

**Minutes of the WADA Executive Committee Meeting
21 September 2016, Lausanne, Switzerland**

The meeting began at 9.00 a.m.

1. Welcome, roll call and observers

THE CHAIRMAN welcomed the members to the WADA Executive Committee meeting held in the splendid surroundings of the home of the Association of National Olympic Committees, ANOC, in Lausanne. When he walked around and looked at the offices, he was very envious of the quality of the office accommodation. It was very different to his little office at home. He welcomed two new faces to the table, first of all, Mr Mizuochi of Japan, who had taken over as State Minister for Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (just a small and easy portfolio), and, representing Mr Kaloko from Africa, Mr Machacha Shepande, who had been present the previous day at the think tank.

He had to record that he missed and grieved for a great man, the WADA Vice-President, Dr Stofile. His career in life and in sport had been outstanding in every possible way. He had been a great supporter of WADA. When he had left his diplomatic position in Germany, he had gone home and had immediately gone back into service in his country at a university in South Africa. WADA missed Dr Stofile enormously, and he asked that everybody stand for a moment in his memory.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Lindberg, the Secretary General of ANOC, for hosting WADA in the ANOC facilities.

MS LINDBERG wished the members a successful meeting.

There was full attendance. He had the attendance sheet, which he would pass to his right for the members to sign. He was pleased to welcome Mr Howard Stupp, who was observing on behalf of the IOC.

The following members attended the meeting: Sir Craig Reddie, President and Chairman of WADA; Ms Valérie Fourneyron, Health, Medical and Research Committee Chairperson, Member of Parliament, National Assembly, France; Ms Beckie Scott, Athlete Committee Chairperson; Mr Gian Franco Kasper, IOC Member and President of the FIS; Mr Francesco Ricci Bitti, Chair of ASOIF; Professor Ugur Erdener, IOC Vice President, President of World Archery; Professor Eduardo Henrique de Rose, President, PASO Medical Commission; Mr Tony Estanguet, IOC Member and Member of the IOC Athletes' Commission; Ms Thorhild Widvey, Representative of the Norwegian Government, Norway; Mr Shepande, representing Mr Mustapha Kaloko, Commissioner for Social Affairs, African Union, Sierra Leone; Mr Marcos Díaz, CADE President, Dominican Republic; Mr Toshiei Mizuochi, State Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan; Mr Godkin, representing Ms Sussan Ley, Minister for Sport, Australia; Mr Edwin Moses, Education Committee Chairman, WADA, and Member of the Board of Directors, USADA; Mr Olivier Niggli, Director General, WADA; Mr Rob Koehler, Deputy Director General, WADA; Mr Tim Ricketts, Standards and Harmonisation Director, WADA; Ms Catherine MacLean, Communications Director, WADA; Dr Olivier Rabin, Science Director, WADA; Dr Alan Vernec, Medical Director, WADA; Mr Julien Sieveking, Legal Affairs Director; and Mr Frédéric Donzé, Director of the European Regional Office and IF Relations, WADA.

The following observers signed the roll call: Sergey Khrychikov; Rafal Piechota; Rune Andersen; Eva Bruusgaard; Shin Asakawa; Ichiro Kono; Howard Stupp; Andrew Ryan; Richard Budgett; Adam Pengilly; Matteo Vallini; Valéry Genniges; Tetsuya Kimura; Ayako Ito and Jun Kondo.

– **1.1 Disclosures of conflicts of interest**

THE CHAIRMAN asked the members if they had any potential conflicts of interest.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting on 11 May 2016 in Montreal

THE CHAIRMAN drew the members' attention to the minutes of the previous Executive Committee meeting, held in Montreal on 11 May 2016. The minutes were very full; they had been circulated, and he was not aware of any comments on them. If there were comments, he would be happy to have them. If not, were the members happy that they were a true record of what had taken place in Montreal in May? If so, he would sign them.

DECISION

Minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee on 11 May 2016 approved and duly signed.

3. Director General's report

THE CHAIRMAN referred to the very comprehensive document in the members' files; it was one of the longest Director General's reports he could remember.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that it was a long report because it included all the directors' reports. Normally, not everybody attended the Executive Committee meeting, but all the directors were present that day because of the think tank the previous day, so they would be happy to answer the members' questions later on that morning.

Starting with the issue of the US Senate, the members would see the exchange of letters. Before the Olympic Games, WADA had received a letter asking a number of questions, and had responded to it. WADA had then been asked to hold a discussion with the staffers from the committee. Mr Howman (the previous Director General) had had a conversation with them, he himself had had a conversation with them and the President had had a conversation with them after the Olympic Games. He had spoken to them again the previous Friday, as they had wanted an update on the hacking situation, and WADA had provided it to them.

On UNESCO, there were still about 12 countries that should be encouraged to ratify the convention. The monitoring of the convention was clearly very important. WADA would certainly like UNESCO to take a more forceful approach in the way in which that was being done, and that was something WADA would raise again at the next conference of parties. Although there was not much hope that UNESCO would be taking any strong measures in any cases of non-compliance; nevertheless, WADA would keep pushing for that.

Regarding the World Customs Organization (WCO), WADA hoped to have a French officer seconded there relatively quickly. The authorities had been looking for the right profile, and had been talking to WCO to identify the right person. Hopefully, there would be somebody posted in Brussels relatively soon, which would be a great help.

WADA was moving forward. There would be a new Chief Investigative Officer, Mr Günter Younger, starting on 1 October; Mr Bouchard had joined WADA and would be the Government Relations Advisor; Mr Donzé would be starting on 1 October as the new Chief Operating Officer in Montreal; and Mr Sieveking had become the new Legal Affairs Director, and he had a lot of work on his plate.

On the legal side, the members had the report in their files. He would not go into all of the cases. If the members had any questions, Mr Sieveking would answer them.

In relation to the NADOs, there were many countries in need of help. He highlighted the good cooperation with existing and more developed NADOs that were reaching out and helping those that needed help to develop. That was a good system and it was working very well, and he thanked all those NADOs providing assistance, because it took time and resources, and it was very important that WADA have that kind of mentoring system in order to improve.

WADA had concerns with a number of the jurisdictions highlighted, including Azerbaijan and Argentina. The latter clearly needed to improve its system relatively quickly, in particular

in light of the upcoming Youth Olympic Games. As far as Brazil was concerned, WADA had not yet solved all of the issues, and was planning to go back to Brazil to have an audit of the system before the end of the year to see that things were falling into place as they should. WADA had been told that Brazil was actually working on establishing the tribunal that needed to be established, and hopefully that would be done by the deadline.

In the field of education, the partnership programme was moving forward. WADA hoped to have a document delivered by the middle of the next year. Seventeen social science research projects had been received in total and recommendations would be made to the members at the November meeting.

Communications had been very busy over the past few months before, during and after the Olympic and Paralympic Games. During the Games, there had been very good Athlete Outreach programmes at the Villages. The booth had been full every time he had visited, and it had been great to see the athletes present and getting the right information. That had been a real success.

WADA continued to work on the Athlete Biological Passport, which remained one of its most important tools in the fight against doping in sport. A new blood stability score tool had been developed which would allow for longer transport of blood samples, and that would be very helpful, making it possible to have a passport in place in some regions of the world in which there might not have been laboratories capable of analysing in the right period of time.

The new ADAMS project remained a priority, even more so in light of the Fancy Bear activities. Unfortunately, WADA had had to change its course of action and its provider, because mid-project WADA had decided to conduct an audit to see whether the progress made was in accordance with the contract and expectations, and the result had not been satisfactory. Rather than persist with the wrong provider, WADA had decided to adopt a different strategy. All the energy and resources in IT were currently concentrated on dealing with the hacking issue, but the New ADAMS remained a high priority, and in particular a number of enhancements in the login procedure, etc. The consequence was that WADA had had to write off some of the investment in the project, which was totally unsatisfactory from a management point of view; however, rather than persisting in the wrong direction, it had been deemed the right thing to do.

WADA was finalising its testing figures, which would be available relatively soon. There would be a TDSSA Expert Group meeting the following month in Montreal and, on that occasion, all the figures linked to the implementation of the technical documents would be reviewed.

As far as the Independent Observer report was concerned, there would be a draft fairly soon and it would be sent to the IOC for review. He hoped to be able to publish it before the end of October.

Finally, the members would see the reports from the various regional offices, which were very much involved in RADO work and work within their regions. It was a challenge for some of them to ensure that their region remained engaged, particularly in Africa, where a lot of work was being done to ensure that anti-doping stayed at the top of the list of priorities in some countries. The European office was different, as it had been focusing on IF work and the

partnership programme, which was a kind of pre-compliance programme. That had been well received, and a lot of work had been done. That summarised the first part of the report.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

– **3.1 Think tank – update from previous day, conclusions and way forward**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that most of the members had been present the previous day, so he would not go into great detail. He summarised a number of points from the discussions the previous day. The members had agreed that there was a role for WADA to play as a centralised Code-compliance monitoring body, that it had to come up with sanctions

that were proportionate to the level of non-compliance, that WADA should be enhancing its investigation activities, and it needed a comprehensive whistleblower programme that was broader than just a policy. WADA needed to focus on an improved anti-doping control process, in particular by ensuring that doping control officers received proper training and regular auditing. The participants had discussed the laboratories, their accreditation process, the fact that, during the audit visit, there were elements that needed to be looked at very carefully, including some of the instruments being used there, and the debate on the number of laboratories, whether there should be a new system with super laboratories versus regular laboratories, and so on. That was for further discussion, but all that had been put on the table, along with the need for governments to ensure that proper legislation was in place. Last but not least, further discussion was to take place on the overall governance of WADA.

He wished to tell the members that morning what was already ongoing from the discussion. Clearly, the issue of sanctions for non-compliance, the idea of having a scale of sanctions, was work that was ongoing and had been taken on by the Compliance Review Committee following the previous Foundation Board meeting and the request from the athletes in particular, so that was ongoing work and, in November, he would come with a framework for those sanctions to be discussed hopefully at that time. The enhanced investigations program was also happening. As discussed in May, WADA had recruited a chief investigation person, Mr Günter Younger, who was a police officer from Germany and a former Interpol member, and would start on 1 October. There would then be more recruitment in that department, in particular an analyst, who was needed to work on the information available, whether it be of a scientific nature or from general intelligence. Obviously, WADA was continuing its relationship with Interpol. It was also still in discussion with the French Government to have an officer posted at the WCO.

The whistleblower programme was also something that was on the cards. WADA was already working on it, and there would be a report on the progress made later that morning, and certainly for November the aim was to have a first whistleblower policy adopted. It would not be the final version, as it was something that would evolve and improve as experience was gained, but WADA was certainly implementing the framework already.

Following on from the successful think tank, the next step was really to agree on a timeline and a process going forward. It had been the first in a series of think tanks. WADA was waiting for stakeholder proposals. On 8 October there would be an Olympic summit, and WADA would wait to hear from the sport bodies, from governments, athletes and NADOs on whatever proposals they had, and would then have a discussion on all of that in November at the Foundation Board meeting, after which it would have to agree on the process and way forward. He felt that the meeting the previous day had been very constructive, with a very open discussion, and he had been very happy to hear the IOC and the IOC representative indicating IOC support to WADA and the fact that the IOC was willing to reinforce the independence and regulatory power of WADA. It had been a good day that was fruitful for the fight against doping in sport, and WADA should build on that as it went forward.

The next item he wished to talk about, and it was not in his report, since things changed so quickly, was the hacking of ADAMS by a group called Fancy Bear, which he did not find fancy at all. It was important to understand what had happened. The word 'hacking' was being used. In fact, what the criminals had managed to do was steal the passwords of certain users of the system, and had entered into those specific accounts. Just to be clear, as he spoke, the indication from the ongoing investigation was that there was no penetration into the database of the system or the system itself. The hackers had entered specific accounts using a login and password that they had stolen from the e-mail accounts of specific users. The accounts had been created for the Olympic Games; therefore, they dealt with athletes who had been in Rio, not all the athletes in the database, but a fairly high number of top-level athletes. WADA had taken the matter extremely seriously, was working with the law enforcement authorities in Canada and the USA (the RCMP and the FBI), had hired a specialised anti-hacking company recommended by the FBI and the RCMP called Mandiant/FireEye, and it was working on that full-time to make sure no other elements were being compromised and that WADA was being protected from any further attacks that might occur. WADA had to be very prudent in terms of what it said, but he would report and update the members as more elements came from the forensic investigation. WADA had been communicating with the athletes; there was a notification/communications banner on ADAMS,

and WADA had written individually to all the athletes who had been exposed on the website of the criminals. WADA had also reached out to all the IFs and the NADOs every time there had been a release, and he thought that everybody had been grateful for that. WADA had also been in touch with regulators and data protection authorities in various countries to make sure that they understood the issue. It was a complex issue, clearly something that was diverting energy and time from the real job and what had to be done, but obviously WADA had to deal with it in a most serious fashion.

– **3.2 McLaren independent investigation report – update on consequences**

MR NIGGLI stated that, despite what the members might have read in the press, WADA had spoken to Mr McLaren, who had confirmed that he still believed he could complete his report by the end of October. He had also indicated that the winter IFs should receive information from him earlier, so that they could start their own process, hopefully before they got into the winter season. It was his priority to get that out to them and then complete the report. The report had generated a lot of comments and discussions over the past few months. WADA should not lose the focus, which was that it was an issue with Russia, and WADA still had to deal with that issue. It was a very important issue, and the fact that Russia had been cheating everybody for a number of years needed to be addressed. That was the key focus, and it probably should have been the focus of the discussion over the past months too. Unfortunately, the discussion had been on trying to attack WADA and blame the anti-doping system, and that had not been helpful. The members should bear in mind that WADA did not operate in a vacuum. WADA was made up of governments and the Olympic Movement, and the Olympic Movement had been around the table from day one, and had supported the work of WADA and the revised World Anti-Doping Code, and it had been paradoxical to see how the entire anti-doping system had been questioned after the McLaren report. He did not think that the system was the issue; the issue was how the system was being practised by some, and the members should not forget the fact that the system had been cheated. One could design a great system but, if those applying it were cheating, it was difficult to achieve success. He also wished to put on the record that WADA should stop having the discussion as to whether it could have produced the report earlier. The person who had had the information about the link between the state and the laboratory was Mr Rodchenkov. The Stepanovs, the whistleblowers, with whom WADA had had earlier contact, had had no idea as to what had been going on, and had cooperated fully with the Pound inquiry. Had they had information about that at that time, they would have let Mr Pound know and Mr Pound would have reported on it, but they did not have that information, as they had not known about it. Mr Rodchenkov, who had been heard three times by Mr Pound and his commission, had never ever said that at the time. He had actually said the opposite, and he had started talking only after leaving Russia, several months later, (to the New York Times in May this year) at the time of the WADA Foundation Board meeting. Frankly, there was nothing that WADA could have done. Even if it had started something in November 2015, it would have got no information. WADA had had to wait for Mr Rodchenkov to decide that he wanted to talk. Once he had talked, of course WADA had done its job. That was the situation. It had been a very difficult time for WADA and, if it was working so well with relatively modest resources, it was because WADA relied on very dedicated people. Most of the people had felt that it was very unfair to receive such criticism. WADA could always improve matters; that had been discussed the previous day at the think tank, and he thought that everybody was committed to doing the right thing and moving forward. He looked forward to the process he had described and achieving some kind of improvement, something that could be accepted by all parties.

– **3.3 Independent testing authority update**

Dealt with in the Director General's report.

– **3.4 Whistleblower programme update**

Dealt with in the Director General's report.

– **3.5 2019 World Conference on Doping in Sport and Olympic Summit proposal for 2017 World Conference**

Dealt with in the Director General's report.

– **3.6 Interim Rio 2016 Olympic and Paralympic Games update**

Dealt with in the Director General's report.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was not sure whether, at the sport meeting that morning, anybody had been welcomed outside. He had been welcomed by Russian television, and the question he had been asked was what he thought about the hacking. The answer was that it was entirely wrong and completely unacceptable that athletes' medical records should be put into the public domain, and it was entirely unhelpful. Then, of course, the question from the Russian point of view was whether it was a charter that allowed people to cheat. He had explained that the TUE system had been developed in the early nineties, it was there to allow athletes who needed medication to be able to take part in sport and it was not a vehicle for cheating. When the members left the meeting, it would be helpful if everybody said the same thing to the gentleman from Russian television. There was clearly much interest, as that was being done to embarrass the organisation and the system that WADA had had for many years.

PROFESSOR ERDENER thanked Mr Niggli for his very comprehensive report, which covered many of WADA's activities. He wished to refer to three different items, first the McLaren report, as the Olympic Movement was awaiting the final part of the report, especially to identify individual athletes. He thought it would be done by 20 October, and he wanted to provide some information. He thought everybody knew that two different commissions had been established by the IOC president. There was the Canivet commission and the disciplinary commission related to the subject, chaired by Mr Denis Oswald. Another point he wished to mention was related to the Athlete Biological Passport. The Olympic Movement believed that the longer stability of Athlete Biological Passport samples would help anti-doping programmes and it strongly supported the entry of all TUEs in ADAMS. In relation to standards and harmonisation, especially the Technical Document for Sport-Specific Analysis, there had been an increase in specific analyses but a 5% decrease in the number of urine samples collected. What was the reason for that? Was it because of more expensive analyses or a reduction in the budget?

MS WIDVEY thanked Mr Niggli for his very good report, and thanked the Chairman for being so clear when it came to hacking and what was actually going on. It was very important to stand up and be clear in that regard. She congratulated all those who had participated in the think tank the previous day. She had received a very good report that it had been very fruitful and that there had been very good discussions. It was important to underline that Europe needed a very strong and independent WADA. It was a special time and there was an opportunity for WADA to strengthen its position and be sure that the authorities and the sports representatives of WADA stood shoulder to shoulder. She kindly asked the IOC vice-president to clarify that there was a commitment to WADA from the IOC as well. The idea was to strengthen WADA as an independent body in years to come, so there should be no discussion outside in the media afterwards. It should be made clear that everybody would work to ensure a strong WADA, and WADA should be the only global organisation responsible for monitoring and standard-setting in the anti-doping field. That was very important. All activities should be based on principles of independence, good governance, transparency and equity between the public authorities and the sport movement. It was also important to state that the public authorities committed to work together to develop the concrete proposals with a view to improving the effectiveness of WADA. There was a lot that could be done better, and the bodies should work together and try to strengthen WADA as an independent organisation. She would come back to that at the November meeting; there had been a discussion that morning that the authorities would like to start that work, try to be a little bit more concrete and come up with some proposals, and then there could be a discussion, probably in the meeting, to see how to take it from there. If there was any kind of discussion outside in the media, she was glad that the President had made it clear that WADA should move forward, and an important step had been taken in that regard to show that it was an independent organisation and WADA should continue to do that in the future. She encouraged

the IOC representatives at the meeting to be sure and make the commitment to stay with WADA so as to avoid any further discussion.

MR RICCI BITTI noted that his intervention was coming at the right time, even though he felt that he represented the IFs more than he represented the IOC, although the IFs formed a very important part of the IOC. He congratulated Mr Niggli on his first performance as the Director General. He could not say much more than that, because he had been involved in the recruitment of Mr Niggli, and so he was in a conflict of interest. He thanked Mr Niggli for his report. He had only three remarks, the first of which was a very small one about the UNESCO convention. Compliance and sanctions had been referred to the previous day at the think tank. He had intervened about 45 times on the matter over his 14 or 15 years' service in the organisation and at three Executive Committee meetings per year. The sport organisations believed that, more than the signature of the UNESCO convention, the implementation was important. It was necessary to know not only who had signed the UNESCO convention (which did not mean very much in practical terms), but also who had a law on doping, who had tackled the legislation side of things, who had tackled the regulatory side, who had a NADO or operated under a RADO, and who had relations with law enforcement agencies to tackle all the criminal issues. Those were the questions he wanted to ask for each country. That information, if WADA were able to collect it, would be very useful also to the government partners.

He moved to the next point on relations between the IOC as a stakeholder and WADA, not the governments, because their relations were very good. The IOC believed that the fight against doping in sport could not be successful without the cooperation of the governments. That had to be made clear. The IOC had raised the idea of improving the structure and organisation of WADA, and some of the ideas were not entirely clear, as there would have to be a practical discussion, only with a view to reinforcing WADA and not to weakening it. That had been a very important statement by the IOC president following the IAAF crisis, which was the first serious problem faced with Russia and, at the June IOC summit, the IOC president, in agreement with all the people attending (he had also been present), had said that something had to be done, and the clear message had been to reinforce WADA. The work had not started, so there could be no speculation, but that had been the spirit. Unfortunately, the McLaren report had occurred at that time and the Russian case had blown up a little bit, and that kind of thing was the best food for the media. It had been a matter of timing, and the McLaren report had not been appreciated by the IOC because of its timing (10 days before the Olympic Games), and the aim of the report had been to investigate the winter Olympic Games in Sochi. The timing had not been ideal, and there had been an issue in relation to the remit of all the bodies involved. Those were the two items that had been matters for discussion and upon which there had been different views. The different views had to be respected. The solutions had been different. The IOC had decided to put the matter of eligibility to the IFs, the IFs had acted according to their view and their conscience, and some IFs (such as track and field and weightlifting) had banned all their Russian athletes. Some IFs (such as rowing) had banned some Russian athletes, and some IFs (such as tennis and archery) had believed that, since their athletes had not been living in Russia and had been tested outside Russia, it would have been very unfair to punish them when they had had nothing to do with the system. There had been a difference of opinion and a proposal, and it had been bad timing, and the media speculation had been the successful part of the period. To transform that into the IOC not liking WADA as he had heard the previous day at the think tank was absolutely unfair, untrue and completely inaccurate. The IOC reiterated its support to WADA, but it had had different views on some items, and that was something that WADA had to respect. The IOC had to manage the Olympic Games, and it was no easy task to do that. The IOC had done its job, but that had had nothing to do with WADA. Coming back to the idea of the IOC president of an independent testing authority, WADA had to work out what could be done. That was the situation and he had extended his intervention just to clarify matters to the government colleagues. He welcomed the think tank report and also welcomed the new investigating unit, and WADA had to discuss how it would interact, as a level of independence should be provided to the unit from the general organisation of WADA.

MR ESTANGUET thanked WADA for the think tank the previous day and for involving the athletes at that level. It was great that he and his colleagues had been able to take part. He believed that athlete involvement was key to the process. He asked for more information regarding the next steps, the outcome of the think tank, solutions and the calendar for the

next meetings, because some key points had been addressed the previous day. It would be interesting to see what the next steps would be.

The athlete community had a number of concerns about security and the recent hacking attacks. It had been made clear that it had not been an attack on the WADA system itself but, at the end of the day, for athletes it was very sad. It was a big concern to see personal data made public, and at a time when WADA wanted to launch a whistleblower programme and ask athletes to share information, how could they trust that such information would not be revealed? It had been said that the hackers had had access to a very limited area, but he was a little concerned and thought that WADA should address the matter strongly, probably with government support. It was key that WADA also have the possibility to tell athletes around the world that it would be secured shortly.

The next topic was the whistleblower programme. It had been discussed the previous day and there was a strong belief among the athletes that there was a key way to improve the fight against doping in sport through that programme, and the athletes wanted to be part of the process. He believed that WADA needed to reinforce dialogue between the athletes and WADA. Many athletes wanted to be part of the solution, wanted to be involved and were ready to share information, but WADA needed to define the steps between being just an athlete and maybe becoming a whistleblower. There were many steps in between, when athletes could share their concerns, and small pieces of information, and it was a big opportunity to improve the system. He really believed that everybody had the responsibility to involve stakeholders more and find a way to communicate better with the athletes.

On the new ADAMS, the matter had been discussed for a long time. He had read in the report that WADA had some trouble with the new ADAMS. Again, there were huge expectations among the athletes regarding making the platform athlete-friendly and easy to use. He had read that WADA would split the different faces of the new ADAMS with different partners, and he was just concerned about the role, experience and athlete-friendly approach, and asked that it be done with the athletes in mind. There should also be a link to the Prohibited List on the new platform.

MR SHEPANDE joined the previous speakers in congratulating the Director General on a very elaborate and comprehensive report. He wished to talk about the position of Africa with regard to the new developments in anti-doping, and said that Africa supported the independence of WADA and believed that WADA should be the only organisation responsible for monitoring and standard-setting in the field of anti-doping. The African governments were resolute in their support to WADA, based on the principles of independence, good governance, transparency, accountability, equity and equality between the public authorities and the sport movement. For Africa, the position was that it supported all the interventions made to make WADA more independent, eradicate doping and ensure a fair and level playing field for all.

His other submission was that, as WADA planned ahead, it needed to take into account some of the challenges currently faced by Africa, particularly the absence of laboratories in Africa. There had been two laboratories in Africa, namely South Africa and Tunisia and both had been closed. The previous year, the African Games had been held in Congo Brazzaville, and had presented a huge challenge in terms of where to send samples for testing. Finally, a solution had been found; but, in that process, the best service had not been ensured because of the lack of laboratories. As discussed, it was necessary to find mechanisms as to how a continent such as Africa might get some help in that regard.

MS SCOTT echoed the comments made about the think tank the previous day, the candid nature of it and the honest discourse that had taken place. She really appreciated that. It had been heartening to hear some of the remarks and especially the recommendations coming out of that meeting. Mr Niggli had spoken in his report about some of the challenges and difficulties for Mr Niggli and WADA recently, and she reiterated that it had been particularly distressing for the athlete community. The public undermining of WADA had not been constructive and it had been damaging. The athletes relied very heavily on WADA. Anti-doping was a number-one priority for athletes, and they really relied on the credibility, strength, autonomy and good work that the organisation did. To have the kind of discourse that had happened, particularly in the wake of uncovering possibly the most sophisticated state-sponsored doping programme ever, had been discouraging. She had been heartened to hear the previous day that there was renewed commitment to working together, that the

biggest and most powerful stakeholder was supportive of WADA, and she thought that that was something that had to be communicated to the athlete community as well.

She had a question about the McLaren report and the next results to be coming out in October. Was WADA preparing or thinking about issuing another statement of recommendations to the winter IFs? A lot of the winter sport athletes she had been hearing from were concerned about the results, and what WADA was going to recommend to the winter IFs. She also had a question about the nature of the IOC commission that had been created, the Canivet commission, and why it had been developed? The WADA Athlete Committee had been very strong in its encouragement of an independent commission, and she was curious about the nature of it.

MR GODKIN thanked the Director General for his very comprehensive report. The Executive Committee had met via teleconference on 18 July, in the wake of the McLaren report, and at that time the Executive Committee had put out a very firm statement. Since that time, there had been a lot of narrative about the response, and much of it had been very critical of WADA. That narrative had continued; there had been more comments over the past couple of days, and the theme of criticism of WADA had been extended. It seemed to him that WADA had a very ambitious programme, it was a critical time, and it had never been more critical that the solidarity of the Executive Committee be very pronounced. He would very much welcome some expressions of solidarity from the Executive Committee given the tasks ahead.

MS WIDVEY commented on the independent testing authority, the whistleblower programme and point 3.5. In relation to the testing authority, Europe supported the idea behind it and thought that the creation of such an authority should not compromise the role of WADA as the only international regulator in the anti-doping field which took full responsibility for standard-setting and monitoring of activities. It was important to underline that. The public authorities had come up with the names of people who would like to participate in the group, and it was a surprise to hear that the IOC had not come up with any.

THE CHAIRMAN intervened to say that the IOC had provided the names the previous day.

MS WIDVEY referred to the whistleblower programme and the importance of WADA developing clear and transparent internal procedures and guidelines on action to be taken in response to information provided by whistleblowers. That was very important as well. On item 3.5 on the World Conference on Doping in Sport and the proposal for an extraordinary World Conference on Doping in Sport in 2017, Europe thought that, since there was no information available on the objectives and potential agenda for the conference, it would not support it. There was no information on its purpose, so Europe would not support it and thought that the focus should be on the conference in 2019.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL thanked Professor Erdener for his comments. The one that called for a response from him was that relating to the TDSSA and the reduction. There would be a meeting of the group in October, and it would review the figures at that time. The idea had always been that what counted was quality and not numbers, and some reduction might be expected. The group would look at whether it was a matter of money or better programme organisation.

He thanked Ms Widvey for her comments. She had mentioned a few points that would be dealt with later in the agenda. He had been about to mention that the names had been provided by the IOC: Mr Juan Antonio Samaranch, Professor Erdener, Mr Kasper, Mr Estanguet and Mr Ricci Bitti, so those would be the people in that group. That list had been received from the IOC on 18 September.

On the whistleblower programme, there would be a report soon, but WADA had an ongoing process. Of course, it wanted to involve the athletes, and it probably wanted to involve the whistleblowers themselves in some way, to benefit from their experience. WADA needed to get things moving so it would have something on the table in November. That would not be the end of the process. WADA also had some social science research projects on that topic, so was putting the first stone in the foundations, but the work would take longer. WADA needed something in place that included the technical aspects, having a proper website and also a programme defining what would be done with the information and what WADA could and could not do, as it was important to manage expectations, and WADA was not a law

enforcement authority. WADA also had to work with the governments to see what could be done at their level to ensure better protection and so on, as there were lots of things that governments could do that WADA could not do.

He thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for his comments. The table would be put together. The answers to the first two points could be found relatively easily. The relationship with law enforcement authorities would take more time, as that was sometimes a question of maintaining a personal relationship with organisations, but he would mention the matter to Mr Younger, and they would try to map that out and see what they could do. The other points would be looked into. On the timing of the McLaren report, obviously, when one went into such investigations, one did not know what the results would be, and all sports, including summer sports, had been involved at the time, and that had made the situation very different to that originally anticipated.

He answered Mr Estanguet's question about the next steps in relation to the think tank. Some of the items were already being moved forward; for others, it was important to collect the different ideas from the stakeholders and agree on a process and timeline in November, leading up to a World Conference on Doping in Sport, bearing in mind that it would be necessary to make some changes at different regulatory levels. It was important to agree on the process. Everything that had been discussed at the think tank would be kept in mind and structured, and then the discussions would take place.

The security of ADAMS was a major concern. He totally agreed with and shared the concern of the athletes. Fancy Bear had also hacked the US Democratic Party the previous week in the USA, and he was sure that the Democratic Party had a lot more money than WADA did to ensure security. It was necessary to be realistic. As of that day, the system had not been compromised. The hackers had got information by stealing e-mails from people. People using the system had to be careful about where they left their passwords. WADA had immediately changed the password reset feature so that, if somebody wished to reset their password, they could no longer do it without contacting the administrator, so that could no longer happen and was being controlled. Obviously, those who forgot their e-mails would have to call. WADA would then work to improve the login system. WADA could provide as much security as possible in the IT world. WADA was putting together everything that was feasible. It would entail serious costs to the organisation. The same would be done for the whistleblower system. That was part of WADA's concern, making sure that everything would be secure.

In relation to the new ADAMS, IT was always a challenge, and it was not satisfactory for WADA either. It was a challenge from a management point of view. The reason WADA was moving from the initial idea of redoing the whole system to working piece by piece was because it would give WADA a lot more control over the development of the system. Instead of having an 18-month project with an audit in the middle, it allowed for three-month projects one after the other and a lot more control over what was going on. WADA had decided that the trust in its IT provider had diminished to such an extent that WADA wanted much more control over what was going on. That would be welcomed by the athletes, because they would see that things would improve relatively quickly one after the other, but there would be results in a shorter time framework, as soon as WADA was done with Fancy Bear.

WADA was well aware of the challenges in Africa. The regional office was fully involved in the work done there, and certainly WADA would continue to work with the governments and the continent to try to find solutions. It was very important to keep Africa engaged in the fight against doping in sport as much as possible.

He thanked Ms Scott for her comment. As far as the McLaren report was concerned, it was an independent report, so he was not exactly sure what Professor McLaren would do. His hope was that, for individual cases, he would go to the IF with a package for each athlete with the evidence that he had on each of them so that the IF could then deal with the issue. WADA would certainly be prepared to give guidance to the IF if there were further steps to be taken, such as reanalysis, and then they would have to deal with result management, as would the IOC depending on the circumstances. The mission of Professor McLaren was to put together the different evidence for each athlete. That was what had been done with the IAAF at the end of the Pound report when WADA had handed over the names of the various athletes.

He thanked Mr Godkin for his comment.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he thought that Professor McLaren's mandate was to report to him, after which WADA would publish the report. He thought that the questionable samples were in the hands of the IOC and the WADA investigators would be looking at them. Thereafter, there was a process within the IOC to deal with the results of that. Was that the case?

DR BUDGETT responded that they were being analysed, and the IOC was in close contact with those involved in the McLaren report, so things were progressing.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the technical group that had been working on the testing authority to determine how in fact that could be made to work would meet again in the next two days. Following that, the major decision the policy group had to make was, if it was going to work, who would actually do it. The group from the IOC had been named. Mr Ricci Bitti had said that he regarded himself as qualified to take part in that discussion. The group would meet and get back to WADA with its decisions. The whistleblower policy had been dealt with. As far as the World Conference on Doping in Sport was concerned, the suggestion had made by the IOC president. WADA was in a process, and its process had started with the think tank the previous day. There was an upcoming Olympic summit, and there would be a whole range of contributions made to how the Code or WADA could operate in a better way, and it might end up with a world conference, and that would certainly be on the agenda for the Foundation Board meeting in November. He thought that the discussion had been extremely helpful.

MS SCOTT said that she had asked about the Canivet commission.

MR RICCI BITTI responded that he was not representing the IOC, but he had reported on what he had understood. The idea was that the IOC had two commissions, one of which was the disciplinary commission, which took care of individual cases. The other was the Canivet commission, the aim of which was to take care of the global problems.

PROFESSOR ERDENER added that the Canivet commission would examine or investigate the situation in parallel with the McLaren report from the IOC perspective. For disciplinary matters, there was another commission for individual athletes.

MR GODKIN wondered if there was any particular response to the questions raised in terms of the solidarity of the Executive Committee in relation to the comments made the previous day. He wondered whether there was a particular view from the sport movement in support of that, or any comments at all.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if Mr Godkin was referring to what had happened at the think tank the previous day.

MR GODKIN noted the importance of solidarity within the Executive Committee and, since the Executive Committee had collectively put forward the statement on 18 July, there had been a variation of positions and lots of criticism of WADA. It seemed to him it would be very beneficial for the ongoing solidarity of the group that everybody was clear that they were working together, and there should be an expression of support to that end.

THE CHAIRMAN responded that he had taken the view that the response to Ms Widvey's question by Mr Ricci Bitti actually covered that, that WADA worked together, was solid and moved forward.

MR MIZUOCHI stated that he wished to comment on the item on Rio. After the revelation of an unprecedented case of state-sponsored doping in sport, not only the sport community but also the entire world was paying attention to the issue of anti-doping. He thanked WADA, the IOC, the IPC and other stakeholders in leading the Rio Olympic Games to success. When Japan's Prime Minister, Mr Abe, had been in Rio for the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games, he had had a bilateral meeting with Mr Bach, and they had spent much of their time talking about anti-doping and Mr Bach had requested Japan's cooperation in strengthening the anti-doping regime. He himself had attended the closing ceremony of the Paralympic Games and had experienced first-hand the anti-doping movement at the Outreach booth. Clean, doping-free sports were key to the success of the 2020 Tokyo Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, and he had set up a taskforce to study the building of a legal framework that would facilitate intelligence work and testing and analysis systems that would be required at the Tokyo Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. In terms of preparations, he wished to focus on educating athletes and their support entourage, educating schoolchildren and

training high-quality doping control officers and analysis personnel so that they would be capable of handling anti-doping events. Finally, he would like to double Japan's anti-doping budget for the next fiscal year, to develop the necessary research and development work, to acquire state-of-the-art analytical methods and to ensure clean Olympic and Paralympic Games. It was important that the world carry out anti-doping programmes everywhere. Japan was determined to work hard and effectively and he hoped it could count on everybody for their continued efforts.

THE CHAIRMAN observed that he did not think that anybody in that room would not be delighted to hear of the creation of the task force for education and training of the necessary personnel in Japan, and he was particularly attracted by Mr Mizuochi's willingness to double the budget.

DECISION

Director General's report noted.

4. Operations/management

– 4.1 New WADA vice-chair – election process

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL informed the members that the first item was the process for the election of the WADA vice-chair, who would replace Dr Stofile. He had no comments to make. The members would see the deadlines. It concerned mainly the public authorities, which would have to nominate candidates for that position.

MR SHEPANDE said that he wanted to discuss the issue of replacing the late Dr Stofile. WADA had really lost a gallant son of Africa, who had contributed immensely to the transformation of sport on the continent, and in particular in the field of anti-doping. As a region, consultations were being carried out with colleagues and ministers of sport would be meeting in Nairobi in October to discuss the matter and look at the way forward.

DECISION

New WADA vice-chair update noted.

– 4.2 Standing committee chairs 2017-2019

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that there were four positions and four candidates, so it should be an easy election, and the Executive Committee would be required to give formal approval. After the election had taken place, WADA would work with the chairs on the appointment of the members of the committees for 2017.

THE CHAIRMAN referred to maintaining the convention that two chairs should be held by representatives of the public authorities and two should be held by representatives of the sport movement. Were the members formally happy to adopt the nominations?

MS WIDVEY said that Europe supported the proposed process. However, she proposed that the chairs of the Finance and Administration Committee and Health, Medical and Research Committee alternate between sport and governments so that they were not simultaneously held by either the public authorities or the sport movement. She reminded the members about when Ms Fourneyron had been elected as the chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee; she had been elected for only two years. She therefore suggested that the Finance and Administration Committee chair be appointed not for the whole period but only for two years. The objective was just to be more sure that a representative of the public authorities and the sport movement was chairing committees at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any observations on that. He did not think that it was statutory. It was a convention, and he was not prepared to look into the future. He thought it was important to maintain the convention and it was important to have the chairs in place, as they had a major say in the composition of their own sub-committees. Were the members happy to accept the four names? He noted Ms Widvey's suggestion.

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Ms Fourneyron. He mentioned that the friends from the government were not enjoying the stability that the sport movement enjoyed. Ms Fourneyron had got into the job very quickly, and he recognised her quality and sensitivity in dealing with the difficult task. He thanked her very much.

THE CHAIRMAN said that one of the problems of writing a nice letter was that people wanted to thank one too often, because clearly WADA would be doing so again in November, but she was still the chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee until the end of the year, so he asked Ms Fourneyron to stay with WADA until then.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he had spoken in response to Ms Widvey's intervention.

THE CHAIRMAN noted the need for stability in those appointments at that time. Those at the think tank the previous day would remember the quite substantial discussion on funding, and that would have a knock-on effect on many things WADA planned to do if it could arrange a funding exercise that gave rather more resources.

DECISION

Proposed standing committee chairs 2017-2019 approved.

– **4.3 Standing committee memberships 2017**

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL reminded everybody that the deadline for the nomination of members of the committees was 7 October.

DECISION

Update on standing committee memberships 2017 noted.

5. Finance

– **5.1 Finance and Administration Committee Chair report**

THE CHAIRMAN noted that finance was becoming an ever-more complicated issue, but it was in very good hands and he was happy to pass the floor to Mr Ricci Bitti.

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that he would be very brief. He would provide a similar report in November. The members had received the report on the Finance and Administration Committee meeting in Lausanne on 19 July. The committee had discussed all the items to which he would refer, including contributions, special investigations and the review of the six-month statement of accounts. The most important item had been a long and extensive discussion on what to recommend for the 2017 budget, and the 2018 and 2019 forecasts.

DECISION

Finance and Administration Committee Chair report noted.

– **5.2 Government/IOC contributions**

MR RICCI BITTI informed the members that there had been a positive contribution figure at the time of the Finance and Administration Committee meeting in July, but it was better to talk about current contributions, which were slightly lower than they had been at the same time the previous year: 96.59% of total contributions. The IOC matched the public authority contributions, as the members were aware. The figure was a little lower because of some outstanding contributions from important countries, one of which was his country, and he did not know why it paid only 70% or 80% and not 100%, but that was the reason for the amount, which was not bad: 96.59% of total contributions.

Additional contributions had decreased dramatically following a kind of decision or recommendation made two years previously and which had proven to be a wise one, given recent events. The recommendation by the Finance and Administration Committee had been to give up the Russian contribution of 300,000 Euros per annum. The committee had felt that it would not be fair or appropriate to receive that money, and had stopped receipt of funds, but the impact on the accounts had to be recorded. For that reason, WADA had received only

291,762 dollars in total that year, and he thanked Japan, Kuwait, Australia and Lausanne for all their extra contributions.

DECISION

Government/IOC contributions update noted.

– 5.3 Special Investigations Fund

MR RICCI BITTI referred to the Special Investigations Fund. The issue had been very well discussed at length, including the fact that WADA would need more funding for its activities, and whatever could be done to improve WADA's performance with not so much money was a matter to be kept on the table for future discussions, because WADA sought to do a great deal through its activities and did not want to cut any, and it wanted to increase investigation activities, although the money was not there. He thanked those who were contributing to the Special Investigations Fund, because it alleviated the situation to some extent.

The special fund for research allowed WADA to have a standard budget, or a slightly lower budget for three years at least, and the total amount was 11,678,450 dollars, so it was a relatively significant sum to be spent over the next three years. The Special Investigations Fund was much smaller, and more recent, and WADA had received 445,359 dollars with 200,000 committed, so that came to a total of 645,359 dollars, which was better than a kick in the face. He hoped that the IOC would match those funds, so WADA would be able to count on 1.29 million dollars. There was no idea about how it would be distributed over the following year. However, the revised budget shows an allocation of this special fund in the amount of USD 125,000 to be applied against additional investigations to be done in the latter part of 2016.

DECISION

Special Investigations Fund update noted.

– 5.4 2016 quarterly accounts

MR RICCI BITTI said that the members would see the quarterly accounts to 30 June in their papers. There was nothing to say other than that the accounts were sometimes misleading. There was a profit of 13.2 million dollars in theory but WADA has to spend that money over the next six months. It was not very significant, as WADA normally receives the contributions in the first part of the year and spent during the entire year.

The deferred income was worth noting. It referred to various funds; the Special Research Fund and the Investigations Fund, the ADAMS fund from Korea and RUSADA assistance. What this latter reference meant was that, after WADA had issued the non-compliance status to Russia, there were a lot of expenses involved in supporting RUSADA to start again or do what was necessary to become compliant. In the meantime, WADA invoiced RUSADA, so it was money coming from RUSADA to WADA to pay for what WADA supplied to RUSADA, and covered the international experts which WADA had coordinated. Some expenses had also been deferred for the following year.

The ADO symposium was on budget; it was one of WADA's major activities and it had been very successful.

DECISION

2016 quarterly accounts noted.

– 5.5 Revised budget 2016

MR RICCI BITTI said that the members would see the information in their papers. He had mentioned only the very significant variances, the first being the assumptions, which were favourable, but the strength of the dollar suggested that WADA change the conventional US/Canadian dollar exchange rate from 1.18 to 1.22 and change the assumption about the Swiss franc/US dollar exchange rate from 0.92 to 0.95. That was obviously favourable for expenses in-house. That was just to give two assumptions on which the revised budget was different to the budget.

Moving immediately to the top of the sheet, there were 238,931 dollars less in income, clearly due to the additional Russian contribution which had ceased, and then, going to the

expenses, he started with legal, which included the cost of investigations. As the members knew, these included the tail-end of the Pound investigation and the start of the McLaren investigation. WADA had to carry much more cost, and there was a figure of 419,000 dollars, and he could anticipate that that would not be enough. He would give more precise information in November, but he believed that the matter could be closed with 770,000 dollars, which was a lot, but was necessary. For that reason, it had been decided to use 125,000 dollars of the special Investigation Fund. That appeared at the end of the table. There were many other variances, but they were not really important, other than IT. He had wanted to concentrate on the major issues, and the next big one after investigations was IT, meaning ADAMS, and there were two critical items. ADAMS was key to the success of WADA, and WADA could not leave it out, even if it spent more time or made mistakes relating to suppliers, because ADAMS was key to WADA's activities. In IT, the members would see, in the operational item, an increase of 510,000 dollars, based on the fact that WADA had to cease working with the ADAMS developer.. WADA had to close the deal, and there were new suppliers coming in, so those were operational expenses that had not been expected. The second item related to that was the writing down of assets (931,000 dollars) not budgeted, and that was because WADA needed to write down assets developed/procured in previous years.. That was unfortunately having an impact on two parts of the ADAMS budget. He hoped that the management would be careful. WADA had to be on top of the problem because, without ADAMS working well, WADA would not be capable of performing its duties. He believed that WADA had to support the special effort and expenses. He hoped they would not be so significant the following year.

The rest was normal, with the use of litigation reserves and the revised budget, it was good news that only 300,000 dollars would be used from the reserve and not 500,000 that WADA had set as a rule. That was the information about the revised budget: in spite of the investigations and the ADAMS cost, WADA could survive.

DECISION

Revised budget 2016 noted.

– 5.6 2017-2019 draft budget

MR RICCI BITTI referred to the 2017 budget and the forecast for 2017-2019. The conclusion of the Finance and Administration Committee had been very clear: WADA needed money for the creation of the new intelligence and investigations department, with a total expected staff of six, there was the recommended reinstatement of travel costs (which was basically 2%), the reinstated increase related to SportAccord, the increase in compliance monitoring, the increase in the ADO symposium and the TUE symposium (TUEs were very trendy at that time), and the continued development of ADAMS. Those were the expenses that WADA had to deal with.

For that reason, for the 2017 budget, the Finance and Administration Committee had presented three options, and only the last one was sustainable. The three options were a 0% increase, which actually meant minus 2% (-2%), leading to the use of the reserve of about 1.387 million dollars, so it was absolutely unsustainable. The second was a 3% increase, meaning 1% (minus the 2% travel costs to which he had referred for the first option), which would require a 555,000 dollar reserve, so he moved on to the third option, which the Finance and Administration Committee recommended strongly to the Executive Committee: 5%, which in real terms was 3%, and which would allow WADA to remain within the rules it had set itself, of not depleting cash reserve by more than 500,000, in spite of the implementation of the new investigations and intelligence department (which had been budgeted at 1,481,000 dollars). The head of the department was already on board and would start work in October that year. That expense was the only significant difference compared to the 2016 budget. To cut a long story short, the Finance and Administration Committee strongly recommended that the only sustainable option was to go for the 5% increase, which in real terms was 3% plus the reinstatement of travel expenses of the members of the Foundation Board and Executive Committee to be paid by WADA. It was not necessary to approve the budget then and there, but he hoped that the Executive Committee would support the proposal so that, in November, he would need only update the information.

To conclude his report, he had to talk about the 2018 and 2019 forecasts. With all the considerations made, and so as not to reduce activities, the Finance and Administration

Committee envisaged and recommended a 5% increase for 2018 and 2019 to keep WADA sustainable without cutting any activities. The forecast was less pressing and it was another recommendation. There had been various options, and the 3% option had been deemed to be unsustainable. The idea of the Finance and Administration Committee was 5%, 5%, and 5% for the coming three years, always including the 2% travel costs. That was the report by the Finance and Administration Committee. No decision needed to be taken immediately. He thanked the Finance Department, which was very efficient and effective, despite the fact that there were not many members of staff. He supported the quick hiring of a person to replace an outgoing member. The department comprised few people but they were very effective, and had very good control of the situation.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Mr Ricci Bitti. Looking back to the previous Foundation Board meeting, the members would recall the auditors' certificates, speaking to the quality of the work done by the finance people.

PROFESSOR ERDENER said that he would like to thank Mr Ricci Bitti, his committee members and the WADA Finance Department for their great job. The Olympic Movement strongly supported the 5% budget increase proposal.

MS WIDVEY thanked Mr Ricci Bitti, who had done a very good job with the budget and also leading the committee. Europe thought that the budget should be increased by 3% and underlined that that increase should go towards operational activities. As Mr Ricci Bitti knew, she had made proposals at previous meetings, and she would try to make the same proposal again: that the issue of reinstatement or reimbursement of travel costs should be re-examined. The public authorities could pay for those themselves and the increase in the budget would therefore go towards the operational activities.

MR GODKIN thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for his comprehensive report. Oceania would contemplate supporting up to 5%, but would also endorse the comments made by Europe, that it was not in favour of the 2% being reinvested in travel costs. Oceania would certainly contemplate up to 5% and would strongly support at least 3% on the same basis, provided that there was a capacity for genuine hardship to be supported through travel costs.

Investigations unfortunately appeared to be part of the landscape, and he wondered whether, in the longer term, WADA might consider how to mainstream the funding for that as part of the cohesive budgetary approach for WADA, but that was a discussion for later on. If he was reading the report correctly, there was the suggestion of a 3% increase for WADA staffing, etc.

MR RICCI BITTI asked Mr Niggli to explain about the staff. There would be an increase in people distributed among the departments. He knew that there would be one person hired for the Finance Department, and the investigations team would comprise six people in total.

The matter of the 2% was a long story. He thought he was getting tired of explaining, as he was with the UNESCO convention. The position of the IOC was that it was a governance matter, not a money matter. The IOC had a very clear position from a governance point of view that it was better that one entity (WADA) pay the expenses, and he agreed with that, because it made the people, at least in principle, less accountable to the bodies they represented. People spoke about independence the whole time. That was not a question of money; it was a governance matter. The IOC strongly believed that it had been a form of avoidance for some time. It had never accepted it, and wanted to go back to the previous situation. He did not know how to get around that. It was a matter of getting back to where WADA had been at the time of its establishment. That had been accepted as a form of avoidance; the IOC had accepted it at the time but, in governance terms, the IOC strongly believed that it was better that the expenses be paid for by the body to which the members had been elected. He asked the Chairman to find a solution to the problem, as he was getting tired of discussing it.

In response to the other question, there was some increase, distributed among investigations and some other departments, but it was not relevant. It was reflected in the amounts. He did not think there had been any other questions.

He would come back with a more detailed proposal for 2018 and 2019 in November. He sought support on the budget for 2017, which had to be worked on, but not formal approval, because that would be given by the Foundation Board. Everybody would be able to make

comments again in November, but the committee needed to make progress and the department would also need to work on that. He asked for a sort of approval on the 2017 budget exercise.

THE CHAIRMAN referred to the question from Mr Godkin. There was a Remuneration Committee, which dealt with staff remuneration, and the forecast was roughly 2%, which was effectively the inflation rate in Canada, with 1% on merit, so that explained the 3%.

If Mr Ricci Bitti was fed up with travel costs, he was fed up with the matter as well. To keep WADA solvent, he had come up some years ago with a change in the system whereby travel costs were met by individual constituents; thereafter, there had been a clear view from the IOC that, from a governance point of view, the organisation should be responsible for all of its travel costs. That was what was incorporated in the budget. He accepted entirely that it was purely money, that governments accounted for things in different ways and it was probably easier for governments to account more easily for travel costs under a different heading but, at the end of the day, the costs were the same. If there was to be a big debate on that, it should take place on the final budget, which he feared might change. He had listened to the estimates of total investigation costs with some encouragement; he hoped that WADA would be able to make it with that kind of figure, although he thought that the figures might change, and there would be a much more accurate set of figures in roughly six weeks' time. At that stage, WADA would have to deal with the issue of travel costs. The governments' argument was quite clear, and the financial argument from the governments was quite clear. WADA would have to take a decision. The Finance and Administration Committee clearly recommended that it should be 5% and that WADA should be responsible for travel costs, and in all honestly he thought that the Executive Committee should support the Finance and Administration Committee and its chairman, and that was what should be put to the Foundation Board in Glasgow in November.

He thanked Mr Ricci Bitti and echoed his congratulations to the Finance Department, which did a splendid job.

DECISION

2017-2019 draft budget noted.

6. World Anti-Doping Code

– 6.1 Compliance update

MR DONZÉ informed the members that he was transitioning from a WADA management perspective. He would be really brief before passing over to Mr Bouchard. WADA continued to work hard on two fronts, mainly in terms of compliance monitoring, the first being the compliance of the rules of signatories to the World Anti-Doping Code. The overwhelming majority of the world had rules in line with the Code, with a few exceptions to be discussed in greater detail by Mr Bouchard, and WADA was also looking more carefully and in greater detail at the programmes of the signatories to the World Anti-Doping Code, and in that regard WADA was still developing the tools that would allow it to assess the compliance of signatories' programmes. They included two main tools. The first was the Code compliance monitoring questionnaire, which was currently being finalised, to be sent to all Code signatories, IFs, NADOs and so on by the end of that year or early next, and signatories would have three months during which to self-report on their compliance. That would be an extremely useful tool for WADA to assess compliance. The other tool being developed was an audit programme, which would benefit in part from the input of the Code compliance questionnaire, and it would allow WADA to go into greater detail in reviewing the quality of the anti-doping programmes of signatories to the Code. There would of course be a more detailed report coming up in November at the Executive Committee and Foundation Board meetings, which would be closer to the launch date of the Code compliance questionnaire, but WADA continued to work very actively as a management team in terms of the preparation and set-up of the anti-doping programme of signatories' Code compliance.

That summarised very briefly the main activities in terms of compliance over the past few weeks. He gave the floor to Mr Bouchard, who would go into greater detail in terms of situations of non-compliance that were ongoing and the consequences of non-compliance that had been partly discussed the previous day.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there were any questions of Mr Donzé. That was a very important development. Having spent two-and-a-half years getting everybody rule-compliant, WADA was going to try to make them delivery-compliant. That was a big exercise in the system that Mr Donzé had outlined.

MR BOUCHARD thanked the members of the Executive Committee. It was always a privilege to report on the work that was accomplished by the Compliance Review Committee. Since the Foundation Board had met in May, the committee had met twice, with a conference call in July, and a meeting on 3 September, and it would have other meetings moving forward, on 17 October and 10 November. Other meetings could be added depending on the complexity of the issues. The members would see in his report that some of the issues would be discussed again on 17 October. On 3 September, the Compliance Review Committee had dealt with a number of matters related to the implementation of the Code compliance monitoring programme, including cases of non-compliance and the consequences of non-compliance, the self-assessment survey, the compliance audit programme, the mandatory use of ADAMS, result management monitoring progress, the evolution of NFs and implementation of anti-doping programmes, the role of RADOs in relation to the compliance monitoring programme, and the McLaren report. He would briefly comment on each of the elements and spend more time on cases of non-compliance and the consequences of non-compliance.

He began with the self-assessment survey alluded to by Mr Donzé. The questionnaire in his view was one of the tools WADA would use to monitor the implementation programme, and it was a very important one. As he had said in the past, the Compliance Review Committee had made a number of suggestions to make the document as user-friendly as possible for signatories, and there had been some consultations with stakeholders to improve the product. The online version that the Compliance Review Committee had seen at its latest meeting was really impressive. It was a very solid product, and was as clear and as easy to use as it could possibly be, quite frankly, and stakeholders would have the option to complete the survey using hard copy as well. It was not a simple endeavour, as he had said in the past. Surveys were usually complex, and there were a lot of questions involved. At the same time, WADA had taken many steps to make it as user-friendly as possible, and organisations would be given enough time to complete it. That covered that point.

On the compliance audit programme, time had been spent discussing some of the tools that WADA would be using to implement the programme. The Compliance Review Committee had discussed some of the criteria to be used to determine when an audit would be undertaken and which signatories should be audited. While the self-assessment survey would be the primary tool used to determine if signatories were in compliance or not with the Code, audits would have to be conducted to verify the implementation of the anti-doping programme. As such, it was important to have the appropriate tools in place and help organisations to be audited so that the right information was provided. He believed that WADA was doing the right thing in that area and facilitating the audit from the clients' point of view. The Compliance Review Committee was of the opinion that WADA staff should be the lead auditors to give credibility and ensure a standardised process so that people would become accustomed to the process and it was equitable for the number of signatories audited. The Compliance Review Committee had also commented on a proposed timeframe for planning audits. Auditing in the middle of an IF's season, for example, might not be the most appropriate approach, so WADA might want to take that into account when looking at schedules. On the mandatory use of ADAMS, following the Foundation Board decision to require the entry of doping control forms and TUEs in ADAMS, WADA had seen an increase in the number of forms submitted to the system, so the Compliance Review Committee thought it was quite encouraging, although more progress was needed. Several ADOs had not signed the ADAMS agreement, and others had not entered their doping control forms or TUEs within the prescribed time. Progress was being made and he hoped that progress would continue. When would victory be declared on that? The Compliance Review Committee, which would be asked for its view on that, had asked that the statistics for 2016 be made available, and that would help determine the percentage level of compliance that should be accepted on the specific requirements. On the result management monitoring process, the Compliance Review Committee had discussed the procedure to be followed to obtain closure on the doping cases reported in ADAMS that remained for various reasons pending without any decision rendered. It was only a small percentage of the procedure, but there were such cases and sometimes

they were due to various reasons, including scientific evidence, political reasons, reanalysis of samples, and so on and so forth. There was a good reason for them, but leaving them pending was not the approach that should be favoured, so the Compliance Review Committee agreed with the WADA procedure to follow up on such cases. WADA would communicate them to the ADOs and, if the set timelines were not met, the case would be brought to the internal task force and then to the Compliance Review Committee. The Compliance Review Committee would not look at individual cases, but it would look at groupings of cases and, if it saw a trend within a particular area, that would be factored in when looking at the compliance issue. The Compliance Review Committee would not look at each specific case; it would leave that to the task force, but it thought it was important, if there were areas in the world in which those pending cases remained, that it be factored into the assessments of compliance.

Regarding the involvement of National Federations (NFs) in the implementation of anti-doping programmes, it had been brought to the attention of the Compliance Review Committee that, in some countries, NFs were conducting testing on their own and the local NADOs were not performing the tests for those federations. In addition, some of those NFs did not always comply with the Code requirements regarding result management. The Compliance Review Committee agreed with WADA's proposal to address the issue through the IFs, and requested an update from WADA at the next Compliance Review Committee meeting. The matter had been brought to the attention of the Compliance Review Committee, which had briefly discussed it and thought that there might be other ways to solve the issue. There would be discussion between WADA and the relevant parties, and there would be a status report in October. The matter might be discussed further.

On the role of RADOs in relation to the compliance monitoring programme, the Compliance Review Committee had briefly discussed the issue of RADO member countries that were strong sporting nations and whether they should remain as part of the RADOs. More information would be required to conclude on the important matter and, as such, the Compliance Review Committee had asked that the issue be discussed again on 17 October or at other future meetings. That was an issue that had been shared with the Compliance Review Committee; it had discussed it briefly and thought that it needed more information.

On the McLaren report, the Compliance Review Committee had been given a verbal briefing at its latest session. The same information was in the members' files under item 3.2, and the Compliance Review Committee would discuss the report further when it was published, towards the end of October he understood.

On cases of non-compliance, a number of cases had been brought to the attention of the Compliance Review Committee, and the members had the relevant information in their folders under item 6.2. Russia and Spain remained on the list of non-compliant signatories, whilst Poland had been reinstated as compliant by the Foundation Board. He commended Poland on the quick response that it had given, as there had been some strong words at the previous Foundation Board meeting because of changes adopted in Polish legislation. Poland had been quick to engage, seek advice and then make the necessary changes. Other cases had been discussed, including Azerbaijan, Brazil, Greece, Indonesia and Guatemala. The Compliance Review Committee would be recommending to the Foundation Board in November that it declare Azerbaijan, Brazil and Guatemala non-compliant. Those signatories would be made aware of the upcoming Compliance Review Committee recommendations. Any updates and developments would be reviewed at the next Compliance Review Committee meeting in October, and the recommendation would be revised if necessary. In other words, the signatories had been advised of the intentions of the Compliance Review Committee. They had time to adjust and, if they did adjust, the Compliance Review Committee would adjust its recommendation in October. Regarding Greece and Indonesia, the issues to be addressed had been discussed, and the Compliance Review Committee would revisit those two cases again at its next meeting on 17 October as he had said.

On the consequences of non-compliance, as noted at the previous Foundation Board meeting, the Compliance Review Committee had undertaken to make recommendations regarding the consequences of sanctions to be imposed on non-compliant signatories. The Compliance Review Committee had looked at some of the sanctions. It was not an easy task, but quite frankly he wanted to thank the people who had made a number of recommendations the previous day and he thought that headway had been made, so the next meeting in October would allow the Compliance Review Committee to consolidate the

information provided to it the previous day, so that it would be able to provide the members with a good update at the Foundation Board meeting and hopefully a good framework for moving forward.

MR DÍAZ thanked Mr Donzé and Bouchard for their presentation. He made formally the comments he had made the previous day at the think tank in relation to non-compliance. WADA should make sure that the sanctions related to non-compliance did not harm NADOs and laboratories. That had currently been happening. Pending legislation, it harmed a government and a NADO that was not doing anything wrong and a laboratory that had no problems in terms of its operations. He had high hopes that, at the upcoming meetings in October, such things would be solved and for example the case of Spain could be treated responsibly and there would be a fair decision so as not to harm other countries that had cooperation agreements with Spain, as well as clean athletes. In the case of the laboratories, he disagreed with the percentage of 60% because, even if 10% of those tests were done for a country abroad, it was helpful. If a laboratory was being sanctioned because of that, it was not fair, because it was not doing anything wrong. He hoped that the matter would be taken into consideration and looked forward to decisions and positive action in that regard in October.

MR ESTANGUET thanked Messrs Donzé and Bouchard for their presentations and all the work done on compliance. He drew the members' attention to concerns expressed by the athletes in relation to compliance. Sometimes people belittled certain types of non-compliance by putting them on the list of non-compliant stakeholders and it would be good to distinguish between the various types of non-compliance. WADA should be more rigorous and stricter when drawing up lists of non-compliance. He was concerned about the fact that, when talking about non-compliant parties, there was a list of different circumstances, and that took away from the clout of the non-compliance status. That had been discussed the previous day, and the possibility of a list of sanctions that could be automatically triggered had been discussed. There should be better cooperation among the stakeholders. It was true that there were sometimes collateral victims, including laboratories and athletes. WADA had to assume that collective responsibility. Everybody had a role to play. When there was a positive result, it was deliberate, it was cheating, and it entailed responsibility. It was not acceptable that most of the sanctions were handed down to athletes, whereas there was a list of sanctions available to sanction the system itself. He encouraged the Executive Committee not to sanction only the athletes but to take further steps.

PROFESSOR DE ROSE agreed that Brazil should respond, but there had been a recent change of government and the chairman of the NADO was from the ministry of sport. There had been a change in the NADO structure. Of the three points, two had already been resolved, and the third point was currently with the group of lawyers working on the matter, and he was pretty sure that they would be providing the nomination of the members of the tribunal in time and the necessary legislation would be available on time.

MS SCOTT thanked Mr Bouchard. She knew that everybody was aware that he had been hired by WADA and would be leaving the Compliance Review Committee. She thanked him formally for his work as chairman of the Compliance Review Committee. He had done a fantastic job. Everybody on the committee who had been notified had written to say that, while it was their loss, it was certainly WADA's gain. The committee members would miss him.

She wished to highlight a recent case relating to compliance, which was the IBU's decision to award the world championships in 2021 to Russia. Mr Estanguet had spoken about collective responsibility. This seemed to go not only against WADA but also against what the IOC had recommended after the McLaren report. Were there any comments about that?

MR RICCI BITTI thanked Mr Bouchard, who had chaired the Compliance Review Committee to the satisfaction of everybody. The previous day, there had been talk about governance. Following that discussion, he wanted to hear why the Compliance Review Committee, which appeared to him to be a permanent and statutory committee, should go immediately as a statutory committee. He did not think that it was a one-shot committee. It was a permanent and very important committee. He believed that there should be an amendment to the WADA constitution. With all due respect, the WADA constitution was very poor and did not reflect the progress of the organisation. He recommended that the

Compliance Review Committee be made statutory, thanked Mr Bouchard, and asked for his new job description, which looked as though it was linked to the old one. That was important from a governance point of view.

MS WIDVEY thanked Mr Bouchard for his very good presentation. She supported the statement made by Mr Díaz with regard to the non-compliance of Spain. She kindly asked WADA to consider reducing the scope of activities that the Spanish NADO was not allowed to perform, taking into account the exceptional circumstances in Spain.

In relation to the non-compliance of RUSADA, she kindly asked WADA to establish clear criteria to be fulfilled by RUSADA in order to regain compliance. That would be very helpful and had been discussed by the European authorities, and she hoped that there would be some very clear criteria to make them easier to fulfil.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if RUSADA could be dealt with after Mr Koehler's report on the situation. The members should remember that they had allowed an extension of the Spanish NADO's work on its educational role, particularly in South America. WADA had taken certain steps and, while everybody had sympathy with Spain for not having a government, actually quite a lot of people in Spain thought that it was a good idea that they did not have a government because they could get on with the rest of their lives. Spain could have solved the matter quite a long time ago. His only observation was that it seemed to him that WADA would need a very clear educational effort to explain to all of the stakeholders what in fact compliance would mean in the future, so that for the first excuse for being non-compliant, which was always not understanding, WADA had to make it very clear that they should understand.

MR RICCI BITTI said that he would really like to understand what WADA sought in terms of compliance with different stakeholders. There were stakeholders with very different jobs. The IFs were responsible for anti-doping activities. The NOCs, with all due respect, were not responsible for anything other than some principles. How could they all be put together? The previous day, they had been mentioned together. There were different levels of stakeholders. There were the IFs and the NADOs, which were the top ones, and then there were others with much less to do. It was necessary to consider that.

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL said that it would be a good idea to amend the statutes to make the Compliance Review Committee a permanent one, on the understanding that it was slightly different to the other committees, because it was made up of independent experts who were not from the sport or public authorities side, so WADA would just have to reflect the structure of the committee in the statutes. He thought that Mr Ricci Bitti was right: it was there to stay.

THE CHAIRMAN congratulated Mr Bouchard on his promotion to the WADA management.

MR BOUCHARD thanked the Chairman. He thanked Mr Díaz for his question, which he had alluded to the previous day. He had not had a chance to give Mr Díaz his point of view on the matter and would do so that morning. It was definitely an important point. He did not want to diminish the importance of it. The Compliance Review Committee was faced with a difficult balancing act. It was almost the last resort. So, when the cases were brought to the Compliance Review Committee, it had to work out what to do with them. In the case of Spain, the problem was that its legislation was not aligned. He was sure that Spain had issues to deal with. At the same time, the authorities had had a long time in the past to deal with the matter. That was why sanctions were being handed down. Certain people were saying that sanctions would weaken the system, and that was where the balancing act came in. There were not that many tools in the toolbox to sanction signatories, and the previous day's conversation would be helpful moving forward because, if it provided WADA with additional tools to sanction, WADA would be able to be more nuanced and more surgical in terms of its approach, and have the right sanctions for the right violations. The Compliance Review Committee had discussed the specific issue of Spain at its previous meeting and would continue to do so in October. He would report it at the next Executive Committee and Foundation Board meeting. He could not guarantee that a recommendation or changes would be made, but the Compliance Review Committee would take a look at it again.

To Mr Estanguet, he said that he did not think that he was belittling or minimising violations, but certainly at the beginning, WADA would introduce the programme, and there would be certain stages, during which the rules and regulations and programmes would be

looked at. That formed the basis of the anti-doping programme. WADA would then go into the details, and see how the programmes were implemented. When WADA looked at the various cases, there would be big differences. There would be violations by some signatories that were less serious than others. Categories had been considered the previous day at the think tank, which signatories were not compliant because of their rules and policies, for example. Then it would be possible to consider sanctions that could be applied to such violations. Then, WADA would look at signatories that had deliberately changed their anti-doping programmes and what kinds of sanctions should be devised for such violations. WADA should be given more freedom to make a distinction between the different violations, and then have the various sanctions that could be applied for the different violations. In relation to sanctioning athletes, that was a very important issue. Would it be possible to have sanctions for those who were actually at the root of the violations, rather than always penalising only the athletes? There had been some proposals made the previous day that were worth examining. WADA should be able to come up with a toolbox in November that included a set of tools that would penalise those who had actually caused the violation rather than the athletes.

As to the fact that Brazil had addressed two of the three points that it needed to address, he thanked Professor De Rose for reminding him. He was very encouraged by the fact that the last point would be covered before 17 October.

He thanked Ms Scott for her comments and would ask Mr Donzé to answer her question on the IBU.

He thanked Mr Ricci Bitti for his comments. He believed he had answered the first issue raised by Norway.

MR DONZÉ said that Ms Scott's question was very relevant. When WADA had seen the news in the press about the IBU allocating its world championships to a Russian city, it had immediately written to the IBU. The World Anti-Doping Code was very clear about the responsibilities of IFs, and one of the Code articles clearly stated that IFs were responsible for doing everything possible to allocate world championships only to those countries that had ratified the UNESCO convention and whose NADO was in compliance with the World Anti-Doping Code. WADA had written to the IBU to ask if it had indeed done everything possible to allocate the 2021 world championships to a country other than Russia. WADA had received an answer from the IBU that raised more questions than provided answers, and would follow up very shortly and seek to get to the bottom of the issue. If necessary, it would be a matter for the Compliance Review Committee to discuss at its next meeting in October. A number of other IFs had allocated their world championships or major events to Russia, including the World Curling Federation, which had done so in October 2015, prior to the declaration of non-compliance of RUSADA, so WADA could not have expected a different decision given the timing, but the Code was clear: as of the time of the declaration of non-compliance, IFs should do everything in their power to allocate world championships to compliant countries.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he was not quite sure whether there should be better planning. Nevertheless, in the absence of such planning, he paid tribute to Mr Bouchard as the chairman of a committee that seemed to be greatly enhanced by the quality of the independent members and the sportspeople who served on it. It had been an outstanding effort, and having Mr Bouchard with WADA was to WADA's benefit, and he was sure that care would be taken when nominating Mr Bouchard's replacement to find somebody with the same skills and talents as Mr Bouchard.

DECISION

Compliance update noted.

– **6.2 Non-compliant countries – status report**

6.2.1 Russia

MR KOEHLER informed the members that he would give them a brief update on WADA's situation with RUSADA, some of the challenges it was dealing with, and the way forward. As everybody was aware, since 18 November, when RUSADA had been declared non-compliant, WADA had continued to reach out to RUSADA and the Russian sport ministry, which was the primary funder of RUSADA. During that time, WADA had also engaged UKAD, which was filling the testing gaps. It was not running a comprehensive programme that a NADO would do, but

was making sure that testing was occurring, target testing was happening, and filling the gaps whilst RUSADA was non-compliant. WADA had engaged two international experts who were paid by RUSADA. That money came to WADA and WADA paid the experts directly. That was to ensure independence and that they were not reporting directly to the ministry of sport or RUSADA in general. They were working on a plan to get RUSADA back to compliance, but several steps had to happen before then. Mr Khrychikov, from the Council of Europe, was the expert sitting on the RUSADA board, and reported back to WADA and the experts on the progress of the independent board. WADA was working with international experts to rebuild RUSADA. WADA did not want to see non-compliance for years to come. WADA needed to get the programme running and see things happen in Russia, but several steps had to be taken first.

Looking at testing capacity, there were still issues. Doping control officers had still not gained access to the closed cities. There had been some communication indicating that progress was happening, but the service providers had confirmed that they had not gained access. The service providers' testing capacity was limited, so whilst there were a lot of missions being placed in the field, there was only so much capacity that the service providers had. Looking at extending and building that capacity was questionable, depending on how long RUSADA's non-compliance would be. There were still whereabouts challenges, but the situation was getting better. There was more engagement on the part of the athletes, and that came with the assistance of the NFs. There was a need for a cultural change so that the NFs would buy into the system and make sure that the athletes were buying into it. They were a crucial element. That was part of the remit of the international experts, to engage the NFs, to make sure that they understood their role, and to be part of the programme. UKAD had informed WADA that the primary focus leading into the testing programme was the winter sports, given that their competition period had commenced, and was working with the IFs to ensure testing was being increased within each of those organisations.

In relation to the laboratory, he gave a non-scientific overview of the situation. The Moscow laboratory had been sealed by the investigative committee. Russia had its own investigative committee and WADA was unable to gain access to the laboratory. During the Rio Olympic Games, there had been an IF that had requested a sample. The independent experts had tried to gain access but had been clearly told that, should they cross the lines within the laboratory, it would be considered a criminal offence and they would be arrested, so they had quickly left. The President had written to the ministry several times, asking for an explanation, but WADA had received no answer as to how to remedy the situation. The ministry had said that it was working on it but it had not been resolved to date.

In terms of challenges in cooperation, every time he had seen something, the President had followed up with the minister. WADA had seen reports that Russia had not yet accepted the independent report and had indicated that the report had been falsified and that those involved in the report would be prosecuted. When receiving those messages, it was sometimes hard to work closely with the organisations involved, and again WADA was trying to understand whether they were actual statements made by the minister or not. It had been reported that RUSADA had not formally accepted the findings either. It was necessary to recognise that there was a different leadership in place, and a lot of people in RUSADA at the time were no longer there. The cyber-attacks led by an apparently Russian espionage group had also made the relationship difficult.

When it came to cooperation, WADA was seeking clarity in terms of who was taking charge of testing or the anti-doping programmes in Russia. RUSADA was currently under the authority of the minister of sport. WADA's main contact had been the minister of sport, but everybody was aware that the new Smirnov commission had been formed, indicating that it was responsible for reforming RUSADA. WADA was awaiting the terms of reference, had been in contact with both parties, and was seeking clarity on who was going to be responsible for rebuilding RUSADA and who was going to be responsible for oversight of anti-doping in Russia. That said, they all had the same approach to making sure that RUSADA had financial and operational autonomy moving forward. WADA had committed and would be looking at scheduling meetings in October with the IAAF and the IPC, so as to work together and so that WADA was not doing things separately, and the different bodies would be working together to rebuild the programmes in Russia.

Ms Widvey had asked about RUSADA moving forward. A roadmap had been developed and provided to RUSADA. It needed to achieve operational and financial autonomy. The organisation could not be under the government's influence. The recruitment of a new director general was moving forward. RUSADA needed to continue close cooperation with WADA, to continue to employ the two international experts to ensure that progress was happening, to ensure and increase the independence of the RUSADA board and to recruit staff and doping control officers so that they could start working in a transition period whilst working with UKAD for the testing programme. Those were the key points of moving forward. That plan had been shared with the Council of Europe when it had been developed the previous year. There was to be a report from Mr Smirnov to the WADA Foundation Board in November with action plans developed to make sure that RUSADA was moving towards compliance.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Ms Widvey if that had answered her questions.

This was a never-ending and very complex situation. The hard facts of the matter were that the biggest country in the world had to be compliant at some future date; otherwise, sport simply would not work. Nobody should doubt the amount of effort coming from WADA to achieve that. He was rather encouraged by the steps developing in Russia, the problem was that they were too slow. It would take a long time of good delivery of anti-doping services before WADA could say that it regarded Russia as compliant and before WADA could say to the rest of the world that Russia could be trusted. He thanked Mr Koehler and his team for all the work done.

DECISION

Status report noted.

– **6.3 Consequences of non-compliance**

Dealt with under the previous agenda item.

7. Science

– **7.1 Health, Medical and Research Committee Chair report**

MS FOURNEYRON informed the members that the Health, Medical and Research Committee had convened on 30 and 31 August at the WADA headquarters in Montreal. There had been a very good meeting, at which many important topics had been discussed based on the work and recommendations of the four expert groups, which met and worked all year round. The Health, Medical and Research Committee had had the pleasure of welcoming Dr Audrey Kinahan, who had been the chair of the List Expert Group since the beginning of the year. She was a distinguished member of the Irish Pharmaceutical Society, specialising in drugs in sport. Her leadership had been pivotal that year, especially in dealing with the issue of meldonium, on which Dr Rabin would be providing an update after her report. On the eve of the Health, Medical and Research Committee meeting, the chairs of the four WADA science and medical expert groups had held an informal meeting for the second time. It was a bit of a new tradition, which she had initiated the previous year, the objective being to allow each chair to express their views on how to facilitate, interface work and communications between the groups, share specific challenges faced by the expert groups and consolidate identification or research needs and integration of research outcomes in the different expert groups. That was very useful and highly appreciated. The agenda was mainly about the adjustments to the List of Prohibited Substances and Methods. Dr Rabin would highlight the main changes between that year's List and the 2017 List for formal approval. The approved List would then be published on 1 October and would come into effect on 1 January 2017, as per the WADA statutes. Between those two dates, WADA should ensure athlete-friendly communication about the Prohibited List to inform and educate the athletes about the changes to be expected.

She wanted to update the members on three important debates about the Prohibited List during the Health, Medical and Research Committee meeting. The first debate had been about the sensitive issue of glucocorticoid injections. As the members might remember, an ad hoc working group had been formed at the end of 2015 to make recommendations on the inconsistency of allowing local injections while the systemic levels obtained during tests were

similar to those of prohibited routes of glucocorticoid administration. She added that glucocorticoids represented by far the highest percentage of the TUEs, so clarification and simplification were needed. Following the recommendations of the working group, the List Expert Group had proposed in the draft 2017 List fully prohibiting glucocorticoid local injections 72 hours prior to competition. The Prohibited List was very much an interactive work with stakeholders, whether they were NADOs or medical commissions of the federations. The draft List had been sent to the stakeholders for consultation, and the vast majority of them had strongly rejected the idea of prohibited glucocorticoid local injections 72 hours prior to competition. Because of that, the List Expert Group had decided not to introduce any changes in the glucocorticoid section for the 2017 Prohibited List. After lively debates, the Health, Medical and Research Committee had decided to follow the List Expert Group's recommendation, and its proposal was to not introduce changes to the List for the time being. Nevertheless, the situation with glucocorticoids was still not acceptable and the issue was not closed. A decision had been made to hold discussions with a larger group and additional research would be conducted. The Health, Medical and Research Committee also looked forward to hearing some recommendations and guidelines on the glucocorticoid issue from the IOC consensus meeting on pain management, which would take place in November. The new timeline for the potential changes was the 2018 Prohibited List.

The second important debate during the committee meeting had been about the issue of the unique List. That was an old chestnut. The purpose was to have only one Prohibited List in which all categories would be prohibited at all times in- and out-of-competition. The List Expert Group had thoroughly explored the possibility of having a unique List. The first conclusions of the group had been shared with the members of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and carefully analysed during the meeting. There were of course advantages and also disadvantages. Some categories currently prohibited in-competition would probably disappear (such as narcotics and cannabinoids) and others would be reshaped (for example, stimulants). It would also be necessary to recategorise some of the specified and non-specified substances. The Health, Medical and Research Committee believed that it was a lot of work to deal with and there might not be a final agreement. However, it was worth exploring, and a good first step had been made. The great news was that it could be done. There was consensus that agreeing on the unique List was definitely achievable but required more time, effort and careful analysis, so the Health, Medical and Research Committee needed to keep working, and to do so it would expand the working group to the Laboratory and TUE Expert Groups.

The last debate about the 2017 List had been about thyroid hormones, which were not currently on the Prohibited List; clearly, there were scientific disagreements. WADA had received several requests from stakeholders that thyroid hormones should be included in the Prohibited List; however, some of the List Expert Group members, especially the endocrinologists, believed that thyroid hormones were not performance enhancing, although they could be a risk for health, so the conclusion was to engage with the stakeholders, especially USADA and UKAD, to share information and perhaps fund some specific studies together.

Those were the comments she had wanted to share regarding the 2017 Prohibited List. She asked the members to consider them as further proof that the Health, Medical and Research Committee was doing a remarkable job in her opinion and made decisions based only on robust scientific evidence, and never based on assumptions or under pressure of any kind.

As to the laboratories, she wanted to share two important discussions that the Health, Medical and Research Committee had had. There was a general feeling among the Laboratory Expert Group members that there was too much time between the identification of serious issues in a laboratory and the final decision to suspend or revoke its accreditation. The monitoring process of the laboratories included blind and double-blind aptitude tests, site visits by WADA experts and complaints sometimes by ADOs. The monitoring process had been threatened over the past few months and the latest suspensions were a direct result of the policy. Most of the time, the monitoring process involved minor issues that could be easily fixed by the laboratories, but it also happened that more serious issues occurred, or even blatant breaches of the rules. The serious issues were reviewed thoroughly by the Laboratory Expert Group. The most concerning cases were then transferred to the WADA Disciplinary

Committee, which included two legal experts and one scientist. It was the Disciplinary Committee that decided whether or not to recommend to the WADA Executive Committee that it sanction the laboratory. The process was pretty solid but could probably be improved to shorten the delay between the inspections and the effective sanctions.

The Health, Medical and Research Committee had also discussed the future of the accredited laboratories. It was quite obvious that there were too many accredited laboratories in some parts of the world, such as Europe (which had 16 accredited laboratories), while Africa had none (with the Bloemfontein laboratory suspended), and the Americas had only four, so some of the current accredited laboratories might not survive due to high maintenance costs. The adherence to the ISL and related requirements was considered to be more and more complex and raised the question of the ability of some laboratories to maintain their accreditation in the future, as well as the ability of new laboratories to join the network of accredited laboratories. There was a general feeling in the Laboratory Expert Group that WADA needed to reinforce efforts to strengthen the independence of the laboratories with regard to the NADOs, to provide athletes with full confidence in the anti-doping sample analysis procedures.

As a direct consequence of the hacking of ADAMS and the subsequent media storm, the members might have seen some reports criticising the fact that there had been a 48% increase in TUEs between 2014 and 2016, implying that the TUEs had been issued for no serious medical reason and that performance enhancement practices were covered more often by TUEs than in the past. That was of course completely wrong and a very bad reading of the actual increase in TUEs. For the record, she wanted to explain where the figure of 48% came from. She was referring to the TUEs inputted in ADAMS, not the total number of TUEs issued. It meant that that figure of 48% should not be understood as proof that athletes were getting more TUEs, but rather as proof that ADAMS was being used more and more. The number of ADAMS users had increased over the past few months as new countries dealt with privacy regulations. That figure of 48% could also be explained by the accelerated number of entries in ADAMS over the past few months, due to the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, as well as the regulation endorsed at the May 2017 Foundation Board meeting obliging ADOs to enter TUEs in ADAMS within 15 business days of receipt of a TUE decision, and all 2016 TUEs no later than 31 December 2016. Those two phenomena explained why there were more TUEs referenced than in the past. She had thought it important that the members have the right information. Her successor as chair of the Health, Medical and Research Committee would have some very interesting topics to deal with and she wanted to congratulate Professor Erdener on his appointment, wished him all the best in his future endeavours and remained at his disposal should any advice be required in the first few months.

THE CHAIRMAN thanked Ms Fourneyron for the last comment on TUEs. The story in the media was that an elite athlete with a TUE was by definition cheating. That was wrong, and the answer on numbers was a very compelling argument.

He had got quite excited that the experts had agreed that there was a possibility of a single List. That was almost like being able to go to the moon. That was undoubtedly a hugely complex issue, but he was excited by it. Were there any other questions on Ms Fourneyron's report?

MR ESTANGUET thanked Ms Fourneyron for her report. He wanted to highlight what she had said about the communication to be addressed in relation to the new List. Everybody knew what had happened with meldonium. He was no expert; he had no information to provide about the content of the List, but he simply requested that Ms Fourneyron do what was necessary to ensure that the athletes, entourage and all the stakeholders would receive appropriate information in relation to the new List. When he said appropriate, he meant information that could be understood. He had no idea how one could simplify information in relation to the List, but there was still an expectation among the athlete community to have the famous worldwide and single application on their mobiles to tell them if a substance was prohibited or not. He did not know how it would work, but WADA needed to make sure that one day it would be possible to have the service available to all the athletes.

He also wondered whether the Prohibited List should be available earlier in the year, as opposed to in September, to give all stakeholders time to be ready from 1 January. The

problems experienced the previous year with meldonium should not be repeated. He was very happy about the project regarding the single List, but that was a personal comment, not on behalf of the athletes.

THE CHAIRMAN thought that Mr Estanguet had hit the very main point. It seemed to him that the information to be given to people had to fall under different categories. WADA had to tell the medical profession and the experts exactly what the modifications were. WADA had to be able to tell the athletes what the modifications were in a relatively simple, straightforward way so that they could understand. WADA really could not have another meldonium incident. The process WADA had gone through to identify that it was a performance-enhancing substance was absolutely correct and, in WADA's rules, WADA had done what it was supposed to do, but people had simply not understood it. WADA needed to learn from that. He did not know how the experts would react, but WADA really had to get that in understandable language. He asked Dr Budgett to go back to his days as the British team doctor. How could WADA make it more available? Obviously, it should be put on a website, but somehow WADA had to tell people in simple terms what the main issues were.

DR BUDGETT agreed that it had to be multifaceted. The sport movement had to take some responsibility along with governments so that it was a partnership, just as WADA was between governments and sport, to make sure that the communication was understandable and appropriate, and NFs, every club and entourage should brief their athletes on all the changes and everything that was on the List. He echoed Mr Estanguet's calls for something that was definitive from WADA. He realised there were challenges, but something might be done very easily on an application, so that athletes would have access all the time.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he had made a presentation to the summer IFs at the SportAccord meeting, and almost the only questions had been about meldonium and related information. Was there a way of involving Mr Ryan and the summer and winter IFs again in getting the message out?

MR RYAN responded that it was not something he had personally given thought to. Certainly he would be prepared to help, but he did not have in mind specific ideas at the moment.

MR RICCI BITTI said that the only question was to have the change at least for the summer IFs, but it was different for the winter IFs. There was a procedure in each IF for the adoption of changes to the List. That took time. From the announcement to 1 January, time was necessary and he believed, at least for the summer IFs, that it would be easier to have the announcement at the April meeting. There were different situations for each IF.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Management whether there was an application.

MS MACLEAN replied that there was an application, but it was just the List, so people could search for substances. It was not a unique list. It was communicated in different forms but, after the meldonium incident the previous year, she had looked at it and seen that there were definitely ways of better communicating the Prohibited List.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, if WADA could polish it up, it seemed to him to be the very best thing that WADA could do. If people knew about the current application and how to access it, that would help.

DECISION

Health, Medical and Research Committee
Chair report noted.

– 7.2 Update on meldonium

DR RABIN said that, as alluded to by Ms Fourneyron, there had been a challenging situation in March and June that year after meldonium had been added to the List on 1 January 2016. To date, WADA had recorded in ADAMS a little less than 500 cases of meldonium use, so that was quite significant. He was pleased to report that he thought the crisis was behind WADA. It had required a lot of work from the experts and the WADA management to address the requests from the IFs. WADA had met with them, talked to them, handled some cases from a technical standpoint on their behalf, and had been involved in tribunals to support the stakeholders. It did not mean that the issue was over, even if the

crisis was far behind WADA; there was a significant reduction in the number of meldonium cases to a few reports a month, so that was good news and showed that the message had got through. WADA continued to work on the issue, continued with the excretion studies, continued to focus on the excretion of meldonium, and had also met the main meldonium manufacturers a few weeks ago, and they had been impressed by WADA's level of knowledge on the issue. He had explained the work of WADA and the Science Department and the process behind the Prohibited List, and the manufacturers had agreed to share confidential information on meldonium, but had accepted that it had been unpredictable on the basis of the information at the time the decision had been taken by WADA. He believed that WADA was in a very strong position to distinguish between recent use of meldonium and what was related to lingering excretion of the substance.

DECISION

Update on meldonium noted.

– 7.3 Update on laboratories

DR RABIN said that WADA had seen a significant number of laboratories suspended over the past few months. Some had been reinstated completely, some had had their blood analysis capacity in support of the Athlete Biological Passport reinstated, some were still in the process of being suspended, and the point he wished to bring to the members' attention and emphasise was that two laboratories, the Bloemfontein and Lisbon laboratories, had requested an extension of their suspensions. That would delay the site visits, but the process continued as planned, and WADA would talk to the laboratories about the most appropriate time to revisit them, conduct an audit and see whether they were in shape for reinstatement of their accreditation.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for an update on the Moscow situation, which was clearly complicated if the place was under lock and key. Again, WADA could not simply proceed on the assumption that there would never be another accredited laboratory in Moscow.

DR RABIN replied that the accreditation of the laboratory had been revoked; it had not been suspended. Following the McLaren report in July, the decision had been taken to suspend the process of reaccreditation of the laboratory. There was no particular plan to reinstate the laboratory; he was awaiting further guidance from the Executive Committee, and the only activity at the Russian laboratory at that point was the testing of blood samples. That was something that could be further considered in the future.

DECISION

Update on laboratories noted.

– 7.4 2017 Prohibited List

DR RABIN referred to the slide on the screen showing the draft of the 2017 List of Prohibited Substances and Methods. The changes were highlighted in yellow. The first appeared in section S1.b. There were two changes: five substances had been moved from section S1.a to S1.b because the substances could be found endogenously. Of course, WADA did not prohibit the endogenous production of such substances, but it did prohibit them taken endogenously. That clarification had been requested by the Laboratory Expert Group. Going down one page, the members could see that there was one of those names, 5 α -androst-2-ene-17-one, which was a substance that was appearing more and more in dietary supplements, and the List Expert Group had felt it important to include it in that section of the List, as it was a metabolite of DHEA, which was already prohibited as a substance.

In section S2 of the Prohibited List, there was a change that had been recommended by the Health, Medical and Research Committee; in particular, one member who was an expert in EPO and EPO-like substances had named erythropoiesis-stimulating agents. That was considered by the List Expert Group as a section that needed to be remodelled to reflect the changes in the pharmacology of that category. There were different classes of substances and different substances being developed, different mechanisms being identified, and the changes were reflected by including the GATA inhibitors, and there was a name code K-11706, which showed that there was a drug in development working with that mechanism of action, which was different to the usual mechanism of action identified. Then there were the Transforming

Growth Factor- β inhibitors, and there were two substances in development by the same biotech company in the USA that had already been contacted which WADA believed were very promising in terms of boosting the production of red blood cells. Those two mechanisms had been added to the List, but he could guarantee that there would be further changes the following year in that section. Also in that section, the List experts had recommended including (and the recommendation had been approved by the Health, Medical and Research Committee members) molidustat and roxadustat, which were drugs currently at the end of clinical development. Roxadustat had previously been named FG-4592, and three of those cases had already been reported by laboratories in the past. Molidustat was a drug competitor of roxadustat developed by another company, but WADA was in contact with that company and knew that the product had been copied and was counterfeited and was currently available to some athletes.

The changes in section S3, beta-2 agonists, reflected two important elements that needed to be clarified. There had been some requests over the summer and slightly before about the status of a drug known as higenamine, currently to be found in some dietary supplements. There was a resurgence of the substance, and it was important to clarify that it was not only selective beta-2 agonists that were prohibited (those that had been named in the List to date), but also all forms of substance with a beta-2 agonist effect, which was why all selective and non-selective beta-2 agonists were covered, and also exemplified, and that was why there was the list of examples, which did reflect selective and non-selective beta-2 agonists. Also, for salbutamol and the section of exceptions to the List, it had been important to reflect good medical practice. In the past, WADA had referred to the maximum acceptable daily dose; WADA still referred to the daily dose of 1600, but it was important to note that that amount could not be taken in excess of 2 x 800 micrograms. That reflected the way experts in the respiratory field recommended the use of such substances for asthma or bronchoconstriction in athletes. There had been an effort to harmonise doses over a 24-hour period to make it more accessible and understandable for the athlete community.

In section S4, another aromatase inhibitor (arimistane) had been added. It had been prohibited in the past, reflecting the fact that the substance was increasingly available on the market.

In section M1, he noted the fact that supplemental oxygen was allowed by inhalation. Some requests had been received over the years in relation to inhalation of oxygen. It had been deemed useful to add that specification.

In section S6, substances prohibited in-competition, lisdexamphetamine had been added, not that it was a substance of concern by itself because it was an inactive substance, but it was the precursor of amphetamine and, since amphetamine was prohibited, it had been deemed logical to add the substance in the section of non-specified stimulants to avoid any confusion.

In S6.b, for methylhexanamine, a well-known substance, the IUPAC had released the chemical name of the substance and, to be consistent with the rule of using IUPAC names when there was no INN, WADA had added the clinical name recommended by IUPAC, but also kept the usual methylhexanamine name in parentheses. The substance had many other names, which WADA had left in the explanatory note to make sure that the athletes and anti-doping community did not lose sight of the fact that there could be different denominations for the substance.

Under section S7, nicomorphine had been added; it was a substance that converted into morphine. Knowing that narcotics was a closed list, it was important to list substances that were prohibited. That concluded the changes for the draft 2017 Prohibited List.

For the monitoring programme, only two changes had been recommended for 2017, one being the addition of codeine to the monitoring programme. Codeine was a precursor of morphine. Also, the combination of beta-2 agonists would be monitored. Stacking, which meant using several molecules from the same class but in smaller quantities to achieve the same effect, would be monitored in particular for beta-2 agonists.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that clearly much work went into the preparation of the Prohibited List. Could he assume that Ms Fournayron was prepared to propose formally that the

Prohibited List be approved by the Executive Committee and, if so, all efforts would be made to communicate it to the various groups of stakeholders, in particular the athletes?

DECISION

2017 Prohibited List approved.

– 7.5 Research projects 2016

MS FOURNEYRON said that the members would see the WADA science budgetary allocations and spending in anti-doping research since the start of the agency in 2001. She did not think that much explanation was needed. It was quite clear from the information on the screen that the WADA research budget had been significantly and constantly decreased over the past few years from almost 6.5 million US dollars in 2007 down to only 1.1 million the previous year. Luckily, in 2015, WADA had received about 11 million dollars from a combined fund collected by the IOC and governments of the world. 8.6 million had been allocated to science research, 2 million to partnerships and another 1 million to social science research. Of the 8.6 million allocated to scientific research, 6.6 million had already been spent in 2015 and 2016. The Special Research Fund had been a blessing to conduct innovative, bold anti-doping research, but it would not last forever. WADA needed to think about a way of allocating more funds to research when the Special Research Fund was gone. Not everything could be a priority with a limited budget, but it would be unwise for WADA and WADA's credibility to not stand strong on the research budget.

She reminded everybody that the special call for research projects focused on the detection of autologous blood transfusion had been issued in November 2015. Only 16 projects had been submitted, suggesting the difficulty of detecting autologous blood transfusion. Three projects had been funded, the contracts and ethics had been cleared and had all been started. All projects had shown good preliminary results.

DR RABIN guided the members through some facts on the 2016 research projects submitted and the recommendations from the Health, Medical and Research Committee. A total of 83 projects had been submitted to WADA at the beginning of the year. That was a lower number than in previous years, and was not completely unexpected because, as mentioned by Ms Fourneyron, for the first time, there had been a call for projects specifically for autologous blood transfusion, so there were about 10 to 15 projects less that year compared to the previous year. Still, a fairly wide range of countries were represented, and WADA was often criticised of too much impact by anti-doping laboratories on anti-doping research, but more than two-thirds of the projects were submitted by leading researchers who did not work in anti-doping authorities. Nevertheless, WADA did like to see that anti-doping laboratories were associated to ensure the facilitation of the transfer between an academic laboratory to an anti-doping laboratory, and to quickly implement the outcomes of research in anti-doping practice. The majority of projects were submitted by leading researchers outside the anti-doping laboratories.

The main themes were selected by the Health, Medical and Research Committee every year, and WADA had received 25 projects to try to implement and enhance the detection of prohibited substances by classical analytical methods. There were other methods known as affinity binding, using antibodies and other devices or methods, and 10 projects had been received in that field. Still looking at the pharmacology of certain substances, whether or not they should be prohibited or whether WADA could gain additional information that was not necessarily available in scientific literature, there had been 15 projects submitted in that category. The other category, the Athlete Biological Passport, was gaining a lot of momentum, which was good because it was one of the key elements in the fight against doping in sport, and 21 projects had been received that were related to the Athlete Biological Passport. Finally, there were 12 projects in the field of detection of doping substances, methods, OMICs, broader projects and perhaps more creative approaches than the mainstream research projects in the other categories.

WADA always followed the same procedure, which was robust, solid, resource- and time-consuming but extremely sound, with different panels of independent experts reviewing the projects. There had been 10 different panels of two to three experts reviewing the projects, then the project review panel had met. Half of the people were independent experts in

research and half were members of the Health, Medical and Research Committee and the WADA management, and the ethical review usually came after projects were approved. Of course, the research proposals were reviewed and debated by the Health, Medical and Research Committee, and WADA was always very careful about conflicts of interest, because some of the members were also applicants or co-applicants, and it was not only recorded but they were also requested to leave the room as the members discussed the projects. Finally the Health, Medical and Research Committee recommendations were presented to the Executive Committee for approval.

Moving to the projects themselves, he had tried to prepare a very condensed presentation. He did not want to give a scientific lecture. 21 projects had been selected for an amount of 3.2 million dollars, 14% of the amount initially requested. 13 projects had been attributed to the regular WADA fund, for a total of 1.6 million dollars. A little bit of money had been kept for reactive and targeted research. Eight projects had been funded by the Special Research Fund, amounting to about 1 million dollars. The 25% success rate was reasonable, within the standards of what might be expected of an international organisation. The amount requested for six projects had been reduced, either because parts of the project might not have been of interest, were redundant, or were less focused than WADA would have liked, or because a slight realignment of the project had required realignment of the budget. He referred to the projects to be taken from the annual WADA fund, starting with five projects related to improvement of methods, looking at improving some existing methods such as IRMS, looking at some metabolites that had sometimes been ignored. He drew the members' attention to the fact that gene doping testing was part of what was known as the detection methods, and that showed a great step forward. Gene doping testing could be routine testing thanks to all the work conducted in Australia in particular and also by the Gene Doping Panel. One project was about long-term metabolites. That was certainly an area in which a lot of progress would be seen, and for which testing would be essential, because the ability to detect very long-term metabolites, secondary or tertiary metabolites was essential in the fight against doping in sport.

He drew the members' attention to two projects related to glucocorticoids. Ms Fourneyron had alluded to the issue of glucocorticoids. They would provide more information on excretion studies and trying to identify some metabolites specific to some routes of administration. WADA already had one, and was trying to expand on that, and was also trying to be innovative in the way in which testing was approached. Some believed that moving from urine to blood could be very helpful, and there had been a very interesting project that year, not only looking at glucocorticoids in blood, but also looking at dried blood spot (DBS) testing, taking a drop of blood, which was put on paper and could be analysed for certain substances. It would be very interesting to see the outcome of the project, combining the two approaches to try to tackle some of the issues related to glucocorticoids.

WADA needed reference materials. When WADA went to court, the court really wanted to make sure that the substance found in urine or blood was what it was supposed to be. Sometimes, the only way of demonstrating that was to use an identical exogenous substance that could be compared to whatever was found in urine or blood. Another project was to consolidate gene doping detection. There was more to be done, looking at the next generation of sequencing. In the future, WADA would probably not bother to look for one transgene in the body. The full genome would be analysed for a few dollars, and it would be possible to work out whether there was a transgene or not. It would be very interesting to look at gene editing issues and some of the methods that would be faced in the near future.

One project looked at how to better extract peptides and hormones from the samples, and another looked at population reference values, in particular for cobalt and vitamin B12, which contained cobalt, and WADA needed to be able to make a distinction based on the population, as had been done in equine testing.

In terms of the targeted and reactive projects that year, WADA had worked with the Cologne laboratory on the excretion of meldonium. An issue related to the cycles of human growth hormone and the robustness of the detection method for GH in those samples, and also still related to human growth hormone, WADA needed to generate controlled studies to run new tools related to the OMICs, in particular the genomics or the proteomics, which were very advanced technologies but did require well-controlled samples for the substances WADA wished to study.

He referred to the projects taken from the Special Research Fund, which was essential to what WADA was doing in support of the Athlete Biological Passport. There were several issues related to EPO, blood microdosing, using IRMS for longitudinal follow-up, growth hormone or related peptides, all the elements that WADA believed, looked at from a longitudinal perspective, could provide some very useful and interesting information on the ways some athletes might wish to manipulate for doping purposes. Confounding factors and what could affect the steroid profiles was another issue. It was known that some substances did modify the steroid profile, and WADA needed to further explore the possible interaction of some painkillers with the steroid profile. One interesting project was on muscle memory. That was the second project WADA would support from a slightly different perspective that time, to see whether muscles, when impregnated with anabolic steroids, did have a memory of doping, and could either recover faster or react faster to doping or physical exercise.

Finally, as had been done for autologous blood transfusion, WADA had a call for proposals for projects on the prevalence of doping. Some things needed to be clarified from the pre-project that had been run in the past; as soon as that was completed, WADA would go for a broader approach on the prevalence of doping in sport. That concluded the Health, Medical and Research Committee recommendation for the research projects.

THE CHAIRMAN noted that the presentation had been splendid in every way.

MR RICCI BITTI heard the message from Ms Fourneyron about the duration of the money, but questioned the figures, referring to one million and 11 million dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, looking at the minutes of the Finance and Administration Committee meeting, the subject of the future funding of research had been discussed at length and was well known. Were there any questions on the suggested grant programme?

DR RABIN confirmed the figure: 2.9 million dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the members were happy that the projects be approved. He hoped they would turn out to be excellent investments.

DECISION

Research projects 2016 approved.

8. Any other business/future meetings

THE CHAIRMAN stated that the members would be in the Mediterranean climate of Glasgow on 19 and 20 November. It would be warmer than Montreal in November and colder than in Doha, but he hoped that a warm welcome would await the members.

He thought that the past two days had been hugely encouraging. The think tank the previous day had been splendid and much good work would come out of that. There had been a statement the previous day that had been backed up at the Executive Committee meeting, that the Olympic Movement and governments would work together going forward. Many had spoken to him informally and noted that it was quite important that both parties stop criticising each other in public. He guaranteed that the press release issued after that meeting would say precisely that. The cause of clean athletes would not be moved forward by forever arguing about who was doing what, why or when, so WADA had to stop that. The members had been informed of the creation of a charitable foundation in the USA. He had stopped any attempt to seek donations to that foundation. Timing in sport was everything, and the past six months had not been the time to be going and asking people for money whilst WADA had been in serious difficulties. He had a meeting that afternoon with a potential donor which he hoped would start up that process again.

Finally, all those on the Executive Committee should know that the staff had worked enormously long hours over the past few weeks. WADA was nowhere near as efficient at doing what it was supposed to do because it was defending itself against criminal cyber-attacks. He was not a member of WADA's management, but he maintained close relationships with the staff members. It was not unusual for him to be speaking at one o'clock in the morning from his home to the staff at WADA who were finishing a 12-hour day. The Executive Committee understood the situation, and he thanked the staff very warmly for everything

that was being done. He thanked everybody at WADA for everything that had been done over the past few weeks and months. It was greatly appreciated. That meeting had been excellent. There were not always as many highly technical issues to deal with, but it was important that WADA deal with those properly. He thanked everybody and looked forward to seeing them again in November.

DECISION

Executive Committee – 19 November 2016, Glasgow, Scotland;
Foundation Board – 20 November 2016, Glasgow, Scotland;
Executive Committee – 17 May 2017, Montreal, Canada;
Foundation Board – 18 May 2017, Montreal, Canada;
Executive Committee – 21 September 2017, date and location to be confirmed;
Executive Committee – 15 November 2017, date and location to be confirmed;
Foundation Board – 16 November 2017, date and location to be confirmed.

The meeting adjourned at 13.10 p.m.

FOR APPROVAL

SIR CRAIG REEDIE
PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF WADA