 12 November 2020, Istanbul, Turkey

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

#### FOR APPROVAL

**MR WITOLD BAŃKA**  
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA